



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2017

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 8, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, 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.

THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, for the past few years, I have been on the floor from time to time railing on the loss of life and waste of money in Afghanistan. I believe we have too many in Congress who are not listening to our men and women in uniform and are actually not even listening to the taxpayers who are paying the bill to be in Afghanistan.

From articles written about paying for ghost soldiers—that means that

they don't exist—to the Department of Defense spending \$6 million to buy nine goats, the stories just go on and on and on.

There are so many examples of waste, fraud, and abuse, it is time that we in Congress realize that it is not in our best interest to stay there for 16 more years. We have already been there 16 years. And, you know, you get to a point that you just wonder. And so many of our young men and women who have fought for our country in Iraq and Afghanistan are special heroes to all of us, and we know that. This is about the policy of the Congress, not the military policy.

Recently, I read an article that the former President of Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, has actually been meeting with the Russians and asking the Russians to come back to Afghanistan, and he, Hamid Karzai, will set up meetings with the Taliban. But sometimes you just wonder who in the world is watching this absolutely wild crazy world of Afghanistan.

Then this past week, there was another article, and I will read the title of the article, Madam Speaker: "Chinese Troops Appear to Be Operating in Afghanistan and the Pentagon is Okay With It."

Again, I repeat myself: after 16 years of war in Afghanistan, hasn't the American soldier done enough? Hasn't the American taxpayer paid enough for goats and paying ghost soldiers? 200,000 Afghans who don't even exist are getting paid, so that means that the money ends up in the hands of the Taliban or the village leaders.

You know, if the Chinese want to spend 16 years in Afghanistan, so be it. Let them have it.

Think about the history of Afghanistan, Madam Speaker. Alexander the Great was the first, and then we had the Brits that went in. In fact, Winston Churchill was a young reporter when they were in Afghanistan and he was

very disillusioned with that world. Then the Russians went in for 10 years and then they left, and now we have been there 16 years. Afghanistan is a graveyard of empires.

It is time for us to start looking at the sensibility of what we are doing there and does it make any sense, which is a better way of saying it.

I think that at some time, Afghanistan being the graveyard of empires, there is probably a headstone that says "Russia." After 16 years, maybe there will be a headstone that says "USA." And who knows? If the Chinese go and stay 16 years, there might be another headstone that says "China." At that time, maybe the ghost soldiers can take the \$6 million goats out to the graveyard and let them eat the grass or something.

I don't know, Madam Speaker. It gets a little bit crazy. It really does. It is time for this Congress to debate whether our policy is to stay in Afghanistan or to come home from Afghanistan.

I close with this. These two little girls from my district are Eden and Stephanie Balduf. Their daddy, Kevin Balduf, was a sergeant from Camp Lejeune, which is in my district. He and Colonel Palmer, from Cherry Point Marine Air Station, which also is in my district, were sent to Afghanistan to train Afghans to be policemen.

These two little girls are at the funeral of their daddy. Their daddy, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, emailed his wife the day before he was shot and killed, along with Colonel Palmer, and said: I don't trust them. I don't trust them. I don't trust any of them.

So I say to these two little girls, your United States Congress needs to debate whether we need to stay in Afghanistan longer than the 16 years we have been there, or is it time to say we have done our job and it is time to come home.

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.

H1597

DAY WITHOUT A WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to stand in solidarity on a Day Without a Woman. You will see women in red today and men with red ties in honor of today.

It is 2017 and we still need a Day Without a Woman to remind this administration and Republicans in Congress that women deserve equal pay and access to affordable health care.

Just yesterday, the assault on women continued with the GOP's plan to pay more for less in healthcare legislation that will restrict a woman's right to comprehensive healthcare coverage.

The Republican bill also defunds Planned Parenthood. Women with nowhere else to turn will lose access to essential preventative care and affordable contraception.

This is very personal for me. When I was growing up, we were poor. I had a sister that got pregnant at 15 and another one that got pregnant at 16. I, myself, had a condition that required me to get on a contraceptive to deal with pain that I had. I had nowhere to turn. I, myself, had to go to a clinic that saw me on a sliding scale; otherwise, I would have had nowhere to go.

The fact that we are facing the threat of losing this today for women and preventive care is beyond incomprehensible to me and scary.

On this day today, without a woman, I also think about women, women like Rosa Parks, the mothers, the daughters and grandchildren that took part in the Women's March on January 21, women at the forefront of every fight for equality.

I stand today with women like my mother, Teresa, an immigrant from Mexico, who raised a large family and who took care of my father when he was sick and continues to support me today.

I stand today to fight for equal pay for equal work because women—and Latinas in particular—are paid only 54 cents for every \$1 paid to White men.

I fight in Congress for American families so that they have economic stability and can make ends meet and set their kids off to a brighter future. I will continue to fight with my sisters in Congress for health care, for immigration, and for human rights. All of these are women's rights.

SUPPORTING THE 2017 MONKEY MADNESS 5K RUN AND WALK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage everyone in south Florida to come out to Zoo Miami this Sunday, March 12, for the Families for Fragile X Monkey Madness 5K Run/Walk.

Fragile X syndrome is the most common cause of inherited intellectual disability, which results in a wide range of mental and physical impairments. It is also the most common known genetic cause of autism.

Through events like the upcoming 5K run/walk, organizations like the National Fragile X Foundation and the Families for Fragile X are working to raise awareness and advance groundbreaking research. These events also bring together those impacted by fragile X in our community and provide them with essential support and encouragement so that no one family has to go through this journey alone.

I ask everyone in south Florida to join Michele and her son Matthew, as well as hundreds of other patients, caregivers, and friends whose lives have been impacted by fragile X, this Sunday for the Monkey Madness 5K Run/Walk. You can register at familiesforfragilex.com.

RECOGNIZING THE FRIENDSHIP CIRCLE OF MIAMI

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Friendship Circle of Miami, a program provided by the Chabad of Kendall & Pinecrest that offers much-needed acceptance to children and young individuals with special needs by providing them with the skills to become our future leaders.

Since its inception, the Friendship Circle has provided these vulnerable members of our society the opportunity to participate in many programs like organized sports or visual and performing arts, all while building lasting friendships.

The Friendship Circle has grown from a small organization that started in Detroit to now having chapters all across our Nation and, indeed, around the world. I would like to offer a special congratulations to our Miami chapter, as it recently held its annual Walk for Friendship, raising awareness and support for the programs and services offered to our youth.

Mr. Speaker, it is organizations like Friendship Circle that serve as the pillar of equality and celebrate each person's individual qualities that make them great. I ask south Florida to join members of our community like the Pardo family—Angel, Rosie, and Andrew—in bringing a smile to the faces of some very special children in our community.

CELEBRATING THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, March 1 marked the 56th anniversary of the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps' talented volunteers have accomplished a lot over the years, serving in over 140 countries across the globe. They have changed millions of lives, provided immeasurable technical assistance to communities in need, and helped create a better understanding between Americans and peoples abroad.

In 2011, I was proud to author a bill that helped protect Peace Corps volunteers. The Senate companion to that bill became law as the Kate Puzey Act,

establishing policies that improved volunteer safety and ensured that they would have the resources necessary to contend with emergencies.

Peace Corps volunteers exemplify the extraordinary compassion and leadership of our great Nation, and their security is paramount as they carry out their missions abroad. I congratulate the Peace Corps on its 56th anniversary, and I wish it even greater success in the years ahead.

CONGRATULATING JONATHAN AGUIAR AND THE KNOW MORE CAMPAIGN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Jonathan Aguiar, a wonderful student at Christopher Columbus High School, whom I recently met, for his efforts that are known as KNOW MORE. He started this organization KNOW MORE, and it is an organization founded to raise awareness about sexual assault on high school campuses in south Florida.

Anyone, regardless of age, can become a victim of sexual assault. Unfortunately, it is a crime that often goes unreported due to the detrimental scars felt by some victims. By joining together to create KNOW MORE, Jonathan and his friends have undertaken a noble effort to support victims, protect others from harm, and prepare high school students to make informed decisions.

I thank Jonathan and Christopher Columbus High School for their work and advocacy to combat this issue that affects so many in our community and across the Nation.

MARINES UNITED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, I stood on this same floor and condemned the online bullying of U.S. Marine Corps servicewomen on a public Facebook page. Today I stand before you again, incredulous, angry, and sad, to say that absolutely nothing has changed.

This weekend, news broke that the Department of Defense is investigating scores of enlisted marines for compiling thousands of naked photos of other marines—servicewomen—often surreptitiously, and distributing them through Facebook and Google Drive. The site in question is called "Marines United," claiming a membership of over 30,000 people.

The photos are being tightly held due to the ongoing investigation, but all indications are they are just as repulsive as what we saw 4 years ago.

□ 1015

The report contains samples of the comments posted about female marines, which are too obscene to read on the House floor. Online commentators also reportedly called for the rape of some of the marines portrayed in the photos, which is terrifying, given many of the women are identified by name and base.

This is not about sex or fun or boys will be boys. This is about marines deliberately trying to degrade, humiliate, and threaten fellow marines. They encouraged stalking, distributed stolen intimate photos, and reduced their comrades to a collection of body parts.

Well, I am here to say that women marines will not be treated like sides of beef. They are warriors and should be treated as such.

As one female marine who recently completed the once male-only infantry training said: "Right now I'm supposed to be able to trust every male marine. And with some of the stuff I see them saying about women, that's just not happening."

This cultural rot, which has clearly regressed even further since 2013, harms our troops and our readiness. It is abundantly clear that this is not a few bad marines; rather, it is another example of a culture of rot. It is a blight that infects not just the ranks of the enlisted, but also the officer corps.

Military leadership has utterly failed in their responsibility to protect their troops, punish those involved, and uphold the professed values of the Corps. That is why the survivors of this latest atrocity did not have the confidence to notify their superiors, for fear of retribution. It took a marine veteran and blogger to blow the whistle, and for that, he has been threatened with death and his wife has been threatened with rape.

Back in 2013, then-Commandant General Amos wrote to me saying, "We share your indignation," regarding deplorable images on social media that denigrate women in the United States Marine Corps. They were words—just words. I fear that military leadership will say anything to placate Congress and an outraged public, but then do nothing.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with Secretary of Defense James Mattis. I found him to be engaging, thoughtful, and committed to our troops. Secretary Mattis is also a retired marine.

Secretary Mattis, I hope that you are deeply disturbed by what we are seeing within the Corps. I hope that you are listening to servicewomen like the one whose private photos were posted in the 2013 Facebook group.

One left the service in 2015, and says that just knowing her pictures are still out there has silenced her. She said: "I wanted to be a positive influence on the community. And this diminished me. It took away everything."

Secretary Mattis, this must change now. I call on you to hold your leadership accountable for these failures; to establish a culture of dramatic change. That means heads should roll.

Talk is cheap. Action is what is needed for the integrity of the military. Survivors must be supported. That will only happen if those bad marines are drummed out of the Corps, with no exceptions.

JCC THREATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSEHTINEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I rise today because there have now recently been at least 100 threats made against more than 75 Jewish community centers across the country. These threats and the recent vandalism of Jewish cemeteries are despicable. I can probably find much more harsh language to use, but we probably shouldn't use it here on the House floor.

Community centers of all faiths should be places where people can find peace and not feel targeted for their beliefs. As a nation, we have to demonstrate that we will do everything within our power to prevent future threats and stop potential attacks.

One of my first acts as a new Member of Congress was to join the bipartisan task force to combat anti-Semitism. I am sad that we even have to do this. Our group works across the aisle to combat global anti-Semitism. I have also cosponsored the Combating European Anti-Semitism Act, which instructs the Secretary of State to track anti-Semitism in Europe.

But it is clear from these attacks, Madam Speaker, that we must also do far more here at home to combat anti-Semitism. In the coming days, I will be working with my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to determine the additional steps that we can take to combat anti-Semitism in the United States and keep our communities safe.

I make this encouragement. I encourage all of my colleagues to ask themselves one question: What if it were their child's elementary school? What if it were their child's daycare? What if it were their child's afterschool program that had the threat of a bomb, just like the one that took my own legs?

RESIST APPEAL PROPOSAL

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the proposal offered by the Republican majority to replace the Affordable Care Act.

After nearly 7 years of repeal votes, House Republicans finally released their healthcare proposal on Monday. Simply stated, this proposal is bad for seniors, it is bad for the poor, and it is bad for the sick. It costs more and offers less. It raises cost on middle class Americans while giving huge tax breaks to the wealthy and to special interests.

Madam Speaker, more than 12,000 of my constituents receive financial assistance to buy health insurance on the exchange in the commercial market. Almost all of them will get less help under the Republican proposal.

Why is that?

Because the proposed tax credits will vary by age and income, which means premiums will be unaffordable for the low- to moderate-income families and seniors. As premiums go up with healthcare costs over time, these tax credits don't rise, making insurance less affordable year after year.

Regarding the individual mandate, while removing it may be politically popular, experts who have studied this expect premiums to increase 25 percent when the individual mandate is eliminated. When the employer mandate is eliminated under the GOP proposal, fewer employers will offer insurance to their employees.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, I am opposed to the GOP proposal because it will significantly raise healthcare costs on individuals in their fifties and sixties.

And why is that?

Because the plan will allow insurers to charge them five times more than younger policyholders. In fact, if you are 60 years or older and making an average income, under the GOP proposal your insurance bill will go up by \$3,200 each year while you lose \$6,000 in tax credits and subsidies.

Madam Speaker, nearly 30,000 men, women, and children in my district are currently covered by the Medicaid expansion provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Each of them now stands to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates Maryland's Medicaid expansion. Even our Republican Governor understands that much.

The GOP plan to so-called modernize Medicaid essentially turns the program into a block grant program that shifts the costs to States. States simply cannot afford that. As a result, we will eventually see massive cuts to this cost-efficient program.

This plan to turn Medicaid into a block grant program would hurt the working poor, children, seniors, and people with disabilities that rely on this program. This is wrong and disgraceful.

And why do Republicans want to cut Medicaid, Madam Speaker?

I am not sure, but I do know they are also proposing huge tax cuts for the wealthy.

Under Monday's midnight proposal, we now see that the 400 wealthiest households in America will receive annual tax cuts of \$7 million. The proposal also includes a tax break for insurance companies that pay their CEOs over half a million dollars a year.

Madam Speaker, the Republicans kept this proposal under lock and key for a reason. They scheduled a committee markup without a single hearing or even a CBO score.

The American people and their Representatives deserve to see the numbers. That means every Member of this Congress needs to hear from the Congressional Budget Office: How much will it cost taxpayers? How will it impact our hospitals and health centers?

How many people will lose the health coverage they have right now?

The American public demands and deserves to know.

Madam Speaker, this is not regular order and this is not why I came to Congress. When Democrats introduced the Affordable Care Act, whether you supported it or not, we held 79 hearings over 2 years, heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, and posted the bill online 30 days before markup.

The Republicans have done none of these things. That is hypocritical and shameful. We will resist this dangerous repeal proposal, Madam Speaker.

TRUMP HOTEL

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss another glaring and scandalous drama involving President Trump's conflict of interest that has been lost in the shuffle of the President's nightly tweets and the daily Russian revelations. I would like to talk about the Old Post Office Building down the street on Pennsylvania Avenue.

The General Services Administration solicited proposals for redevelopment of the Old Post Office Building in 2011, selected The Trump Organization in 2012, and signed a 60-year lease in 2013 to redevelop the building.

For the first time in U.S. history, a sitting President now operates and profits from a private business in a taxpayer-owned Federal building. The Old Post Office Building lease agreement explicitly prohibits any elected official of the U.S. Government from serving as a lessee or from profiting under the lease.

Before the President took office, career officials at GSA confirmed that the prohibition on elected officials benefiting from the lease is a categorical ban on any elected official, including the President, being a party to or benefiting from the lease. The prohibition not allowing elected officials to benefit from GSA leases exists because of the outsized influence elected officials, especially the President, have over the funding and management of GSA.

President Trump has violated the very terms of the lease agreement that his company entered into with the United States Government for the Trump International Hotel the very moment that he took the oath of office to become President of the United States of America.

Soon, President Trump will appoint the administrator who serves at the pleasure of the President. That same administrator will be responsible for administering and managing the lease where the guy who signs his paycheck is the guy who benefits from the lease. That, ladies and gentlemen, is a classic conflict of interest.

To try to hide this conflict, President Trump has announced a so-called di-

vestment plan that has two of his adult children responsible for negotiating with the GSA on behalf of daddy. If you think daddy's kids won't make sure that daddy is happy with the administrator and if you think that the administrator won't make sure that the kids are happy with him, then you would be the one who would buy some ocean-front property in Chicago. Essentially, the President controls the man exercising judgment on his lease.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has repeatedly written to the GSA trying to get more information about this glaring problem, but we have not received a substantial response. On March 7, 2017, Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO and I wrote to the GSA Inspector General requesting that they examine administration and management of the Old Post Office Building lease.

□ 1030

Congress needs an independent investigation to determine how and when GSA plans to resolve this breach of the lease and eliminate this conflict of interest, how GSA is shielding the career officials working through this conflict, and whether GSA is receiving fair market value for any amendments to the lease. This lease has already been amended five times, without any congressional oversight.

There is also the elephant in the room as to whether this Trump hotel business is violating the U.S. Constitution. It is unclear whether payments by foreign governments to the Trump International Hotel provide evidence of a violation of the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution. There are also serious allegations of whether foreign diplomats are steering business toward the Trump International Hotel. Could it be that Putin has already made arrangements to rent the presidential penthouse suite in the Trump Hotel for \$10 million a year for the next 4 years? Or perhaps he has paid \$100 million for an option to lease the Grand Ballroom at the Trump Hotel over the next 4 years. The American people need and deserve answers to these very important questions.

President Trump and GSA need to come clean and address these conflict of interest issues in a transparent fashion that protects the interests of the American taxpayers.

COACH STEVE CHAPMAN

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, today I am here to congratulate Calallen High School baseball coach Steve Chapman on his recent induction into the Texas High School Baseball Coaches Hall of Fame.

Coach Chapman was born and raised in Hallettsville, Texas. After graduating from Hallettsville High School, he attended Blinn College and the Uni-

versity of Mary Hardin-Baylor, where he received a degree in education. After graduation, he began his coaching career at Victoria Stroman High School as an assistant coach. In 1983, he became head baseball coach at Calallen High School.

In Coach Chapman's 33 years at Calallen, his Wildcats have won or shared 25 district championships and have been to the Region 4 finals 19 times. The Wildcats have reached the UIL State tournament on 12 occasions, played in the State championship game 8 times, and have won 3 State championships. Coach Chapman's overall record is 967 wins, 204 losses, and 2 ties.

Coach Chapman's induction into the Hall of Fame is a testament to his hard work and the thousands of lives he has touched while coaching the Wildcats, including my long-time legislative director, Blake Adami. I offer my congratulations to Coach Chapman, his family, and everyone at Calallen.

REPLACING THE ACA

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

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, today I would like to share a letter I received from Sherry, who lives back in my hometown of Olympia, Washington.

Sherry writes to me:

My husband was a veteran. He worked as a civilian with high security clearance at White Sands Missile Range and later as a paramedic and firefighter. When I met him, I was working as a paramedic, also. We were crazy in love. But I lost him to cancer in 2009, at the age of 56.

Since the day my husband died, we lost his income. I had to figure out how to raise our son, who was then 6. I sold my business on the Oregon coast, lost my house in Newport, and moved to Washington to be with my sister. I found Olympia a year later and have been here since. I have qualified for food stamps for the last 8 years. We have depended on the food bank on and off.

When all this happened, that was before ObamaCare, and the \$1,000 monthly premium for insurance for my family was simply not sustainable. At first, I was able to keep my insurance through COBRA. But after that ran out, we were left to paying for some cut-rate insurance that provided very little coverage.

When the Affordable Care Act was enacted, I finally felt relief. I got covered through the ACA, and that allowed me to direct some of the money I was paying to insurance toward food, books, clothing, or tuition. My son is now 13, and 6 foot 1, with a size 14 shoe, so we go through clothes and shoes for him like crazy.

I still struggle. I still have medical bills and collections. I still struggle with food and clothes for both myself and my son. I still go to the Thurston County Food Bank in downtown Olympia. But ObamaCare allows me to follow my health closely and helps me pay for the medical care my son and I require.

I have a spot on my lung that needs constant monitoring, and ObamaCare has allowed me to go in for those routine MRIs. Preventative services like mammograms are also paid for.

Since my husband died, I have been focused on raising my son and getting a higher education degree. I went to massage school, and

then I earned my degree at The Evergreen State College. I will graduate with a master's degree in psychology in August. Not only will I be employable and be able to help others in the mental health field, I will also get to start whittling away at paying old medical bills and my student loans.

Although I will no longer need ObamaCare since I will have health insurance through my employer, the ACA has forever changed the insurance marketplace. The insurers can't charge me more for my preexisting condition like they could before.

If the ACA had been in place when my husband died, I would have been able to keep my business on the Oregon coast. If the ACA had been in place when my husband died, I would have immediately qualified for insurance under the ACA, and I may have been able to keep our house. I want you to know, I am not lazy. I am a determined, self-improving mom who is raising her son alone. Before the ACA, I had to decide whether to pay for insurance or food. I depend on the ACA.

That is the letter from Sherry.

Madam Speaker, this past Saturday, I had the opportunity to meet with more than 300 of my constituents who support accessible, affordable health care in our country. I heard from many, but still a small portion of the 750,000 Washingtonians who gained coverage through the ACA.

The ACA is working for many people across America, and Congress should not reverse the progress we have made under it. That being said, I know there are parts of the ACA that could be improved upon. We all know that. We can and should make improvements in order to make healthcare insurance more affordable and more accessible to more people across our Nation. As we began this Congress, I had hope that we could have a productive, bipartisan discussion about the steps we could take to do just that, but I was saddened and, frankly, dismayed by the lack of serious policy efforts from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Well, the majority finally released their proposed replacement for the ACA, the so-called American Health Care Act, after weeks of hiding this secret bill behind closed doors. Frankly, I am not impressed by the bill. This bill offers no attempts to improve healthcare coverage or insurance coverage, no attempts to reduce healthcare costs or the rate of inflation. This bill allows insurance to charge older people more while, at the same time, reducing the subsidies for many of those very same people. The bill was presented without any indication of how it will affect our budget or how many people will be kicked off their insurance under this plan.

This bill does not address the barriers that prevent working class and middle class people from accessing and securing health insurance. In fact, the bill would likely put health insurance out of reach for millions of Americans who are in the working and middle classes.

Madam Speaker, to earn the label "American," a bill had better be exceptional. The American Health Care Act is a lot of things, but exceptional is not

one of them. People like Sherry are exceptional. Let's put Sherry and people in her circumstances first.

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 39 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: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon us this day. During these days, the American people can see the difficulties of legislating for this great Nation of ours. Disagreements between and within parties emerge when important and sweeping laws are being considered.

So also the push and pull of local, State, and national governmental interests and responsibilities can be seen to contribute to the enormity of our way of government. Be it health care or immigration, the wisdom of our Founders can perhaps be seen in their designing a governmental process that is difficult, resistant to hasty solutions, and demanding of those who engage.

May the American people be patient with and supportive of this process, and may the Members of this House, especially, merit the trust of their constituents, those who voted for them and those who did not.

And 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 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOODALL 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.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE 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 gratitude—yes, gratitude—for the opportunity that we have to serve the American people and by beginning the process of repealing and replacing ObamaCare.

As Republicans, we understand that even \$1 trillion in new taxes—as the Affordable Care Act dropped on our friends and families—cannot save a healthcare system that is based on government interference and overreach. We as conservatives defend compassion, fairness, and freedom. These values are mutually inclusive, and I submit the American Health Care Act is a case study in their application.

As insurance markets contract and healthcare options for Americans evaporate across the country, Medicaid continues to give more Federal dollars toward able-bodied Americans than toward the elderly and disabled neighbors that the program was designed to help.

ObamaCare has ushered in a brave new world of diminished health care and skyrocketing costs, and we cannot let these directives stand. Republicans are protecting our most vulnerable neighbors by putting conservative principles back in place. Limiting government, thoughtful budgets for Federal programs, free markets, and choices are the best medicine we have to bring relief to struggling Americans, and we are here to deliver.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have introduced their healthcare plan. The President said it would be better and more cost effective than the Affordable Care Act and it would offer insurance to everybody.

Well, if you believe that, you believe the President has got a secret plan to defeat ISIS which he was going to give us within 30 days, that there were thousands of Muslims in New Jersey cheering 9/11, and that President Obama was born in Kenya. It is not true.

What the plan they have introduced is something that will give the wealthy unbelievable tax breaks. The 400 wealthiest people in America will get tax breaks of \$7 million apiece; and the Americans who earn \$200,000 a year or less will get none of those breaks, but they will pay more for their insurance and get less for it.

The fact is property taxes will go up as less and less people are covered by insurance and they go to emergency rooms for primary care; and as hospitals give more uncompensated care, they have to raise your insurance rates in public hospitals and raise your property taxes.

The American Hospital Association has come out against this. The American Medical Association has come out against this. Next thing you know, the people living the lifestyles of the rich and famous at Mar-a-Lago will come out against it.

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

(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, Elizabeth Oddy returned from east Africa after spending 2½ years as a Peace Corps volunteer. Before returning home, she was examined by a Peace Corps physician. She was deemed healthy and okay to come back to America.

Two days after coming home, Elizabeth went to her doctor for a regular checkup where she was diagnosed with a life-threatening illness. She had stage I thyroid cancer. Her Peace Corps insurance ended the next day.

Peace Corps volunteers often have severe health problems upon their return from abroad. Health issues that are a direct result of serving in the Peace Corps should be covered by the Peace Corps.

Volunteers like Elizabeth are the spirit of humanitarian assistance. It is our responsibility to ensure they are properly cared for both at home and abroad.

My bill, the Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act, improves health care for all current volunteers and returned Peace Corps volunteers that contract illnesses during their service. We must continue providing support for our American angels abroad.

And that is just the way it is.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled and disappointed that Republicans have chosen to move forward with their plans to dismantle the Affordable Care Act rather than working in a bipartisan fashion to improve this landmark legislation.

Republicans have had 7 years to work across the aisle to find solutions. Instead, they have chosen to ignore the ACA's success in pursuit of their single-minded focus on gutting the law. They have voted over 60 times to repeal the ACA. Could not even one of those votes have been to try to improve it if they saw these shortcomings?

Mr. Speaker, the ACA expanded healthcare access to over 100,000 Rhode Islanders and 20 million people nationwide who otherwise did not have health insurance. Unfortunately, the Republican proposal jeopardizes the comprehensive, affordable, quality coverage Americans received under the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan will lead to higher costs and less accessible coverage, and it will strain, not strengthen, our healthcare system. Their plan disproportionately harms seniors, people with disabilities, and those who rely on Medicaid.

I have long said, Mr. Speaker, that the ACA isn't perfect, but it is an important first step toward fulfilling our Nation's promise of compassion and opportunity because health care is a necessity. It is something that is a right, not a privilege. Unfortunately, the Republicans' American Health Care Act will break this fundamental promise by undermining the healthcare coverage of millions.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rarely come down during the 1-minute time of the day, and I am glad I came down this morning for Father Conroy's prayer because there really is a lot of anxiety in this country as it relates to health care. Every family in this country has health care on their mind.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is exactly right. We have an opportunity to work together to fix it because we all know the ObamaCare system is failing. That is why we talk about how to fix it because we know that it is failing.

President Trump said on Monday that the Republican alternative is now open for review and negotiation. He didn't say take it or leave it. He didn't say pass it before you can read it. He said open for review and negotiation.

I challenge my colleagues to think about our opportunity to serve not just one constituent, but all of our constituents. Think about our opportunity to come together and put this healthcare discord behind us for a generation.

I thank Father Conroy for that admonition this morning. I hope we will rise to that challenge.

EPA PUGET SOUND BUDGET CUTS

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose potential deep cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency.

According to many recent press reports, the EPA budget to restore our critical Puget Sound in my home State of Washington is facing a 93 percent

cut. What is worse is the EPA, overall, is potentially facing a 25 percent budget cut, resulting in a loss of 15,000 jobs.

Let us be clear that the EPA is the entity that ensures clean air, clean water, and strong human health. Because of the EPA's work on accountability and oversight of strong environmental regulations, we have seen progress on pollution mitigation, shoreline restoration, water treatment, and education projects that are aimed at protecting our sound and our environment.

This administration's cuts will be devastating to our environment. By signing an executive order to move forward on Keystone and the DAPL pipeline, appointing Scott Pruitt to lead the EPA, and rolling back environmental regulations, we are showing overt hostility to protecting our environment.

We need to be investing in our environment and not slashing it, and we need to make sure that we restore our environment and preserve it for our future generations.

NORWICH BOYS BASKETBALL SECTION 4 CHAMPIONS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to rise and recognize and congratulate the new Section 4, Class B boys' basketball champions, the Norwich Purple Tornadoes. The hard work, dedication, and sportsmanship of these young men helped lead their team to claim the Section 4 victory for the second year in a row.

In the game against the Waverly Wolverines, senior forward Chris Jeffrey scored 17 hard-fought points, taking Norwich into the second half leading 18–17. In the final half, Norwich took the court by storm to claim the title of Section 4 champion with a final score of 49–35.

On behalf of the 22nd District, congratulations to Norwich and Coach Brian Collier on an outstanding win. We wish you luck in the State quarter-final on March 11 against the Section 3 champions.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY AND A DAY WITHOUT A WOMAN

(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, I rise today in support of International Women's Day and to join the countless women across this Nation in participating today and, yes, dressed in red to celebrate our achievements of women across the world in many fields.

I stand with the women today to highlight the economic injustices women face: unequal pay, unpaid leave, gender discrimination, and the list

goes on. Oh, yes, to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Women are the primary breadwinners. Six out of 10 American women are paid only 80 cents on the dollar, and for women of color like me, 64 cents.

But today it is so important for us to say we are faced with the dangerous and irresponsible repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which will once again make being a female a preexisting condition and take away access to free preventative services like mammograms and cervical cancer screening.

You should ask yourself: Why are they doing this markup without hearings? You should ask yourself: Why should families pay more? Why should those with disabilities and preexisting conditions pay more? Why should billionaires benefit more?

Stand with us women on International Women's Day.

□ 1215

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join so many of my women Members of Congress to recognize and celebrate International Women's Day. In my lifetime, women have made so much progress, but our journey toward full equality still has so far to go.

More than five decades ago, a half a century, we began the work to achieve equality in the workplace when President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act. We took another important step forward when President Obama signed his first bill into law, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Even with those laws, women in my congressional district still only make 72 cents on a man's dollar. For women of color, the wage gap is even worse, 63 cents for African-American women and 54 cents for Latinas.

When you consider that women make up almost half of the workforce, and women are either the sole or primary breadwinner in 40 percent of the homes, this isn't just a women's issue; it is a family issue. This is why we must pass the Paycheck Fairness Act to give every woman additional tools to fight for equal pay they earn on each and every payday.

In a country as great as ours, we must guarantee that our daughters have the same opportunity to earn a fair and equal wage.

STEPHANIE CHANEY AND THE ACA

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are, on International Women's Day, 7 years from when we started the Affordable Care Act, 60 votes to repeal behind us, and

yet only this week we have had the big reveal of what the plan will be for replacement. What are we seeing? We don't have any cost information, but we know we are going to protect wealthy insurance executives, and we know that an estimated 15 to 20 million Americans will have their health insurance ripped away from them.

Let me introduce you to one who is concerned about her ongoing coverage. Her name is Stephanie Chaney, and she is from my district in Framingham, Massachusetts. She is a recent grad student at Lesley University, where she studied to be a clinical counselor and dance therapist. She was diagnosed with a rare and extremely painful joint disease, and because of the ACA, she got the treatment she needed.

Because she was a student and not employed, the healthcare law and the changes we make are going to have a direct impact on her life. She worries that if she cannot find another affordable plan, she will have to start over again. Let's think of her and do the right thing by Americans with their health care.

DEFENSE SPENDING IS IMPORTANT

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I rise to voice my full support for the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. This legislation supports our Armed Forces by helping pay our troops and provide care for our men and women in uniform and their families, and it gives our military the resources necessary to combat terrorism, deter our adversaries, and support our allies.

The Defense Appropriations bill includes a 2.1 percent pay raise for our servicemen and -women, which will help our military families like those who are currently struggling in Nevada to make ends meet.

One of the most important investments proposed is increasing our military readiness, which helps strengthen our national security. The legislation fully funds troop number increases authorized and provides an additional \$6.8 billion in procurement spending. This is especially important for helping modernize our Armed Forces by fulfilling unmet requirements for additional ships, weapons, and aircraft, such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighters at Nellis Air Force Base and unmanned aerial vehicles flying counter-ISIL operations missions from Creech Air Force Base.

Finally, the NDAA helps support programs that strengthen relations with our allies. I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

TODAY WE RAISE OUR VOICES

(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, today is International Women's Day, a day without women. I am going to join millions of women in recognizing the important economic power of women in the United States and around the globe.

In a few minutes, I will exit this Chamber with colleagues to show solidarity with our sisters, who are staying away from normal duties and mainstream commerce to call attention to the inequities that women and gender nonconforming people continue to face. We are wearing red to signify our love for our sisterhood and our passionate energy to pursue measures that will advance the lives of women and families, such as equal pay, paid family leave, quality affordable child care, access to Federal health care, and freedom from violence.

In Congress, Democrats will resist efforts to take us back from hard-earned gains, standing strong against the unrelenting attempts by Republicans to repeal the Affordable Care Act, defund Planned Parenthood, and block access to full reproductive care. In the words of the Women's March, today we raise our voices to say that women's rights are human rights, regardless of a woman's race, ethnicity, religion, immigration status, and so forth. When women succeed, the world succeeds.

OPPOSING REPEAL OF THE ACA

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the plan to repeal the ACA. A recent analysis of this plan concludes that 10 million people would lose their health insurance. That is mainly due to the fact that the plan would stop Medicaid expansion and shorten the Medicare trust fund.

Many people in my district would be affected by this plan. 68,000 of my constituents are covered by the Medicaid expansion, 23,000 constituents receive assistance to afford health insurance through the exchange. If the ACA is repealed and the new plan implemented, thousands of my constituents, my neighbors, and my friends would lose their coverage.

But don't just take my word for it or my constituents' word for it. Let's ask the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office to look at the plan carefully and to give a report as to who and how many people it will affect. If you are going to take on something that affects so many Americans, then America deserves to know how our health care and our lives will be impacted by your plan.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY STRIKE

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of International Women's Day, A Day Without a Woman strike. Today we are here and are joined by many of our sisters around the Nation to declare, once and for all, that women's rights are human rights. We are here to stand in solidarity with women across the country to send a clear message: We will not rest until we create a society where all women—all women—have equal rights under the law.

We are resisting and letting President Trump and the Republicans know that we will not go back. We stand with the millions around the Nation who have walked out today, and today we are walking out for them. We are raising our voices for the millions of women who can't because they might get fired or because they can't afford to lose their meager wages.

I encourage all of my Democratic colleagues to join us, along with Leader PELOSI, the Democratic Women's Working Group, Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK, and so many others, for a walkout following these 1 minutes and attend the press conference on the House steps right outside in solidarity and in honor of all of the women in the world who are marching today and striking today for equal rights.

PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic today that we are celebrating the international success and celebration of women when we are also working to repeal affordable quality health care for women and families.

I am reminded, in fact, of my own mother, who fought during a time in the 1960s and 1970s to ensure that my sister, who was very sick and disabled, would have access to a quality public education and also to affordable health care. Quite frankly, it was not available. My mother and father were financially destitute. Today, as a result of trying to provide that health care, I am my mother's caregiver.

Today, I am reminded of all of the women primarily—49 million of us—providing more than \$500 billion worth of long-term care and caregiving support to our families, that this is a day to really celebrate that leadership, that support, and the efforts made by women. Congress, as a body, should do much, much more to preserve and protect those rights of women and their families all across America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1301, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 174

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1301) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than Wednesday, March 8, 2017, such material as he may deem explanatory of H.R. 1301.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), 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

Ms. CHENEY. 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 gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 174, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 1301, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 2017. I would like to thank, in particular, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Chairman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCOSKY for their hard and dedicated work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have no higher obligation as elected representatives of the people of this great Republic than ensuring for the security and defense of our Nation. We are gathered here at a tremendous time of action and achievement across an array of crucial policy areas, regulatory relief for the citizens and businesses of our Nation, restoration of authority to our States and local communities, tax reform, ObamaCare repeal and replacement, and the list goes on.

President Trump is doing what he promised during his campaign, and it is an honor to serve the people of Wy-

oming at this historic moment. But, Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to say that if we fail to provide the resources our military needs to defend our Nation, if we fail to do what is necessary to ensure America's Armed Forces remain superior to all others in the world, if we fail to provide the support our men and women in uniform need to recover from 8 years of devastating policies, nothing else we are doing in this body will matter.

Mr. Speaker, the need is urgent. As we meet today to debate the 2017 Defense appropriation, our Nation faces a more complex and grave threat environment than we have faced at anytime since World War II, and possibly, Mr. Speaker, more than at anytime in our history. For 8 years, our adversaries' strength has grown, while our relative capabilities have stagnated and, in some instances, declined.

□ 1230

North Korea continues its ballistic missile launches as it threatens our allies and interests.

The Iranian nuclear agreement has bought time for Iran to continue to advance its nuclear weapons program, as it reaps the windfall of at least \$1 trillion of U.S. taxpayer funds provided to it by the Obama administration. Iran continues to threaten U.S. naval vessels in the Strait of Hormuz, support terrorism across the Middle East, and test ballistic missiles despite its U.N. obligations.

China is rapidly building up its military, and it is targeting, in particular, technologies to try to level the playing field with our capabilities. It continues to threaten freedom of navigation and trade in the South China Sea, and to conduct cyber operations against the United States.

Russia has invaded Ukraine, threatens Eastern Europe and the Baltics, is violating INF Treaty obligations, and openly threatening the use of nuclear weapons.

Al-Qaida today exists in more countries than ever before, and ISIS continues to recruit and hold territory as it plans and launches attacks against the West.

Most of the actors I just mentioned are also responsible for cyber attacks against the United States.

Against this backdrop, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. military is vastly underresourced. At a recent House Armed Services Committee hearing, the vice chief of staff of the Army told members that of the 58 brigade combat teams, only three are ready to "fight tonight." The vice chief of naval operations, Admiral William Moran, recently testified that more than half of all Navy aircraft are grounded due to maintenance issues and an inability to acquire the necessary parts. Our nuclear force is aging, even as our adversaries continue to make advancements in their own nuclear forces and capabilities. Our Air Force is the oldest, smallest, and least ready it has ever been.

These stories and shortfalls, Mr. Speaker, exist across nearly every aspect of our military. America's fighting men and women are the greatest fighting force and the greatest force for good our world has ever known. They deserve the resources to do their job.

We have prevailed over great challenges in the past, from our unlikely and miraculous founding, through our Civil War, two world wars, the Cold War, and the early years of the war on terror. We must, Mr. Speaker, marshal our forces to do so again. To prevail, Congress—this Congress—must do its job.

That job begins with passing this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. Then, Mr. Speaker, we must repeal the Budget Control Act and end sequestration. There is a rational and responsible way for us to undertake defense budgeting. The process in place today is neither.

The last time our military was able to assess the threats we face and then recommend the necessary funding levels to defeat those threats was fiscal year 2011, over 6 years ago. We must return to this standard budgeting process. In describing the effects of sequestration several years ago, our current Defense Secretary put it this way: "No foe in the field can wreak such havoc on our security as mindless sequestration is achieving today." We must end this practice with all speed.

This should not be a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. It has not been in our past. Since World War II, every American President, Republican and Democrat alike, has understood the importance of American military superiority of ensuring a world in which America and our allies set the rules.

Threatened by the Nazis and the Japanese, Franklin Roosevelt and George C. Marshall knew America had to be the "arsenal of democracy." At the beginning of the Cold War, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy roused the Nation to defeat freedom and liberty against communism. John F. Kennedy knew America had to be "the watchmen on the walls of freedom." In the 1980s, President Reagan oversaw the defense buildup we are still benefiting from today. He knew that "war comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, it is when they are weak that tyrants are tempted." And in the aftermath of 9/11, it was George Bush and Dick Cheney who kept us safe, who knew we could not win this war on defense, who understood we had to have a military strong and capable enough to deny terrorists the safe havens from which they plot and plan and launch attacks against our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, now it is our turn. Across the globe, our adversaries challenge us, from China to North Korea, to Iran, to Russia; across the Middle East, in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Thirty-four years ago, Ronald Reagan described our duty at another time, against another enemy, this way:

It is up to us in our time to choose, and choose wisely, between the hard but nec-

essary task of preserving peace and freedom, and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore our duty while our enemies grow stronger. We must take the first step today to begin rebuilding our military. H.R. 1301 is that first step. It increases defense spending, provides a full pay raise for our servicemen and -women, and begins to address our readiness shortfalls. This bill provides funds based on our military's priorities for fiscal year 2017 and gets us off the cycle of continuing resolutions, which are doing real damage to our readiness and capacity.

Therefore, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 1301, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Defense Subcommittee Chairmen GRANGER and FREILING-HUYSEN, and Ranking Member VISCOSKY, for their hard work in bringing this bill to the House floor today. The Defense Subcommittee is known for its ability to work in a bipartisan manner, and this bill demonstrates that this tradition continues.

Last year, the House approved its version of the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. It was a deeply flawed bill filled with funding gimmicks, including a funding cliff that cut off funding for the war budget in order to boost base defense spending by \$18 billion. The Senate version of the Defense Appropriations bill did not contain such gimmicks and was marked up by the Senate Defense Subcommittee, the full committee, and reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, but it never went to the Senate floor for consideration.

The FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill that the House will consider later today is not, therefore, a conference report. It is being treated as if it were a conference report, namely by having a closed rule, but let us be perfectly clear that this is not a conference report.

Let me also be clear, Mr. Speaker, that we could have had this type of final bill come before us last December, just as we could have brought up all of the pending FY 2017 appropriations bills before the House last December for final action. Instead, Republican leadership chose to keep nearly the entire Federal Government, including the Pentagon, operating at FY 2016 levels without any clarity about what their annual budgets might be.

So when we hear talk about problems with military readiness or shortfalls in defense budgets, I suggest the Republican leadership hold a mirror up to

their faces and take some responsibility.

This bill is 5 months late. It could also have been taken care of 3 months ago in December, and, in fact, it should have been taken care of in December. It is now making its way through another convoluted process today. But we still have no idea about the fate of the other pending ten appropriations bills that the Republican leadership failed to complete last December.

And I say convoluted, Mr. Speaker, because when the House votes on H.R. 1301 today, it still needs to go back to the Senate, and we really have no idea what they are going to do with it. Are they going to pass it without any changes and send it to the President for signature? Or are they going to use it as a vehicle to attach the other ten appropriations bills and send it back to us as the FY 2017 omnibus that we should have completed in December? Perhaps they might consider holding on to it until the President gets around to sending Congress his request for the FY 2017 supplemental so that we finally know how much Congress is actually being asked to approve for Pentagon spending in FY 2017?

So hold on to your hats because we are not done today with the defense spending bills for fiscal year 2017, one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I know that everyone in this House wants to make sure that our men and women in uniform are well staffed, trained, and equipped to carry out the missions and duties that we have asked them to carry out. In these areas, in particular, there is much to recommend in this latest version of the FY 2017 defense bill. The same is true for the funding included in H.R. 1301 for suicide prevention, sexual assault, and medical research.

I would also like to point out that H.R. 1301 totals \$577.9 billion. This includes \$516.1 billion in the base bill and \$61.8 billion in the overseas contingency operations account to fund the many wars in which we are engaged. Coupled with the \$5.8 billion FY 2017 supplemental Congress approved last year, total defense spending for FY 2017 currently stands at \$583.7 billion; and that is before we receive still another FY 2017 supplemental from the President.

Mr. Speaker, that is well over half a trillion dollars for the Pentagon, more than the combined total military spending of the next seven greatest military powers in the world. So for those who bemoan how underfunded the Pentagon is, I would argue it is more a matter of failing to set priorities and tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars of waste, fraud, and abuse. Every report on every attempted audit of the Defense Department reveals that the Pentagon doesn't have a clue about where the money goes. Billions and billions of dollars cannot be accounted for. No other agency in the U.S. Government gets so much money or is allowed such sloppy

accounting, yet the White House and the Congress can't wait to throw even more billions at the Pentagon, rather than demanding accountability and setting clear spending priorities.

There are also other matters of concern with this bill, Mr. Speaker. H.R. 1301 not only continues, but adds to the prohibitions regarding the detention facility at Guantanamo. This is all an effort to prevent Guantanamo from shutting down, which hurts America's ability to do human rights work around the world and remains a stain on our own values and ideals.

This bill continues to spend billions of dollars on the insane trillion-dollar effort to modernize and produce new generations of nuclear weapons when what we should be doing is continuing to reduce our nuclear arsenal and enter hard negotiations with other nations that have nuclear weapons to eliminate them altogether.

Finally, H.R. 1301 continues to provide so-called emergency funding through the OCO account to continue wars in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and elsewhere. These wars are hardly unexpected or an emergency and should, therefore, be fully incorporated into the base budget for the Pentagon. They are also wars for which Congress has not debated or approved any authorization for the use of military force.

We do not have an AUMF to deploy our military forces against the Islamic State, yet we have deployed military forces in the air, at sea, and on the ground in Iraq, in Syria, and elsewhere in the region.

We do not have an AUMF to deploy our military forces in the civil war in Yemen, yet we have deployed them to Yemen where one of our Navy SEALs was killed in combat and several others wounded in January.

The Republican leadership continues to fail at its constitutional responsibilities by not bringing any AUMF before the House for consideration, despite promises to do so. So here we are in the 115th Congress, following in the failed footsteps of the 113th and 114th Congresses, getting ready to vote on tens of billions of dollars for wars that Congress has failed to authorize.

I am proud of the courage demonstrated every single day by our men and women in uniform. I wish I could say the same thing about Congress and this House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while I am glad that at least one of the pending appropriations bills is going to see some action today, I wonder about the fate of the other ten.

When will we see those bills, Mr. Speaker?

In fact, speaking of urgent pending matters, when will we see a jobs bill?

□ 1245

When are we going to see legislation to repair and modernize America's infrastructure? Will extra funds be included in the fiscal year 2017 Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill, in

the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, in the Interior Appropriations bill for similar improvements on Federal lands?

We have all read about the replacement proposed by the Republican leadership for the Affordable Care Act, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I am having trouble remembering how many hearings were held on that proposal so that Congress could benefit from experts in the healthcare field about whether this replacement bill will provide health care to even more Americans at less cost than the ACA. Oh, that is right, Mr. Speaker. The proposal is being marked up today without any hearings or expert testimony whatsoever.

Especially for the new Members of this body, it is important to remember that, when the Democrats drafted the Affordable Care Act, there were dozens of hearings and 30 days prenotification before Energy and Commerce held its markup, a markup that continued over many days. And then the bill, as reported out of committee, was posted for over 2 months online before coming before the full House for debate on amendments and final passage.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if a replacement bill to the ACA is not able to make sure that more Americans have health insurance at a lower cost, then what is the point other than politics?

We don't need to see any bill that covers fewer people and forces workers, families, and individuals to pay even more for their healthcare coverage and get even less in terms of healthcare protections. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Republican replacement bill is being marked up in committee without a score by the Congressional Budget Office; and without a CBO score, then no one in this Chamber, in this city, in this Nation has any idea, has any clue how much this replacement bill will cost the taxpayer, let alone who will benefit and who will suffer under its provisions.

That is simply a scandal, Mr. Speaker, completely unacceptable. It is a cruel joke on American families, American workers, and the States, local communities, hospitals, doctors, nurses, and healthcare providers who will have to struggle with the consequences of people losing their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, let's see America's priorities taken care of: a jobs bill, an infrastructure bill. Let's make sure we don't weaken healthcare protections for people in this country, and let's see all of the FY 2017 appropriations bills come before the House in the next few days so that we can complete the work that should have been done last December.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and, frankly, I want to thank her for taking on this rule and the role she plays in this House. She came to Congress with an extraordinary expertise in national security, probably unsurpassed by any new Member. So she is not only a valuable member of the Rules Committee, she is an important voice for the security of the United States of America in a very dangerous era.

Before I begin, I want to actually agree with my friend from Massachusetts on a couple of very important points that he made. First, I want to agree with him that this should have been done earlier. My friend is exactly right about this. This could have been done, in my view, in November and December. We should have gotten it done then. We would have avoided a lot of problems that come with a continuing resolution.

I am very pleased that we are moving it now, but earlier would have been better, no question about it. And that is true with every other bill, and my friend made that point as well. We really should make sure that each of the appropriations bills are passed. All of the problems associated with the continuing resolution are so evident for our military, are evident, frankly, in every other department. So I would hope my leadership continues to do what they are doing today and that is move these bills forward.

My friend is also right, in my opinion, about the authorization of the use of military force. This is something we have agreed on, even when we disagree on other things. This is a congressional responsibility. The President has announced he is going to announce a new strategy going forward on ISIS. I would suggest to my side of the aisle and to the administration, now would be a great time to come to the Congress so we could have this robust debate on deploying and using our military and discharge our constitutional responsibilities.

I am less persuaded by my friend's arguments about the spending levels here. I just point out for the record this is well below what former Secretary of Defense Gates, when he was Secretary in the Obama administration, recommended we should be doing at this time. Frankly, that is because the last administration dropped the ball and simply didn't listen to its own experts as to what the appropriate level of our forces should be.

The underlying legislation here is an excellent bill. My friends have already talked about it in detail. I am going to take a 30,000-foot look at the bill and remind our listeners and our colleagues, there are three important objectives that this bill achieves:

The first is stopping the erosion in end strength, something that went on for years under the last administration that somehow thought we would be safer if our military got smaller. That was a bad assumption.

The second is to restart the procurement cycle. We have fallen far, far behind what we should be doing in terms of replacing, upgrading, and improving the weapons systems and the communication systems, every system that we move into war with and that we ask our men and women to use.

And finally, this actually begins to address a problem that my friend from Wyoming discussed in great detail: readiness. We simply are not ready now to fight with the effectiveness. Now, I don't have any doubt, if we had to deploy massively, that our forces would do well and they would win, but a lot of people would die because they hadn't had the appropriate training, the appropriate time on task to get ready.

The other great objective that this bill meets is that we finally match up spending with the authorization. Last year, we had an excellent authorization bill out of the House Armed Services Committee. Unfortunately, that doesn't get you very far if the money doesn't match the policies and the recommendations that they advanced. This now takes care of that problem.

I also remind our colleagues that passing this bill is only a first step. As my friend from Wyoming pointed out, we are going to need a supplemental later this year, just for this year. We are going to need a robust increase in the fiscal year 2018 authorization and appropriation, something that the President has committed to and something I hope we can advance on a bipartisan basis.

Finally, again, as my friend pointed out, real military buildups take years, not months and weeks. We are going to have to be at this task for several years to restore and strengthen, frankly, what we allowed to decline, what the last administration allowed to decline over several years.

So this is an extraordinary first step, but it is only a first step; and I would hope my colleagues would join us on a bipartisan basis, while we have differences, but come together and put the defense of the country in a very dangerous time ahead of all else that we do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill and the underlying legislation, and I urge the passage of the rule.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Wyoming. I want to thank my friend from Massachusetts. We sometimes disagree, but he makes very valuable and very important points in some of the critiques he offers, and I hope that we heed them well.

With that, again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the underlying legislation and the adoption of the rule.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind words and for understanding that it is inappropriate for Congress to continue these wars without having a vote on an AUMF. I hope that that changes, but I appreciate his support, and there is bipar-

tisan support for having this body actually do its job. That shouldn't be a radical idea, but, unfortunately, nowadays, doing our job seems to be something that a lot of people don't want to do.

Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of the year, the Republican majority adopted a rule to explicitly exempt the cost of any bill that repeals or amends the Affordable Care Act from a requirement that it not increase spending by \$5 billion. They effectively adopted a legislative blindfold to completely ignore the cost of repeal.

Let me show you the poster of the language, and I am happy to provide this to my colleagues on the Republican side. I will even give you my bifocals if you want to read it, because I think it is important that people understand what it says. It says:

Point of order: It shall not be in order to consider any bill that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$5 billion.

Limitation: This subsection shall not apply to any bill repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, with this act, the majority declared that they were not going to let the rules of this House, which are purportedly in place to ensure fiscal discipline, stand in the way of repealing the Affordable Care Act no matter how much it would cost American families.

But, Mr. Speaker, it gets even worse. As we stand here today, Republicans have taken their head-in-the-sand approach to the Affordable Care Act to a new low. Right now, both the Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means Committees are considering Republican legislation to repeal healthcare reform without providing any analysis from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office on the cost of their legislation.

So let me put this another way. Earlier this year, the Republicans said: It does not matter how much it will cost to take health care away from millions of Americans. Now they are saying they don't even want to know how much it will cost or what impact it will have on American families.

Mr. Speaker, we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office. That office costs nearly \$50 million a year. We pay them to advise us precisely at times like this. Republicans have talked about repeal and replace for 7 years. Acting like they had not enough time to weigh the cost of their actions would be laughable if it were not so irresponsible.

Now, we Democrats care about health care and we care about costs and we demand to know what the impact of this repeal bill will be. Members should not be asked to vote on this legislation until they know the full weight of their decision.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would require a CBO cost estimate to be made publicly

available before any legislation that amends or repeals the Affordable Care Act may be considered in the Energy and Commerce or Ways and Means Committee or on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of that amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on this issue, and he will explain this even further.

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

The issue before us is far more basic than one's view on the Affordable Care Act. I recognize that there is a philosophical difference about the Affordable Care Act: on our side of the aisle, we think it is good legislation; on the opposite side of the aisle, they have concerns. But the issue is whether the American people, whether taxpayers, ought to know the cost of the repeal legislation, whether they have the right to know how much a legislation introduced in this House costs.

Now, here is the irony: the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, made his entire career demanding that we know numbers behind legislation. That was his mantra in his time of service in the House.

You talk to Doug Elmendorf, who was the former Congressional Budget Office Director, and he said that the one thing he respected about the Speaker is that he would actually insist on the numbers, that he would want to know how much we are adding to a \$20 trillion deficit. That is why it is incomprehensible to me that, in this Congress, under this Speaker, we would ever be asked to vote on legislation without knowing the financial impact of that legislation.

These are basic issues:

How much is the repeal legislation going to add to our deficit?

How much is it going to finance tax cuts for the wealthy?

How many people will it leave out of insurance or how many people would it add to insurance?

There just ought to be a transparent discussion.

Now, it is not just Democrats who want this transparent discussion; actually, a Republican, the gentleman from Ohio, a founder of the Freedom Caucus, has expressed similar concerns. He has expressed concerns that this repeal legislation will balloon the deficit and explode the deficit, and he wants to know the numbers.

We can have as much respectful disagreement about how to cover people and whether the Affordable Care Act is

a good piece of legislation or not, but what we should not be debating is the public's right to transparency. That is why I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question so that we can hold an immediate vote on requiring the Congressional Budget Office to score the repeal legislation and provide the American people with the basic financial costs of the legislation.

□ 1300

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

What is incomprehensible to me is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem so fundamentally confused about what the actual issue before us today is. The issue before us today is whether or not this House is going to undertake its fundamental, most important, most sacred obligation under our Constitution and provide for the defense of this Nation.

Now, they can choose to dedicate their time to another very important topic. It is a hugely important topic and one that we will have many days to debate and discuss on this floor. Unlike under the previous leadership, Speaker PELOSI, our leadership, Speaker RYAN, has not told us we have to pass the bill before we know what is in it.

Today, the issue before us in this House is whether or not we are going to provide for the defense of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that our colleagues across the aisle have become so interested in the impact of the national debt on the American people. I only wish that, during their time in control of the White House, we had not doubled the national debt.

I am similarly grateful that Members on the other side of the aisle would say that we should know the impact of legislation before we vote for it because, after all, it was former Speaker PELOSI who said: Let's vote for it so that we know what is in the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because following an 8-year cycle of abandonment, it is time we do right by our military members and their families. I rise in support of the brave warriors stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, Naval Air Station Pensacola, and all across the globe. The 2.1 percent pay raise we provide in this appropriation is a modest downpayment on what is owed to those who put themselves in harm's way for our freedom.

Our current state of military readiness is not acceptable. Half of the planes in our Navy cannot fly. Pilots are leaving. Marines are harvesting parts out of museums. Soldiers downrange don't have the unrivaled equipment they need to match their unrivaled patriotism.

This \$583 billion appropriation is a first step. It means 74 new F-35 aircraft. The F-35 is the most capable air-

craft in the sky. Pilots have greater survivability in the F-35. This matters so much to me. In my district, we are training the next generation of F-35 pilots to fight and win against any enemy we encounter in the skies.

This legislation also reflects our values by investing in cancer research and traumatic brain injury research.

Now, some say we cannot focus on defense; we should focus on other domestic priorities. I would simply say our adversaries are not waiting. Our warfighters and military families are tired of waiting and so am I.

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

I appreciated the gentleman from Florida's comments, but I would just ask him: Why is the Republican leadership 5 months late in bringing a defense appropriations bill to the floor?

We could have done this months ago. So if there was this urgency, it seems to escape the Republican leadership.

I want to take issue with the gentlewoman from Wyoming when she says that what is important today and what we are debating today is only this Defense Appropriations bill.

As you know, we are currently debating the rule, and the rule is a tool used to set the House agenda and to prioritize consideration of legislation. For that very reason, this is, in fact, the appropriate time for us to explain to the American people what legislation we would like to prioritize, what is of grave concern to us, and what agenda we would like to pursue in this House.

The fact of the matter is that, as we are speaking, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee are marking up TrumpCare, which we know, in all likelihood, is going to result in millions of Americans losing their health insurance. We also are concerned that it is going to cost the American taxpayer a boatload of money.

What we are simply saying here today is that the Congressional Budget Office, which we fund and we rely on, ought to be able to give us a cost estimate, ought to tell us how much this is going to add to our deficit, how much it is going to cost the American people, how many people are going to lose their health care.

Why in the world would you rush a major piece of legislation through committee and onto the floor without even knowing what you are talking about?

I mean, this process constitutes mindless legislating. This is not doing your job, and that is all we are requesting.

We can argue over whether or not you like the Affordable Care Act or you don't. But whatever you are going to do, we ought to bring it to the floor with everybody's eyes wide open and knowing what the impacts are going to be.

Talk about lack of transparency, this TrumpCare bill was under lock and key until just a couple of days ago. It was

the best-kept secret in the world. For 7 years, my friends have been talking about a replacement bill. No one ever saw it. But all of a sudden, it is brought out before the American people at a press conference and, again, in a way that doesn't answer a lot of questions. It is being rushed through committee, and it is going to be rushed onto the House floor. That is not a good process.

I will remind my colleagues that when the Affordable Care Act was considered here in the House, the House held 79 bipartisan hearings and markups on the health insurance reform in 2009 and 2010. You have held no hearings. None. There has been no expert testimony, no healthcare professionals, no doctors, no patients, no nurses, no families, nothing. There have been no hearings. The bill went right to markup.

House Members spent nearly 100 hours in hearings, heard from 181 witnesses from both sides of the aisle, considered 239 amendments, both Democratic and Republican, accepted 21 amendments. Again, there have been no hearings.

In markup, the Energy and Commerce Committee adopted 24 GOP amendments. In markup, the Education and the Workforce Committee adopted six GOP amendments. The original House bill was posted online for 30 days before the first committee began their markup and more than 100 days before the tricommittes formally introduced their merged bill in the House.

House Democrats posted their first House bill online for the promised 72-hour review. The Senate bill voted on in the House was online for 3 months, and the reconciliation bill was online for 72 hours of review before the final vote.

House Democrats heard and answered questions from constituents at more than 3,000 healthcare townhalls and public events. Tens of thousands of emails, calls, and letters were logged in congressional offices to register public comment. My friends are busy trying to avoid public town meetings.

I am just simply saying that we are raising this issue because we are deeply concerned about the prospect of millions of Americans losing health care and about you adding God knows what to our deficit. I don't think it is too much to come together in a bipartisan way to say: Let us know what the costs are going to be, let us know what the impacts are going to be. And if you still want to vote for TrumpCare, you can vote for it, but you ought to know what you are voting for.

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

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

I would say that not knowing what they are talking about is something with which our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are quite familiar. Accounts of public input really bear little

relationship to what actually happened when ObamaCare itself was drafted in the dark of night.

Imagine what it must be like if you are tuning in to this conversation and this discussion thinking that the U.S. House of Representatives is taking up the rule to debate, discuss, and pass our FY17 Defense Appropriations. Instead, what we are hearing is a list of when bills were posted online—a list—which, as I said, bears little reality to what actually happened when ObamaCare was passed.

Now, those are hugely important issues. I am incredibly proud of the job we are doing as Republicans in this body to help save a collapsing healthcare system.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no higher duty and obligation we have than to ensure that our military is second to none. No matter what kind of a job we do, as important as that is to repeal and replace ObamaCare, if we fail to address this fundamental issue and fail to provide the resources our military needs, nothing else we do in this body matters.

I believe, frankly, that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle owe our men and women in uniform, they owe the policymakers at the Pentagon, they owe those people who are serving this Nation the respect of talking about the resources they need to do their job and focusing on the true issue before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 1301, which will fund our national defense for fiscal year 2017. This bill is a vital first step as we begin to work on rebuilding our military. The best way to look at defense spending over time is as a percentage of U.S. gross domestic product.

Since World War II, we have spent an average of 5 percent of our GDP on defense during peacetime. Despite a world that has gotten more dangerous, the defense drawdown in recent years cut defense spending from 5 percent of GDP to 3 percent of GDP. And in a \$17 trillion economy, that is real money.

Meanwhile, since Vietnam, we have spent an average of 21 percent of the Federal budget on defense. Today, we spend well below that, about 15 percent of the overall budget.

Things are so bad today—and I don't have time in 2 minutes to go into all the details—that we are actually at risk of losing more American lives than we should in the event of another war.

The next step is to pass a robust defense supplemental and then to fund defense for fiscal year 2018 at a minimum level of \$640 billion. Anything less will not keep Americans safe and will not allow us to rebuild our military as we desperately must do.

Congress must deal with sequestration. Trying to fund defense at BCA levels is like trying to put a size 10 foot

into a size 7 shoe. It simply doesn't work and it is dangerous for our own security and it is dangerous for the world.

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

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side: I know you don't like me talking about health care. If I were you, I wouldn't want to talk about health care either. This is a serious matter, and it is a matter of security for millions and millions of Americans in our country.

Again, maybe somebody over there can tell me: How much is this new TrumpCare bill going to cost? How much is it going to add to the deficit? How much are the American taxpayers going to have to pay for it? Does anyone know how many people will lose their coverage? Hello?

I guess I would ask the questions: Why do we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office, who we pay \$50 million a year to be able to give us these estimates, if we are not going to utilize them? Why are we doing this?

It seems to me that before we do something that could harm millions of people in this country, before we could do something that could result in an increase in our deficit, why don't we ask the experts? And we all acknowledge that they are experts and we pay them lots of money. Why don't we get their advice?

This whole process seems backwards. You ought not to be marking up bills when you don't know what their impact is going to be.

Part of our job as Members of Congress, in addition to holding hearings and listening to experts and listening to citizens tell us their perspective—which, again, has been totally ignored in this process of the repeal of the healthcare bill—is also to make sure that when we are voting, we know what the impact is going to be, we know whether or not it is going to have a positive impact or whether it is going to have a negative impact.

Again, one of the reasons why I want to defeat the previous question is so that we can vote in a, hopefully, bipartisan way to get a CBO score so we know what is what.

I get it. I know my colleagues don't want to talk about health care. They would rather talk about something we should have done months ago. That is what we are doing now, we are doing old work now. This should have been done 4 or 5 months ago. I am just baffled why you don't want to do your job.

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

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

We on this side of the aisle are more than happy to talk about health care. We are more than happy to talk about the really crucial work that is underway to rescue our healthcare system from the collapse and the train wreck of ObamaCare, which my colleague's

party put into place in the dark of night with no reading of the bill.

We are thrilled actually that our bill is 120 pages and that it is readable and that it is available online right now. So when he leaves the floor, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts can go read the bill.

It is also not surprising that our colleagues do not want to talk about our national defense because the record of the last 8 years, the record of the last President is unparalleled in American history. The mess that we are having to clean up with respect to our healthcare system is matched perhaps only—and maybe even exceeded—by the damage that was done to our military and to our national security under the last administration.

We think, on this side of the aisle, that it is crucially important that we do our job when the time is now to debate, discuss, and vote on this bill and address this topic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

□ 1315

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, a bill providing vital funding for the United States military and intelligence communities who continue to be engaged in responding, engaging, and destroying threats around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the great responsibility of representing the largest concentration of Active-Duty military and veterans of any congressional district in the Nation. Who are they? Fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, sons, daughters, soccer coaches, neighbors.

Our district has thousands of the less than 1 percent of the Nation that has gone forth over and over to fight for us; the best among us, fighting the worst in the world.

In our district, Mr. Speaker, we have the largest naval base in the world, NASA, SEAL teams, Marines, Army soldiers, Air Force Combat Command, coastguardsmen, Oceana Naval Master Jet Base, national guardsmen, and many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving toward the smallest Army since World War II, the smallest Air Force ever, Navy ships not being properly maintained due to budget, Marine planes not combat-ready. This is unacceptable. Our Nation requires a military, but our force is voluntary. We owe them more.

We must take up this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill to help maintain a technological advantage. If we must send our men and women into harm's way, let us always send these warfighters with an unfair advantage.

This bill provides essential equipment, platforms, and upgrades. We must give our force and our industrial base predictability and stability, the right equipment, the right training, and the right military superiority.

This bill not only supports the warfighters, but their families as well

who, Mr. Speaker, are the very backbone of our forces and an integral part of the tremendous sacrifice that has taken place for our Nation. This bill provides important investments in traumatic brain injury, suicide prevention, sexual assault prevention, and much more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives a well-deserved pay raise, enhances health care, and eases the burden our Nation demands on military families moving forward. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I surely want to make sure that we support our warfighters. My problem with the Defense bill is that we are spending so much money on things that I think are questionable. I would rather spend money on supporting our troops more than spending \$1 trillion over the next 3 decades building more nuclear weapons. We have more nuclear weapons than any other country in the world, and we ought to be talking about limiting nuclear weapons and eliminating them altogether.

I want to support our men and women who we put in harm's way, but I want this Congress, I want Members of this House, to do their job. It doesn't take any courage to sit back and have troops deployed all over the world, in harm's way, and we don't even take the time to actually debate an authorization for the use of military force. We are too afraid to talk about those issues.

So when we talk about supporting our men and women in uniform, people ought to do a little bit of reflection on how we have not been doing our job.

Again, I note my friends don't want to talk about health care. My colleague actually said she would like to talk about health care more. Well, we should, because the fact of the matter is, as I said, as we are speaking here, the Republicans have unveiled this bill that has been in secret, that nobody has really had a chance to digest. No hearings. They want to talk about health care so much—no hearings, no expert testimony, no nothing. Right to markup; trying to rush it to the floor before we find out the true cost to the American people about what this TrumpCare bill is going to be all about; when they find out how many of them are going to lose their care; how it is going to cut Medicare; how senior citizens are going to see an increase in their healthcare costs; how average Americans are going to pay more for health care and get less protections; how people who are struggling in poverty are going to be out of luck because they are going to do away with the Medicaid guarantee to States.

Health care ought to be a fundamental right in this country, and they are taking that right away, and they are doing it in a fashion so that CBO, again, 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office that Congress appropriates \$50 million a year to support so they can do their expert work, they are doing this in a way so we are not even asking for their expert advice. What sense does that make?

This is the rule. This is where we set our priorities about what our legislative agenda ought to be; and all I am simply saying is vote "no" on the previous question so we can vote on an amendment so we can demand a CBO score in the healthcare bill.

By the way, that doesn't slow down the Defense Appropriations bill. It still goes forward. Nothing stops. So let's do what is right. Let there be a little sunshine on this House of Representatives.

There is a pattern that has developed under the Republican leadership where everything is closed. This bill that we are dealing with right now, closed rule. It is not a conference report, closed rule.

We have had more closed rules in the first few months in this Congress than any Congress, I think, in history, and that is the pattern. No hearings, no discussion, just go right to markup. We don't want to know how much it is going to cost. We don't want to know how many people are going to be thrown off of health care. Let's just rush something through. That is mindless legislating, and it has to stop.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 8 years, the United States has experienced a sharp rise in the number of military threats from foreign aggressors. Last month, Russia secretly deployed two batteries of new nuclear-capable cruise missiles. North Korea test-launched four ballistic missiles just this week, and China continues to bolster its military presence in the South China Sea, while going toward a naval fleet that may surpass 351 ships by 2020.

Meanwhile, our own Navy is the smallest it has been in 99 years, satisfying only 40 percent of the demand from regional commanders. Fifty-four percent of the Air Force's major weapons systems now qualify for antique vehicle license plates in the State of Virginia.

The Army, to quote the Vice Chief of Staff, is "outraged, outgunned, and outdated."

These are the bitter fruits of defense sequester; defense sequester which must be pulled out, root and branch. To quote Secretary Mattis: "No foe in the field can wreak such havoc on our security that mindless sequestration is achieving."

I agree with General Mattis. I agree that defense sequester is mindless. It is

also dangerous. So today, while I speak in support of this rule and this bill, I applaud the Appropriations Committee for its critical work, and I urge my colleagues to support final passage.

This is just the first step. We will not have fulfilled our first and foremost constitutional duty to keep the country safe until we have completely eliminated defense sequester and truly begun the process of restoring peace through strength.

Einstein's words are as true today as they were in 1931, when he said of America: "The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this country and is bound in the end to lead to disaster all around."

If we do not act now to rebuild and modernize our military, if we continue to play the role of passive spectator, not only will it lead to disaster, at some point we will no longer be worthy of global leadership.

So to my colleague, I will say that this is our job. This is our most basic job. So let's do what the American people sent us here to do to keep the country safe, restore peace through strength. That is doing our job.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wyoming, and I appreciate the hard work of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairman GRANGER on this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FY17 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, and I urge voting and adoption of this bill.

I served 26 years in uniform, and I can say, firsthand, that continuing resolutions are bad for our troops. It is urgent that we pass this bill. One reason is that we are in a military readiness crisis like I have not seen in my lifetime.

This bill provides over \$215 billion for readiness, an increase of \$5.2 billion above the FY16 enacted budget. This increase includes funding for flight time for our pilots, maintenance for our aircraft, and base operations, among other things. It also provides more than \$6.8 billion for procurement of aircraft, ships, and helicopters for our troops.

The bill fully funds the mighty A-10 Warthog, and it has continued funding for upgrades for this critical plane, extending its service life by starting the re-winging of the remaining 110 aircraft in the fleet. It also increases funding to maintain our asymmetric electronic warfare advantage, developed and tested at Fort Huachuca, in my district.

Finally, it provides funding for important missile programs, from air-to-air missiles to missile defense.

Our troops are counting on us. Let's stop the bickering, and let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to again urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote to defeat the previous question so we can actually bring an amendment to the floor to demand CBO tell us how much the Republican healthcare bill is going to cost and what its impact is going to be on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you why I am worried. The AARP estimates that the Republican repeal bill could increase premium costs by \$8,400 for a 64-year-old earning \$15,000 a year, and it could put at risk the health care of millions of vulnerable Americans.

Now, we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office. That office costs nearly \$50 million a year. We pay them to advise us precisely at times like this. We ought to rely on their information. We ought to ask for their guidance. Before marking up bills, before rushing bills to the floor that could adversely impact millions and millions of Americans that could break the bank in this country, we ought to find out what we are talking about.

We can walk and chew gum at the same time. You can pass the Defense bill and you can also pass an amendment that tells us how much this Republican healthcare bill is going to cost. We ought to do both.

So defeat the previous question so that we can bring this amendment to the floor. Let a little sunshine in on this process. Let the American people know what is going on here. I think that is the appropriate way to proceed.

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

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

H.R. 1301 is the first step we must take in rebuilding our military. It is only a first step. We must also repeal the Budget Control Act and end sequestration if we are going to truly address our shortfalls. We must return to a rational budgeting process at the Pentagon, where spending is based upon defending the defeating threats to this Nation, not arbitrary and devastating across-the-board cuts.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 70 years ago, President Harry Truman addressed this body about the growing Soviet threat to Eastern Europe. He said: "There are times in world history when it is far wiser to act than to hesitate. There is some risk in action. There always is. But there is far more risk in failure to act."

President Truman continued: "We must be prepared to pay the price for peace or, assuredly, we shall pay the price for war."

Today, Mr. Speaker, I urge that we begin to pay the price for peace. I urge support for the rule and for the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 174 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. In rule XXI add the following new clause:

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, or in the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, unless an easily searchable electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a).

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, sec-

tion 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

□ 1330

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 725, INNOCENT PARTY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 175

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 725) to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered 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. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such 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.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. Current Federal court rules allow trial lawyers to engage in picking their preferred venue. In particular, trial lawyers are able to file suit against the defendant in one State while keeping their case in a different State's court.

When a lawsuit is filed against a defendant in another State, trial lawyers may also sue a defendant in the State where they want the trial to occur. This keeps the case in the lawyers' preferred State court.

Many times the target of the lawsuit is a large, national business. But if the only defendant in the case is an out-of-State business, then the case can be heard in Federal court. Because of this, the trial lawyer will then also sue an innocent local individual or a small business in order to keep the case before a local court.

Usually, the case against the innocent local defendant is dropped once the case is safely back in State court, but it is dropped only after the innocent local defendant has spent time and money dealing with the lawsuit.

This practice is wrong. This practice perverts our justice system and causes needless pain. Trial lawyers should not have the power to subject innocent local individuals and small businesses to costly and time-consuming lawsuits just to rig the system. This kind of abuse of litigation is unjust and must be stopped.

A well-respected Federal appeals court judge, J. Harvie Wilkinson of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, has publicly supported Congress putting an end to this abuse. He has suggested that Congress provide judges greater leeway in making the proper decision on whether a case should be removed to Federal court. He has also suggested that Congress give Federal judges greater discretion to determine early on in a case whether a local party has been fraudulently sued. The Innocent Party Protection Act provides these exact changes.

In 2014 Judge Wilkinson addressed these proposals and said:

That is exactly the kind of approach to Federal jurisdiction reform that I like because it is targeted.

And there is a problem with fraudulent jurisdiction law as it exists today, I think, and that is that you have to establish that the joinder of a nondiverse local defendant is totally ridiculous and that there is no possibility of ever recovering.

That is very hard to do.

So Judge Wilkinson went on:

So I think making the fraudulent joinder law a little bit more realistic appeals to me because it seems to me the kind of intermediate step that addresses some real problems.

The legislation that this rule makes in order is the solution to the problem that Judge Wilkinson identifies. The underlying legislation would protect innocent local defendants in two main ways. First, the Innocent Party Protection Act allows Federal judges more leeway when determining whether a defendant has been fraudulently joined to a lawsuit for the purpose of keeping the case out of Federal court.

When a judge has a case before his or her court, the judge will have clear guidelines for determining whether the locality of a defendant can be disregarded in establishing whether the case will proceed in Federal or State court. However, this in no way infringes on our State court systems.

The judge must conclude that the defendant will not face a liability under applicable State law. Once that conclusion is reached, the judge then may release the innocent defendant from the case. This provision keeps legal claims in Federal Court that properly belong there by allowing Federal judges to decide whether a local party is truly a legitimate defendant and not simply ensnared in a case for the sole purpose of keeping the case in a trial lawyer-friendly State court. This is a fair and efficient solution to the problem.

Secondly, the Innocent Party Protection Act establishes a uniform approach for evaluating whether a plaintiff has a good-faith intention of seeking judgment against a local defendant.

While the U.S. Supreme Court has long recognized the right of courts to consider whether a plaintiff has a good-faith intention of seeking a judgment against a local defendant, the application of this principle has not been uniform.

The Innocent Party Protection Act simply codifies this longstanding principle and permits Federal judges to limit a lawsuit to the appropriate defendant.

Plaintiffs with legitimate claims against both a local and out-of-State defendant will be able to pursue their case in State court. However, if no legitimate claim exists, the out-of-State defendant will have the opportunity to have the case heard in a neutral forum. By codifying this principle, we effectively protect innocent individuals and small businesses from bad-faith litigation.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation is a fair solution to one type of frivolous litigation. I support this effort, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and the Judiciary Committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate a rule for a piece of legislation that will, in the final analysis, make it more difficult for hardworking Americans to stand up to corporate malfeasance; a piece of legislation that jettisons a history of legal precedent in the blink of an eye because, well, it helps keep the deep pockets of the ultrawealthy as deep as possible.

I learned this law in law school in 1959, but it was in existence way before that time, and now my friends across the aisle are going to tell us that this legislation is needed because it will protect small businesses. This is a feint, folks. Small businesses—indeed all of us—have been and continue to be protected by the century-old jurisprudential rule that the Republicans come here today to upset. In reality, all this bill will do is make it more difficult for regular folks across this country to bring lawsuits against massive corporations.

I shudder to think what would have happened in the critically important asbestos case had this particular law been in effect; and there are many more.

This bill will make it more expensive both in time and treasure for our fellow Americans to hold corporations responsible in the courtroom, a need all the more prevalent today as my friends across the aisle have been busy gutting regulations at a dizzying pace.

Let me make it clear, after we finish, my colleague from Colorado and I are going to go back to the Rules Committee to discuss some more judicial reform. A lot of it is stuff that is going to harm little people in the courts and to cause them not to have access to the court system, as have many of the regulations that we have already disapproved.

Let us be clear, the American people didn't vote for dirty water, but that is what they got with this Republican majority when it voted to repeal a rule that barred corporations from dumping mining debris into our drinking water, helping powerful mining companies by hurting all of the rest of the people in their near curtilage.

The American people didn't vote to weaken the Securities and Exchange Commission, but that is what this majority did when it passed a bill adding more hurdles to the SEC rulemaking process, making it more difficult for the agency to protect consumers, helping Wall Street while putting our economy at risk. I will make a prediction

here. It may not happen right away, but just like we saw the Great Depression that we are just coming out of, we are likely to see that same kind of situation again by virtue of lessening the rules against violations in securities.

The American people didn't vote to drug test Americans on unemployment insurance—degrading the hardworking men and women in this country—but that is what this Republican majority did without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the list really does go on and on. In fact, just yesterday, Republicans continued to chant the corporate clarion call with the unveiling of what I now will call their shameful replacement of the Affordable Care Act. Until there is a resolution, I am going to call it TrumpCare.

My colleagues like to tout how short the bill is compared to the Affordable Care Act. Well, the American people will be surprised to find that, in that brevity, Republicans managed to repeal an Affordable Care Act provision that placed a limit on insurance executives' compensation. Let me repeat that. They managed to repeal a provision that placed a limit on insurance executives' compensation. The insurance executives shouldn't be too surprised by this, however. Repeatedly, Republicans have shown they represent corporate interests over the interests of the American people.

But my Republican colleagues didn't stop there. Their so-called replacement, the Trump bill, also claims to have done away with the individual mandate. What they don't tell you is that, instead, their plan calls for funnelling money to the insurance companies in the form of a 30 percent surcharge if an individual goes without health insurance.

Let me tell all the older Americans and 80-year-old people like me to get ready because they are going to be able to charge you just exactly what they want to charge you, and all—mine and yours—insurance is going to go up if this particular measure were to become law.

That is right. Under the Republican healthcare proposal, if you, the American worker, goes without healthcare coverage for longer than 2 months—say you couldn't after a new plan between jobs—then Republicans give insurance companies the right to charge you 30 percent higher premiums. That is ridiculous.

Republicans didn't get rid of the individual mandate. They just turned the mandate into a windfall for insurance companies—a windfall that is going to work out great for insurance executives now that Republicans also removed the cap on their compensation tax deductions.

Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of the fact that it took Republicans 7 years of undermining the Affordable Care Act to finally come up with this proposal for replacing it.

□ 1345

Their plan would kick millions of Americans off their health insurance

and force millions more to pay higher premiums. It would take health care away from the poor, give tax cuts to the rich, and pull the rug out from under seniors, families, and children.

In fact, this plan is so bad that Republicans literally hid not only their horrific proposal, but themselves, from their constituents. Many of their Members are seeing it just in the last 36 hours. They did this by callously brushing off townhall meeting after townhall meeting.

Why all the smoke and mirrors regarding something as simple as this measure is in light of the fact that they ran on replacing it? Why hide it and why rush it and why go through this charade that most of us know and several Senators said yesterday will be dead on arrival?

Actually, let me ask the American people. Who do you think the Republican Party is representing, you or corporate America?

Mr. Speaker, we are not even a full 2 months into the Republican-led government and, in addition to the unconstitutional Muslim bans—and notice I said “bans,” because the old one is nothing but the new one, and the new one is the old one, minus one, and that is the country of Iraq—we have the Republican denial of clear Russian influence in our most recent election.

Let me be very clear about this particular aspect. All of the intelligence agencies have indicated that there was Russian interference in this last election. I don't understand why we are not totally outraged and why there is not extraordinary emphasis on this kind of action against our fundamental democracy.

It is ridiculous that we are around here doing things that we know are not likely to pass the United States Senate and that we are disapproving regulations, yet we cannot get an independent commission to make a determination of how this impact occurred. And we do know that it occurred. I am outraged, and I would hope more Americans would be as well.

We have also seen the almost immediate recusal of the Attorney General due to his inability to be forthright with our Senate colleagues; wild and baseless claims emanating from late-night Twitter storms from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or Mar-a-Lago; and we have a Republican Party dedicated to ensuring that their corporate benefactors can rest easy, no matter the harm they cause to everyday working Americans.

Are we addressing any of these concerns here today?

I would imagine my colleague, rightly, will come back and argue that all the things that I just talked about are not this particular rule. Well, this rule is not even deserving of that kind of consideration, largely for the reason it is yet another structured rule disallowing Members of this House to have an opportunity to have input into a measure that is getting rid of a cen-

tury of precedent in our judiciary. No, what we are doing is debating obscure civil procedure rules that date back to the days of President Teddy Roosevelt.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Florida that we are debating the special order of business from rules and that all comments must be relevant to the rule or the underlying bill.

This particular underlying bill has to do with a rule of civil procedure and fraudulent joinders. It does not have to do with the gentleman's healthcare replacement act or his thoughts on the healthcare replacement act, insurance executive's compensation, individual mandates, tax cuts for the rich, Russia, Iraq, although I did appreciate the gentleman's memories from law school the year that I was born.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is a delight for me to join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) on a piece of legislation that actually has his name on it, he is responsible for, understands, and is prepared today to fully debate.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Florida, a member of the Rules Committee, for not only coming down to offer his argument against the facts of the case as they reside today on this important piece of legislation, but I also want to acknowledge that I know the frustration.

I know there is a lot of frustration. There is a lot of frustration from our colleagues who have lost the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. They are in the middle of what might be called wandering, as they have called it, in the darkness or in the doldrums of being deep in the minority.

With that said, there is an agenda that is being laid out before the American people. It happened, Mr. Speaker, directly as a result of what we call an election—an election where all these issues, or most of them that have been discussed by the gentleman, were fully debated not only in a theater near you, but directly in congressional contests, in senatorial contests and the debates for the President of the United States.

The facts of the case are really pretty simple. The Republican Party will be talking about all the issues that the gentleman brought up today right before our eyes. Probably on C-SPAN, trying to compete against us, is a hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The gentleman, GREG WALDEN, the chairman of the committee, over the weekend released the text of the chairman's mark, the “bill” of the Republican Party of how we are going to look at health care.

It is true that we have Chairman DEVIN NUNES of the Intelligence Committee looking at the issue that was

brought up of Russia. We have forthrightly, over the weekend, said: All right. We are being asked to look at this. Just so you know, media, American people, we are going to do that. We are going to do what you have asked because we believe it is the right thing to do: open hearings, open debate, acknowledgement of the issues, and a certainty that we will go look into it, and we are going to let you know what we find. That is really where we are.

This morning, at 8 a.m. in my office, I cohosted with the gentleman from Florida an opportunity for the American Bar Association. We brought in, from across this country—I didn't bring them in; they came into my office from across the country—a number of well-established, thoughtful, and articulate people. We didn't ask: Are you Republican? We didn't ask: Are you Democrat? We said: You represent your organization, and we want to hear from you.

This is the kind of leadership that I believe not only myself but also the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, wants to be associated with. We want to be associated with listening to the American people, trying to be thoughtful about what we do and have equal participation.

The gentleman knows that at the Rules Committee yesterday we had a very thoughtful person representing the Republican Party. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) came up. We had Mr. BUCK, who was able to come and talk about this issue today.

In fact, it might be an arcane issue to the American people, but it consumes a lot of time, and it has a deliberative effect on the outcome of important cases in Federal courts and State courts across the country. We feel like it is worthy of an afternoon, an afternoon at the Rules Committee, to fully vet the legislation and an afternoon here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

But like any other good majority, we have a lot of other things going on, and we are looking at the Affordable Care Act, how it worked and how we might thoughtfully replace it. We are looking at the issues related to Russia. We are looking at the American Bar Association.

Members of Congress are extremely busy, but, Mr. Speaker, I think, with great respect, we should give the author of the bill, Mr. BUCK, his time to come and thoughtfully explain why we are doing what we are doing.

I am just a dadgum chairman of the committee. I just do the things that I hope are necessary to look at every single item and being fair—being fair in the ability that people have to come and bring their ideas and trying to be fair in trying to bring them down here.

So I want to thank the gentleman for acknowledging this body is busy. This body is engaged in, as we speak, a public, open debate about what direction health care should go.

What I would like to offer is my evaluation of where we are going to be. We are going to be at a point where we do not have to scare people about where we have been or why we are going to a place.

I am on what is known as ObamaCare. As a Member of Congress, I am legally required to be on ObamaCare for health care. But, Mr. Speaker, it is twice as expensive as what I had before; and it is not working for me, it is not working for my family, and it is not working for a lot of people.

So we are trying to look at how we might carefully, thoughtfully, artfully work with the American people, so we put the bill up and let you see it. We don't have to pass it to find out what is in it. We are trying to read the bill and understand it first.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a pledge. It is a hope that every single Member of this body will understand what is in the bill before they can respectfully, whether somebody disagrees or agrees with it, explain the bill for what is correct.

What is correct about the bill is this: if you like your own doctor, you can keep your own doctor. If you like your own healthcare plan, even if it is ObamaCare, you can do that, too.

The Republican Party is open about what we believe. We are trying to be thoughtful with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, with the leadership that we have of PAUL RYAN who has attempted to work through a difficult issue, the American people will understand why Republicans not only won the election, but why Republicans have better ideas in health care, too.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the chairman of the Rules Committee and he knows that.

I just heard him say his insurance went up under ObamaCare. Mine did, too. I also want to remind him that, if this measure as offered yesterday were to become law, his and my insurance is going to go up again.

So we weren't doing all of the things that you said you were going to do by bringing the price down. In addition, we don't even know what CBO's score is with respect to this matter.

You said that you are reading it to understand it now, yet Members are in the Energy and Commerce Committee, as you explained, marking it up, and they don't even know what CBO's score is. I will get back to that in a few minutes about all these people we pay over there to do that work, and then we are not utilizing them.

I also want to address my friend from Colorado and have him understand that I am not precluded from presenting to the American public what legislation we wish to prioritize.

As the gentleman knows, we are currently debating the rule. This is a tool used to set the House agenda and to prioritize consideration of legislation.

For that very reason, this is, in fact, the appropriate time for us to explain to the American people what legislation we would like to prioritize and what agenda we would like to pursue in this House. I won't reiterate it, in the interest of time.

I will have a previous question that will demonstrably show what legislation we think we should be addressing. I will do that for as long as I am given the opportunity to manage rules. I will come down here and present the position of the Democratic Party so that they understand our priorities and not necessarily am I hidebound by this rule.

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

□ 1400

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, without continuing the dialogue, I would like to at least respond to the gentleman and look right at you, Mr. Speaker, and tell you, in fact, we are going to have a CBO score. We are going to have a CBO score when we have an agreed-upon bill. This is a process that is open. The bill is being proposed. The bill is going to be debated. Then there are going to be votes.

For them to presume that they know the score before they know the outcome is not the way the chairman of the committee looks at it. Mr. WALDEN looks at it that he is going to let the committee vote and come up with a bill, and there are significant changes that could happen one way or another. I think it would be a presumptuous viewpoint to say here is the bill and here is the score, take it or leave it. I know Chairman WALDEN very well, and GREG WALDEN is trying to operate off openness and the agreement to look at the bill. When it is finalized, a score will become available. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this issue up.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. I especially thank him for bringing this legislation before this Congress.

I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill. We are addressing the topic that we used to call fraudulent joinder. I like the title of this bill better, as pointed out by Ms. SLAUGHTER last night. We call it the Innocent Party Protection Act. It is more accurate and it is more descriptive. The other fraudulent joinder piece tends to put people to sleep who aren't operating in this arena.

I know that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) has operated in this arena. He has significant experience and frustrating experience watching innocent parties being drug into litigation just so that an opposing attorney can utilize that jurisdiction within a

particular State where they think they have a friendly venue.

First, Mr. Speaker, I make the point from the beginning, which we don't often enough do here, and that is our pledge we made some years ago that all of our legislation would be indexed back to the Constitution. We don't always address that in the debate.

I just turn my pocket Constitution to Article III, section 1. It says: "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

We agree with that. I have made this point that all of the Federal courts are completely under the jurisdiction of the United States Congress. If we decided that we wanted to abolish a Federal district, we could do that. In fact, it happened 200 years ago, two districts. I don't propose such a thing, but I am just asserting the power of Congress, which hasn't been questioned or challenged, I would point out.

Under section 2, it says: "The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising . . . between Citizens of different States. . . ."

This is a tool, then, that the fraudulent joinder attorneys use to drag people into litigation who may have nothing to do with it whatsoever. It is a problem. It is a problem, we know, not just because there are complaints out there from innocent parties that have been wrapped up in litigation and required to defend themselves and hire attorneys and spend thousands of dollars—tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to protect their economic interests even though they have zero involvement in the case and perhaps zero chance of having any judgment brought against them.

So apparently the judges who make these decisions look at rule 11 and they find enough latitude in there that they allow the defendants to stay on the case, and I will call them being fraudulently joined to the case. We need to tighten up these rules. We need to send a very clear message to the courts so that they have got some guidelines to live by because it is their job, of course, to read the law, take their directions from the United States Congress, and act accordingly. I think just this debate and the debate we had in the last Congress help us in that cause.

The next thing I pick up from the Constitution, the next thing is the bill itself, and prevention of fraudulent joinder is under section 2. It sets out four different categories that would be cause for the court to release a defendant. And it says the joinder of the defendant is described in this paragraph. It says it is fraudulent if the court finds that in one of four different categories there is actual fraud in the pleading of jurisdictional facts, which, with respect to that defendant, if there is actual fraud, that is pretty much a no-brainer, should be released from the case. That is pretty simple. I am glad

it is now an opportunity to go into statute.

Second is if it is based on a complaint and the materials submitted under the paragraph, it is not plausible to conclude that the applicable State law would impose liability on that defendant. In other words, if it is implausible for the defendant to have a liability, then the court can release that defendant under this act should it become law. That is also, to me, a no-brainer.

As one who has been a defendant in lawsuits, I would reflect, Mr. Speaker, that when I first ran for office, there were some people who thought that I should just simply capitulate to whatever their legal demands were. Even though I have only been in the courtroom a couple handful of times throughout the 40-some years of business that we have done as King Construction, I had four of them lined up against me at the same time. They thought that I would just have to settle out of court. It is a frustrating thing to not see a liability but have that leverage brought against you. I have experienced that, and that animates me on this.

The third component is if a State or Federal law clearly bars all claims in the complaint against that defendant. All right, that is also a simple provision.

But the fourth one is another one that deserves consideration, and that is that there be a good faith intention. Otherwise, if there is no good faith intention to prosecute the action against that defendant or to seek a joint judgment which would include that defendant, then that defendant can be released from the case. We need to streamline our courts, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would just summarize this case in that it is not only me, it is not Mr. BUCK alone, it is not Mr. SESSIONS alone, it is the American people who are calling out for this kind of relief. It is not just the American people—we might consider them to be laypersons in this—but it is also the courts. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Harvie Wilkinson, as Mr. BUCK quoted, spoke to this issue. The Supreme Court of the United States has spoken to this issue under "plausible" versus "speculative." Professor Martin Redish also has spoken on this subject matter.

The Third Circuit spoke to the Briscoe issue. The final piece is the Fifth Circuit has essentially adopted a very similar, if not identical, policy. We need to codify this. This is our chance to do so. I urge adoption of the rule and support of the underlying rule.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his thoughts.

May I inquire how much time is remaining on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) that I have no additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule which would modify the rules of the House to require a cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office before any legislation that would amend or repeal the Affordable Care Act may be considered in committee or on the House floor.

The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce are marking up repeal legislation today. Legislation this significant should not advance through the committee process, let alone the House, without first hearing from our nonpartisan budget experts at the Congressional Budget Office on what the cost and overall impact will be.

Mr. Speaker, we have over 200 employees at the Congressional Budget Office. We pay them collectively—and administrative duties—nearly \$50 million a year to advise us at times exactly like this.

House rules already require the Congressional Budget Office cost estimates to be included in committee reports. We are simply trying to improve and strengthen this principle of transparency in order to ensure that we know the cost of this repeal legislation before we vote, and that includes the members in the Committee on Energy and Commerce today who are marking this up so as how they would know the cost before they vote in committee today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for my friends across the aisle to tether themselves to the ideals that have made this country great for generations; ideals that, if we are to be saved from the rushing current we presently find ourselves being dragged down by, will be, as they always have been, those ideals which save us from ourselves.

We are a nation built upon the strength of immigrants, of teachers, of doctors, of mill workers, garbagemen and -women, small-business owners, and farmers. We are a nation of dreamers and innovators, respectful of our individuality and mindful of our unparalleled power once unified in common cause.

At some point, my Republican friends will, I hope, realize that their unabashed and wholesale championing

of corporate interests at the expense of hardworking Americans is a losing cause. For the sake of our environment, our children, our grandchildren, and our unborn children, I hope this day is earlier rather than later.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule and the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House today is simple. It provides for the consideration of the Innocent Party Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, we often speak of the Federal regulations or taxes inhibiting job growth in our country, but there are other headwinds that our Nation’s job creators face as well. One of those headwinds is frivolous litigation.

I believe strongly that anyone and everyone should have access to justice. Everyone who is injured deserves to have their day in court, and they should have the opportunity to make their case. However, sometimes trial lawyers take advantage of our justice system and seek to gain an unfair advantage against a defendant. Trial lawyers may try to go court shopping in order to rig the case against the defendant.

One way they may seek to secure their preferred venue is to sue a perfectly innocent individual or a small business who happens to reside in the jurisdiction within which the trial lawyer desires to pursue the case. After some time, the innocent party is often released from the litigation, but not before incurring legal costs as well as emotional and opportunity costs. Each time an innocent small-business man or woman has to divert their attention from growing their business and divert resources away from investing in their employees and creating jobs and divert energy away from expanding their involvement in our communities, and instead they are forced to direct their attention toward defending themselves from a frivolous legal claim, each time this happens is a missed opportunity for creating jobs and for realizing economic growth.

The Innocent Party Protection Act defends our small-business men and women from bad faith lawsuits. It provides relief from trial lawyers who seek out friendly courts in order to pursue their cases. It balances the needs of justice with proper restraints on decidedly unjust actions. The Innocent Party Protection Act is a good and equitable solution. I ask my colleagues in the House to support our local businesses and defend them against frivolous lawsuits. Vote “yes” on the resolution. Vote “yes” on the underlying bill. Rein in this abuse of our justice system. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman Sessions for bringing this bill before us.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 175 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. In rule XXI add the following new clause:

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, or in the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, unless an easily searchable electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a).

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal

to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 175 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 175, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 174; and adoption of House Resolution 174, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Conaway	Grothman
Aderholt	Cook	Guthrie
Allen	Costello (PA)	Harper
Amash	Cramer	Harris
Amodei	Crawford	Hartzler
Arrington	Culberson	Hensarling
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Bacon	Davidson	Hice, Jody B.
Banks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Barletta	Denham	Hill
Barr	Dent	Holding
Barton	DeSantis	Hollingsworth
Bergman	DesJarlais	Hudson
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga
Bilirakis	Donovan	Hultgren
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hurd
Black	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Blackburn	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)
Blum	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bost	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Faso	Johnson, Sam
Brat	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Buck	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Bucshon	Foxx	King (NY)
Budd	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Byrne	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Calvert	Gallagher	Labrador
Carter (GA)	Garrett	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Chabot	Gohmert	Lamborn
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Lance
Cheney	Gosar	Latta
Coffman	Gowdy	Lewis (MN)
Cole	Granger	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Long
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Comer	Graves (MO)	Love
Comstock	Griffith	Lucas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1444

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.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 130.

Stated against:

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 130.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1301, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1301) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, 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 ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Cole	Gohmert
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Goodlatte
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gosar
Amash	Comer	Gowdy
Amodei	Comstock	Granger
Arrington	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Babin	Cook	Graves (LA)
Bacon	Costello (PA)	Graves (MO)
Banks (IN)	Cramer	Griffith
Barletta	Crawford	Grothman
Barr	Culberson	Guthrie
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Harper
Bergman	Davidson	Harris
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Denham	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Black	DesFarales	Higgins (LA)
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Blum	Donovan	Holding
Bost	Duffy	Hollingsworth
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Huizenga
Bridenstine	Dunn	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Hurd
Buchanan	Faso	Issa
Buck	Ferguson	Jenkins (WV)
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (LA)
Budd	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Byrne	Fortenberry	Jordan
Calvert	Foxx	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Gaetz	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	Gallagher	King (IA)
Cheney	Garrett	King (NY)
Coffman	Gibbs	Kinzinger

Knight	Nunes	Simpson
Kustoff (TN)	Olson	Smith (MO)
Labrador	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
LaHood	Palmer	Smith (NJ)
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Pearce	Smucker
Lance	Perry	Stefanik
Latta	Pittenger	Stewart
Lewis (MN)	Poe (TX)	Stivers
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Taylor
Long	Posey	Tenney
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Love	Reichert	Thornberry
Lucas	Renacci	Tiberi
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Tipton
MacArthur	Roby	Trott
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Turner
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wagner
Mast	Rokita	Walberg
McCarthy	Rooney, Francis	Walden
McCaul	Rooney, Thomas	Walker
McClintock	J.	Walorski
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
McKinley	Ross	Weber (TX)
McMorris	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
Rodgers	Rouzer	Wenstrup
McSally	Royce (CA)	Westerman
Meadows	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Rutherford	Wittman
Messer	Sanford	Womack
Mitchell	Scalise	Woodall
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Sessions
Murphy (PA)	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Newhouse	Shuster	Young (IA)
Noem		Zeldin

NAYS—189

Adams	Espaillat	Maloney, Sean
Aguilar	Esty	Matsui
Barragán	Foster	McCollum
Bass	Frankel (FL)	McEachin
Beatty	Fudge	McGovern
Bera	Gabbard	McNerney
Beyer		Meeks
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Meng
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Moore
Blunt Rochester	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Brown (MD)	Grijalva	Neal
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bustos	Hanabusa	Norcross
Butterfield	Hastings	O'Halleran
Capuano	Heck	O'Rourke
Carbajal	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Cárdenas	Himes	Panetta
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pascarella
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Perlmuter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Chu, Judy E. B.	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cicilline	Jones	Pingree
Conelly	Kaptur	Pocan
Connolly	Keating	Polis
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Correa	Kennedy	Quigley
Costa	Kishana	Raskin
Courtney	Klindt	Ruppersberger
Crist	Kihuen	Rush
Crowley	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Kilmer	Sánchez
Delaney	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lee	Schiff
DeJett	Levin	Schneider
DeLauer	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
DeLoach	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
DeLoach	Lipinski	Scott, David
DeLoach	Loebback	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Deutch	Lowey	Sherman
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema
Dingell	Doggett	Sires
Dingell	Doggett	Slaughter
Dingell	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Maloney,	Soto
Dingell	Eshoo	Speier

DeSaulnier	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Barragán	Chu, Judy	Deutch
Bass	Cicilline	Dingell
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael F.
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Ellison
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Engel
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cohen	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Espaillet
Brown (MD)	Correa	Evans
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Foster
Bustos	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Davis, Danny	Fudge
Carbajal	DeFazio	Gallego
Cárdenas	DeGitter	Garamendi
DeGette	DeGitter	Gonzalez (TX)
DeLoach	DeLoach	Grijalva

Suoza	Tsongas	Wasserman
Smith (CA)	Vargas	Schultz
Smith (NE)	Takano	Waters, Maxine
Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Watson Coleman
Smith (TX)	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Smith (MS)	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Tonko	Velázquez	
Torres	Visclosky	
	Walz	

NOT VOTING—8		
Cleaver	Jenkins (KS)	Titus
Cummings	Reed	Welch
Jeffries	Roskam	

□ 1451

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 131.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Can the Chair tell me whether the CBO has scored the American Health Care Act, which is currently being marked up in the Ways and Means Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Speaker will not respond.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HOYER. 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 Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-vote minute vote on the motion to adjourn will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 174, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 295, answered "present" 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—127

Adams	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Barragán	Chu, Judy	Deutch
Bass	Cicilline	Dingell
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael F.
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Ellison
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Engel
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cohen	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Espaillet
Brown (MD)	Costa	Evans
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Foster
Bustos	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Davis, Danny	Fudge
Carbajal	DeFazio	Gallego
Cárdenas	DeGitter	Garamendi
DeGette	DeGette	Gonzalez (TX)
DeLoach	DeLoach	Grijalva

Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Green, Gene	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Grijalva	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Hastings	Massie	Schiff
Heck	Matsui	Schneider
Higgins (NY)	McCullum	Schrader
Hoyer	McEachin	Scott (VA)
Huffman	McGovern	Scott, David
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Serrano
Jayapal	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Shea-Porter
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sherman
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Sinema
Kaptur	Nadler	Sires
Keating	Napolitano	Slaughter
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Kennedy	Nolan	Soto
Khanna	Norcross	Speier
Kihuen	O'Halleran	Suozzi
Kildee	O'Rourke	Takano
Kilmer	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Panetta	Thompson (MS)
Krishnamoorthi	Pascarella	Blunt Rochester
Kuster (NH)	Payne	Foster
Langevin	Pelosi	Fudge
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Boyle, Brendan F.
Larson (CT)	Peters	Brady (PA)
Lawrence	Peterson	Brownley (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Bustos
Lee	Pocan	Butterfield
Levin	Polis	Hastings
Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Carbajal
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Himes
Lipinski	Raskin	Hoyer
Loebssack	Rice (NY)	Carson (IN)
Lofgren	Richmond	Jackson Lee
Lowenthal	Rosen	Castor (FL)
Lowey	Royalb-Allard	Vargas
Lujan Grisham, M.	Ruiz	Bustos
	Ruppertsberger	Cicilline

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver	Jeffries	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Jenkins (KS)	Titus
Dunn	Moulton	Welch
Hunter	Sensenbrenner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1516

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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether or not you could inform us whether or not a CBO score has been completed on the Republican repeal of the Affordable Care Act because many of us are worried it will kick up to 20 million Americans off their health coverage. It will increase out-of-pocket expenses for millions of families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will give the Republicans a little bit more time to request a CBO score.

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 announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 277, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

AYES—107

Adams	Engel	Napolitano
Beatty	Eshoo	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Espaillet	Norcross
Blunt Rochester	Foster	O'Halleran
F.	Gallego	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garamendi	Panetta
Brady (PA)	Brownley (CA)	Payne
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Pingree
Peters	Vargas	Loebssack
Peterson	Bustos	Quigley
Pingree	Butterfield	Raskin
Pocan	Hastings	Richmond
Vela	Carbajal	Ruppertsberger
Velázquez	Cárdenas	Hoyer
Visclosky	Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee
Walz	Castor (FL)	Rush
Watson Coleman	Bustos	Sánchez
Royalb-Allard	Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)
Ruiz	Wasserman	Barbanes
Yarmuth	Cicilline	Kaptur
	DeSaulnier	Schakowsky
	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
	Doggett	Clarke (NY)
	Doyle, Michael F.	Kennedy
	Conyers	Castor (FL)
	Cooper	Lawrence
	Correa	Takano
	Costa	Lee
	Crist	Lieu, Ted
	Crowley	Lowenthal
	Davis, Danny	Lowenthal
	DeGette	Lowey
	Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray
	DeLauro	McEachin
	Demings	McGovern
	DeSaulnier	McNerney
	Dingell	Meeks
	Doggett	Meng
	Doyle, Michael F.	Moore
		Nadler

NOES—277

Abraham	Cartwright	Flores
Aderholt	Chabot	Fortenberry
Aguilar	Chaffetz	Foxx
Allen	Cheney	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Cole	Gabbard
Arrington	Collins (GA)	Gaetz
Babin	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Bacon	Comer	Gibbs
Banks (IN)	Comstock	Gohmert
Barletta	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barr	Connolly	Gottheimer
Barton	Cook	Gowdy
Bera	Costello (PA)	Granger
Bergman	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Biggs	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Green, Gene
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Grothman
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bonamici	Defazio	Harper
Bost	DeBene	Harris
Brady (TX)	Denham	Hartzler
Brat	DeSantis	Hensarling
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Brooks (AL)	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Higgins (LA)
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Bucshon	Ellison	Hollingsworth
Budd	Emmer	Hudson
Burgess	Esty	Huffman
Byrne	Farenthold	Huijzenaga
Calvert	Faso	Hultgren
Capuano	Ferguson	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hurd
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Issa

Jenkins (WV)	Jenkins	McSally
Johnson (LA)	Johnson	Meadows
Johnson (OH)	Johnson	Schweikert
Johnson, Sam	Jones	Scott (VA)
Jones	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Jordan	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner
Joyce (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Sessions
Katko	Moulton	Shea-Porter
Keating	Mullin	Shimkus
Kelly (MS)	Murphy (FL)	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Sinema
Kildee	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Kilmer	Noem	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Nolan	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Latta	Nunes
Kustoff (TN)	Lawson (FL)	Smith (TX)
Labrador	Levin	Smith (WA)
LaHood	Posey	Smucker
LaMalfa	Pearce	Stefanik
Lamborn	Perry	Stewart
Lance	Peters	Stivers
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)
Latta	Poe (TX)	Taylor
Lawson (FL)	Poliquin	Tenney
Levin	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Lewis (MN)	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Reed	Tiberi
LoBiondo	Reichert	Tipton
Loebssack	Renacci	Tsongas
Lofgren	Rice (NY)	Turner
Raskin	Rice (SC)	Upton
Richmond	Loudermilk	Valadao
Ruppertsberger	Love	Visclosky
Hoyer	Rush	Walberg
Jackson Lee	Sánchez	Walder
Castor (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Walker
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Walorski
Rush	Maloney, Lujan Grisham,	Walters, Mimi
Sánchez	Wasserman	Walz
Barbanes	Krishnamoorthi	Weber (TX)
Kaptur	Slaughter	Webster (FL)
Schakowsky	Maloney, Sean	Wenstrup
Kelly (IL)	Marino	Westerman
Clarke (NY)	Marshall	Williams
Lawrence	Speier	Wilcox
Takano	Massie	Wilson (SC)
Lee	Mast	Wittman
Lieu, Ted	Tonko	McCarthy
Lowenthal	Vargas	Ruiz
Lowey	Veasey	Russell
Royalb-Allard	Velázquez	Rutherford
Ruiz	Wasserman	Ryan (OH)
Yarmuth	McHenry	Sanford
	McKinley	Young (AK)
	Schultz	Scalise
	Waters, Maxine	Zeldin
	Watson Coleman	
	Wilson (FL)	
	Yarmuth	

NOT VOTING—45

Barragán	Gallagher	Olson
Bass	Gosar	Pascarella
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pittenger
Brown (MD)	Heck	Pocan
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Cleaver	Jeffries	Ratcliffe
Cummings	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Scott, David
Dent	Kinzinger	Shuster
DesJarlais	Knight	Titus
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Trotter
Dunn	Marchant	Trott
Evans	McCullum	Vela
Frankel (FL)	O'Rourke	Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1533

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on roll call No. 134.

Stated against:

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on roll call No. 134.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY DIRECTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO TRANSMIT CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATING TO THE FINANCIAL PRACTICES OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GOODLATTE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115-28) on the resolution (H. Res. 111) of inquiry directing the Attorney General to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the financial practices of the President, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 174, I call up the bill (H.R. 1301) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

**TITLE I
MILITARY PERSONNEL
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY**

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$40,042,962,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$27,889,405,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities,

permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$12,735,182,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$27,958,795,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$4,524,863,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,921,045,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$744,795,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while un-

dertaking reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,725,526,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under sections 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$7,899,423,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,283,982,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law, \$32,738,173,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$38,552,017,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,055,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, \$5,676,152,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law, \$36,247,724,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance

of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, \$32,373,949,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$15,000,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than \$34,964,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than \$3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That \$5,023,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$480,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support or facilitate counterterrorism, crisis response, or other Department of Defense security cooperation programs: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$2,743,688,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$929,656,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$271,133,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, \$3,069,229,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), \$6,861,478,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, \$6,615,095,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, \$14,194,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$170,167,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, \$289,262,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, \$371,521,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, \$9,009,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, \$222,084,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the

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

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), \$123,125,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, under programs and activities of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program authorized under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act, \$325,604,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$4,587,598,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,533,804,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training

devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$2,229,455,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$633,678,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$633,678,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Ohio Replacement Submarine (AP), \$778,138,000;

Carrier Replacement Program,		
\$1,255,783,000;		
Carrier Replacement Program (AP),		
\$1,370,784,000;		

Virginia Class Submarine, \$3,187,985,000;		
Virginia Class Submarine (AP),		
\$1,852,234,000;		

CVN Refueling Overhauls, \$1,699,120,000;		
CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP), \$233,149,000;		
DDG-1000 Program, \$271,756,000;		

DDG-51 Destroyer, \$3,614,792,000;		
Littoral Combat Ship, \$1,563,692,000;		
LPD-17, \$1,786,000,000;		

LHA Replacement, \$1,617,719,000;		
TAO Fleet Oiler (AP), \$73,079,000;		
Moored Training Ship, \$624,527,000;		

Ship to Shore Connector, \$128,067,000;		
Service Craft, \$65,192,000;		
LCAC Service Life Extension Program, \$82,074,000;		

YPC Craft Maintenance/ROH/SLEP, \$21,363,000;		
For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, \$626,158,000;		

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, \$160,274,000; and		
Polar Icebreakers (AP), \$150,000,000.		

In all: \$21,156,886,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2021: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2021, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for production of the common missile compartment of nuclear-powered vessels may be available for multiyear

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$6,147,328,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$3,265,285,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

procurement of critical components to support continuous production of such compartments only in accordance with the provisions of subsection (i) of section 2218a of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328)).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$6,308,919,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, \$1,307,456,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$14,253,623,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$2,348,121,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of spacecraft, rockets, and related

equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor; ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, \$2,733,243,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, \$1,589,219,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$17,768,224,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, \$4,881,022,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4518, 4531, 4532, and 4533), \$64,065,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test

and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$8,332,965,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$17,214,530,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$27,788,548,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, \$18,778,550,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That, of the funds made available in this paragraph, \$250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$186,994,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018.

TITLE V REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, \$1,511,613,000.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, \$33,781,270,000; of which \$31,277,002,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, and of which up to \$15,315,832,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which \$402,161,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019, shall be for procurement; and of which \$2,102,107,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than \$1,014,600,000 shall be made available to the United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command to carry out the congressionally directed medical research programs.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS
DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, \$523,726,000, of which \$119,985,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than \$49,533,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of \$20,368,000 for activities on military installations and \$29,165,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, to assist State and local governments, and of which not more than \$13,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for the destruction of eight United States-origin chemical munitions in the Republic of Panama, to the extent authorized by law; \$15,132,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2019, of which \$15,132,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and \$388,609,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which \$380,892,000 shall only be for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG
ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, \$998,800,000, of which \$626,087,000 shall be for counter-narcotics support; \$118,713,000 shall be for the drug demand reduction program; \$234,000,000 shall be for the National Guard

counter-drug program; and \$20,000,000 shall be for the National Guard counter-drug schools program: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$312,035,000, of which \$308,882,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed \$700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which \$3,153,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation.

TITLE VII
RELATED AGENCIESCENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT
AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

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

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT
ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, \$515,596,000.

TITLE VIII
GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited

for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$4,500,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled Explanation of Project Level Adjustments in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2017: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to transfers from the following appropriations accounts:

(1) "Environmental Restoration, Army";
 (2) "Environmental Restoration, Navy";
 (3) "Environmental Restoration, Air Force";

(4) "Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide";

(5) "Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites"; and

(6) "Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense".

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" appropriation and the "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer: *Provided further*, That except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of \$20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed \$500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*,

That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advance procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows: AH-64E Apache Helicopter and UH-60M Blackhawk Helicopter.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99-239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2017, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2018 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and

submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2018.

(c) As required by section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) civilian personnel at the Department of Army Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories may not be managed on the basis of the Table of Distribution and Allowances, and the management of the workforce strength shall be done in a manner consistent with the budget available with respect to such Laboratories.

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

SEC. 8013. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That, in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8015. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8016. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protégé Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term "manufactured" shall include cutting, heat

treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8018. Of the amounts appropriated for “Working Capital Fund, Army”, \$140,000,000 shall be available to maintain competitive rates at the arsenals.

SEC. 8019. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M-1 Carbines, M-1 Garand rifles, M-14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M-1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8020. No more than \$500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8021. Of the funds made available in this Act, \$15,000,000 shall be available for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over \$500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8022. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8023. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to

incur obligations of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That, upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8024. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than \$40,021,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) \$28,000,000 shall be available from “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) \$10,337,000 shall be available from “Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”; and

(3) \$1,684,000 shall be available from “Other Procurement, Air Force” for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8025. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during the current fiscal year may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings not located on a military installation, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2017, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That, of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department’s fiscal year 2018 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in

this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by \$60,000,000.

SEC. 8026. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy, or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8027. For the purposes of this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8028. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8029. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary’s blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

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

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2017. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

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

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8031. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term "Indian tribe" means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8032. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$250,000.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled "Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria", dated January 27, 2014.

SEC. 8034. The Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations to prohibit the sale of any tobacco or tobacco-related products in military resale outlets in the United States, its territories and possessions at a price below the most competitive price in the local community: *Provided*, That such regulations shall direct that the prices of tobacco or tobacco-related products in overseas military retail outlets shall be within the range of prices established for military retail system stores located in the United States.

SEC. 8035. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current

fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2018 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2018 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8036. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) shall remain available until September 30, 2018.

SEC. 8037. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act and hereafter for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8038. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", not less than \$12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8039. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term "Buy American Act" means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

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

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress

that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8040. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to consolidate or relocate any element of a United States Air Force Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational Repair Squadron Engineer (RED HORSE) outside of the United States until the Secretary of the Air Force—

(1) completes an analysis and comparison of the cost and infrastructure investment required to consolidate or relocate a RED HORSE squadron outside of the United States versus within the United States;

(2) provides to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the findings of the cost analysis; and

(3) certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the preferred site for the consolidation or relocation yields the greatest savings for the Air Force:

Provided, That the term "United States" in this section does not include any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 8041. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or
 (2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program;

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats;

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense; or

(4) an Air Force field operating agency established to administer the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Program and Mortuary Operations for the Department of Defense and authorized Federal entities.

SEC. 8042. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) \$10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

(RESCISSES)

SEC. 8043. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

“Aircraft Procurement, Army”, 2015/2017, \$15,000,000;

“Other Procurement, Army”, 2015/2017, \$23,045,000;

“Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, 2015/2017, \$88,000,000;

“Weapons Procurement, Navy”, 2015/2017, \$11,933,000;

“Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, 2015/2017, \$43,600,000;

“Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, 2015/2017, \$57,000,000;

“Other Procurement, Air Force”, 2015/2017, \$25,500,000;

“Aircraft Procurement, Army”, 2016/2018, \$34,594,000;

“Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, 2016/2018, \$5,000,000;

“Other Procurement, Army”, 2016/2018, \$84,100,000;

“Aircraft Procurement, Navy”, 2016/2018, \$6,755,000;

“Weapons Procurement, Navy”, 2016/2018, \$5,307,000;

“Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps”, 2016/2018, \$6,968,000;

“Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2016/2020: DDG-51 Destroyer, \$50,000,000;

“Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2016/2020: LPD-17, \$14,906,000;

“Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2016/2020: LX (R), (AP), \$236,000,000;

“Other Procurement, Navy”, 2016/2018, \$56,374,000;

“Aircraft Procurement, Air Force”, 2016/2018, \$383,200,000;

“Missile Procurement, Air Force”, 2016/2018, \$34,700,000;

“Space Procurement, Air Force”, 2016/2018, \$100,000,000;

“Other Procurement, Air Force”, 2016/2018, \$56,369,000;

“Procurement, Defense-Wide”, 2016/2018, \$2,600,000;

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, 2016/2017, \$33,402,000;

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy”, 2016/2017, \$31,219,000;

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force”, 2016/2017, \$532,550,000; and

“Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, 2016/2017, \$64,500,000.

SEC. 8044. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military technicians (dual status), unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8046. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8047. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other depart-

ment or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of “commercial items”, as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8049. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, realign, or transfer RQ-4B Global Hawk aircraft, or to disestablish or convert units associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds made available by this Act for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle service competitive procurements may be used unless the competitive procurements are open for award to all certified providers of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle-class systems: *Provided*, That the award shall be made to the provider that offers the best value to the government.

SEC. 8051. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, \$44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, the Secretary shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: \$20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and \$24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8052. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8053. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program set-asides shall be taken proportionally from all programs, projects, or activities to the extent they contribute to the extramural budget.

SEC. 8054. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8055. During the current fiscal year, no more than \$30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities

outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8056. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note); *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8057. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8058. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of United States Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: *Provided*, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 2004, shall remain in force until a written modification has been proposed to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees: *Provided further*, That the proposed modification may be implemented 30 days after the notification unless an objection is received from either the House or Senate Appropriations Committees: *Provided further*, That any proposed modification shall not preclude the ability of the commander of United States Pacific Command to meet operational requirements.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8059. Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide”, \$25,000,000 shall be for continued implementation and expansion of the Sexual Assault Special Victims’ Counsel Program: *Provided*, That the funds are made available for transfer to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force:

Provided further, That funds transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which the funds are transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SEC. 8060. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8061. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section XI (chapters 50-65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8062. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8063. Of the amounts appropriated for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, up to \$1,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund established under section 116 of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1105).

SEC. 8064. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide” for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 45 days after a report, including a description

of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8065. The Secretary of Defense shall continue to provide a classified quarterly report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8066. Notwithstanding section 1231(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8067. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any non-governmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of “armor penetrator”, “armor piercing (AP)”, “armor piercing incendiary (API)”, or “armor-piercing incendiary tracer (API-T)”, except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8068. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, \$75,950,170 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8070. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to take any action to modify—

- (1) the appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget, including through the creation of a new appropriation or new appropriation account;
- (2) how the National Intelligence Program budget request is presented in the unclassified P-1, R-1, and O-1 documents supporting the Department of Defense budget request;
- (3) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are apportioned to the executing agencies; or
- (4) the process by which the National Intelligence Program appropriations are allotted, obligated and disbursed.

(b) Nothing in section (a) shall be construed to prohibit the merger of programs or changes to the National Intelligence Program budget at or below the Expenditure Center level, provided such change is otherwise in accordance with paragraphs (a)(1)–(3).

(c) The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense may jointly, only for the purposes of achieving auditable financial statements and improving fiscal reporting, study and develop detailed proposals for alternative financial management processes. Such study shall include a comprehensive counterintelligence risk assessment to ensure that none of the alternative processes will adversely affect counterintelligence.

(d) Upon development of the detailed proposals defined under subsection (c), the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) provide the proposed alternatives to all affected agencies;

(2) receive certification from all affected agencies attesting that the proposed alternatives will help achieve auditability, improve fiscal reporting, and will not adversely affect counterintelligence; and

(3) not later than 30 days after receiving all necessary certifications under paragraph (2), present the proposed alternatives and certifications to the congressional defense and intelligence committees.

SEC. 8071. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, \$5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8072. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings “Procurement, Defense-Wide” and “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, \$600,735,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$62,000,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, subject to the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement, as amended; \$266,511,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which \$150,000,000 shall be for co-production activities of SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel’s defense requirements consistent with each nation’s laws, regulations, and procedures, of which not more than \$90,000,000, subject to previously established transfer procedures, may be obligated or expended until establishment of a U.S.-Israeli co-production agreement for

SRBMD; \$204,893,000 shall be for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, of which \$120,000,000 shall be for co-production activities of Arrow 3 Upper Tier missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel’s defense requirements consistent with each nation’s laws, regulations, and procedures, of which not more than \$70,000,000 subject to previously established transfer procedures, may be obligated or expended until establishment of a U.S.-Israeli co-production agreement for Arrow 3 Upper Tier; and \$67,331,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8073. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, \$160,274,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred to:

(1) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2017: LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program \$45,060,000;

(2) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2011/2017: DDG-51 Destroyer \$15,959,000;

(3) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2017: Littoral Combat Ship \$3,600,000;

(4) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2013/2017: Littoral Combat Ship \$82,400,000;

(5) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2012/2017: Expeditionary Fast Transport \$6,710,000; and

(6) Under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy”, 2013/2017: Expeditionary Fast Transport \$6,545,000.

SEC. 8074. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094) during fiscal year 2017 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8076. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2018 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces’ participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the Procurement accounts, and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or

object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP-5 and OP-32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

SEC. 8078. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to favorable foreign exchange rates, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by \$157,000,000.

SEC. 8079. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act: *Provided*, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8081. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ-1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8082. Up to \$10,120,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Navy” may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2018.

SEC. 8084. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision

of appropriations made in this Act under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading “Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy” appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8085. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2017: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President’s budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center and project; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8086. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate, restructure, or realign Army Contracting Command—New Jersey or make disproportionate personnel reductions at any Army Contracting Command—New Jersey sites without 30-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

(RESCISSON)

SEC. 8087. Of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Defense, the following funds are permanently rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

From “Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, Defense”, \$531,000,000.

SEC. 8088. None of the funds made available by this Act for excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), or peacekeeping operations for the countries designated annually to be in violation of the standards of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c–1) may be used to support any military training or operation that includes child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, unless such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008.

SEC. 8089. Of the amounts appropriated for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$67,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the Secretary of Defense acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense to make grants, conclude

cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds to address the need for assistance to support critical existing and enduring military installations and missions on Guam, as well as any potential Department of Defense growth, for purposes of addressing the need for civilian water and wastewater improvements.

SEC. 8090. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that—

(1) creates a new start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of \$10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations, unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8091. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President’s budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8092. For the purposes of this Act, the term “congressional intelligence committees” means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8093. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed \$11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, and “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8094. Funds appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfer to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8095. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required

to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8096. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of \$1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to—

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a “covered subcontractor” is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of \$1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor’s or subcontractor’s agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract terms selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8097. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for

the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to \$122,375,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111-84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110-417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8098. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof in contravention of the provisions of section 130h of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8099. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8100. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$1,500,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2017.

SEC. 8101. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8102. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24,

2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8103. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at United States Naval Station Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity except in accordance with section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) and section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328).

SEC. 8104. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8105. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense, or any other official or officer of the Department of Defense, to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or any subsidiary of Rosoboronexport.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that it is in the vital national security interest of the United States to do so, and certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge:

(1) Rosoboronexport has ceased the transfer of lethal military equipment to, and the maintenance of existing lethal military equipment for, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) The armed forces of the Russian Federation have withdrawn from Crimea, other than armed forces present on military bases subject to agreements in force between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) Agents of the Russian Federation have ceased taking active measures to destabilize the control of the Government of Ukraine over eastern Ukraine.

(c) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct a review of any action involving Rosoboronexport with respect to a waiver issued by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to subsection (b), and not later than 90 days after the date on which such a waiver is issued by the Secretary of Defense, the Inspector General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the review conducted with respect to such waiver.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8107. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Department of Defense, amounts may be made available, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to local military commanders appointed by the Secretary, or by an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, to provide at their discretion ex gratia payments in amounts consistent with subsection

(d) of this section for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces in a foreign country.

(b) An ex gratia payment under this section may be provided only if—

(1) the prospective foreign civilian recipient is determined by the local military commander to be friendly to the United States;

(2) a claim for damages would not be compensable under chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the "Foreign Claims Act"); and

(3) the property damage, personal injury, or death was not caused by action by an enemy.

(c) **NATURE OF PAYMENTS.**—Any payments provided under a program under subsection (a) shall not be considered an admission or acknowledgement of any legal obligation to compensate for any damage, personal injury, or death.

(d) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.**—If the Secretary of Defense determines a program under subsection (a) to be appropriate in a particular setting, the amounts of payments, if any, to be provided to civilians determined to have suffered harm incident to combat operations of the Armed Forces under the program should be determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary and based on an assessment, which should include such factors as cultural appropriateness and prevailing economic conditions.

(e) **LEGAL ADVICE.**—Local military commanders shall receive legal advice before making ex gratia payments under this subsection. The legal advisor, under regulations of the Department of Defense, shall advise on whether an ex gratia payment is proper under this section and applicable Department of Defense regulations.

(f) **WRITTEN RECORD.**—A written record of any ex gratia payment offered or denied shall be kept by the local commander and on a timely basis submitted to the appropriate office in the Department of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) **REPORT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis the efficacy of the ex gratia payment program including the number of types of cases considered, amounts offered, the response from ex gratia payment recipients, and any recommended modifications to the program.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds available in this Act to the Department of Defense, other than appropriations made for necessary or routine refurbishments, upgrades or maintenance activities, shall be used to reduce or to prepare to reduce the number of deployed and non-deployed strategic delivery vehicles and launchers below the levels set forth in the report submitted to Congress in accordance with section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8109. The Secretary of Defense shall post grant awards on a public Web site in a searchable format.

SEC. 8110. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund the performance of a flight demonstration team at a location outside of the United States: *Provided*, That this prohibition applies only if a performance of a flight demonstration team at a location within the United States was canceled during the current fiscal year due to insufficient funding.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of

title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 8113. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of any agency funded by this Act who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8114. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for activities authorized under section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1621) to initiate support for, or expand support to, foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals unless the congressional defense committees are notified in accordance with the direction contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act, not less than 15 days before initiating such support: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used under section 1208 for any activity that is not in support of an ongoing military operation being conducted by United States Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibitions in this section if the Secretary determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances and, by not later than 72 hours after making such waiver, notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any A-10 aircraft, or to disestablish any units of the active or reserve component associated with such aircraft.

SEC. 8117. None of the funds provided in this Act for the T-AO(X) program shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of the following components unless those components are manufactured in the United States: Auxiliary equipment (including pumps) for shipboard services; propulsion equipment (including engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes.

SEC. 8118. The amount appropriated in title II of this Act for “Operation and Maintenance, Army” is hereby reduced by

\$336,000,000 to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings due to lower than anticipated fuel costs, the total amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by \$1,155,000,000.

SEC. 8120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest or retire, or to prepare to divest or retire, KC-10 aircraft.

SEC. 8121. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, or prepare to divest, retire, transfer, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status, any EC-130H aircraft.

SEC. 8122. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Government Travel Charge Card expenses by military or civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for gaming, or for entertainment that includes topless or nude entertainers or participants, as prohibited by Department of Defense FMR, Volume 9, Chapter 3 and Department of Defense Instruction 1015.10 (enclosure 3, 14a and 14b).

SEC. 8123. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

SEC. 8124. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$274,524,000, to remain available until expended, may be used for any purposes related to the National Defense Reserve Fleet established under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. 4405): *Provided*, That such amounts are available for reimbursements to the Ready Reserve Force, Maritime Administration account of the United States Department of Transportation for programs, projects, activities, and expenses related to the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8125. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act, the Secretary of Defense may use up to \$20,000,000 under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, and up to \$75,000,000 under the heading “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide” to develop, replace, and sustain Federal Government security and suitability background investigation information technology systems of the Office of Personnel Management or other Federal agency responsible for conducting such investigations: *Provided*, That the Secretary may reprogram or transfer additional amounts into these headings or into “Procurement, Defense-Wide” using established reprogramming procedures applicable to congressional special interest items: *Provided further*, That such funds shall supplement, not supplant any other amounts made available to other Federal agencies for such purposes.

SEC. 8126. None of the funds made available by this Act for the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System recapitalization program may be obligated or expended for pre-milestone B activities after March 31, 2018.

SEC. 8127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the closure or realignment of the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8128. Additional readiness funds made available in title II of this Act for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, and “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force” may be transferred to and merged with any appropriation of the Department of Defense for activities

related to the Zika virus in order to provide health support for the full range of military operations and sustain the health of the members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and their families, to include: research and development, disease surveillance, vaccine development, rapid detection, vector controls and surveillance, training, and outbreak response: *Provided*, That the authority provided in this section is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 8129. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network is designed to block access to pornography websites.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities, or for any activity necessary for the national defense, including intelligence activities.

(RESCISSON)

SEC. 8130. (a) The Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund established by section 8103 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 321) is hereby terminated, effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Any unobligated balances in the Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund as of the date of the enactment of this Act are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 8131. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion.

SEC. 8132. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any transfer of funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Global Engagement Center pursuant to section 1287 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) shall be made in accordance with section 8005 or 9002 of this Act, as applicable.

SEC. 8133. No amounts credited or otherwise made available in this or any other Act to the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund may be transferred to:

(1) the Rapid Prototyping Fund established under section 804(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note); or

(2) credited to a military-department specific fund established under section 804(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (as amended by section 897 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017).

SEC. 8134. The explanatory statement regarding this Act, printed in the House of Representatives section of the Congressional Record on or about March 8, 2017, by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, shall have the same effect with respect to the allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 8135. No funds provided in this Act shall be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or to prevent or impede that Inspector General's access to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly refers to

the Inspector General and expressly limits the Inspector General's right of access. A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General with access to all such records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner. Each Inspector General shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the establishment over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978. Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 5 calendar days any failures to comply with this requirement.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/ GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$1,948,648,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$327,427,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$179,733,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$705,706,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$42,506,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$11,929,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$3,764,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$20,535,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Con-

gress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$196,472,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$5,288,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$15,693,068,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$7,887,349,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$1,607,259,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$10,556,598,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$6,476,649,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed \$920,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access, provided to United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional com-

mittees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used to support the Government of Jordan, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to enhance the ability of the armed forces of Jordan to increase or sustain security along its borders, upon 15 days prior written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the amounts intended to be provided and the nature of the expenses incurred: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed \$750,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be available to provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support or facilitate counterterrorism, crisis response, or other Department of Defense security cooperation programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, up to \$30,000,000 shall be for Operation Observant Compass: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$38,679,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$26,265,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", \$3,304,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", \$57,586,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard",

\$127,035,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund”, \$4,262,715,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary’s designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may obligate and expend funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title for additional costs associated with existing projects previously funded with amounts provided under the heading “Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund” in prior Acts: *Provided further*, That such costs shall be limited to contract changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuation, rate adjustments, and other necessary contract actions to complete existing projects, and associated supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not use more than \$50,000,000 under the authority provided in this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify in advance such contract changes and adjustments in annual reports to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq and other entities, to carry out assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entity may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive a provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services or sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785) if the Secretary determines that such provision of law would prohibit, restrict, delay or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance and a notice of and justification for such waiver is submitted to the congressional defense committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the

forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, and the recruitment and training of female security personnel: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

COUNTER-ISIL TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND

For the “Counter-Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant Train and Equip Fund”, \$980,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training; equipment; logistics support, supplies, and services; stipends; infrastructure repair and renovation; and sustainment, to foreign security forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals participating, or preparing to participate in activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and their affiliated or associated groups: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used, in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense may determine, to enhance the border security of nations adjacent to conflict areas, including Jordan and Lebanon, resulting from actions of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be available to provide assistance only for activities in a country designated by the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, as having a security mission to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and following written notification to the congressional defense committees of such designation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of any forces or individuals, such elements or individuals are appropriately vetted, including at a minimum, assessing such elements for associations with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and receiving commitments from such elements to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq and other entities, to carry out assistance authorized under this heading: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any foreign government or other entity may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive a provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services or sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785) if the Secretary determines that such provision of law would prohibit, restrict, delay or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance and a notice of and justification for such waiver is submitted to the congressional defense committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs of the

House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading, or under the heading, “Iraq Train and Equip Fund” in prior Acts, that was transferred to security forces, irregular forces, or groups participating, or preparing to participate in activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and returned by such forces or groups to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading, or under the heading, “Iraq Train and Equip Fund” in prior Acts, and not yet transferred to security forces, irregular forces, or groups participating, or preparing to participate in activities to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense when determined by the Secretary to no longer be required for transfer to such forces or groups and upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided under this heading, including, but not limited to, the number of individuals trained, the nature and scope of support and sustainment provided to each group or individual, the area of operations for each group, and the contributions of other countries, groups, or individuals: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Aircraft Procurement, Army”, \$313,171,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Missile Procurement, Army”, \$405,317,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army”, \$395,944,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, \$290,670,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, \$1,343,010,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", \$367,930,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Weapons Procurement, Navy", \$8,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", \$65,380,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Navy", \$99,786,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$118,939,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", \$927,249,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", \$235,095,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", \$273,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Air Force", \$3,529,456,000, to re-

main available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$244,184,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT ACCOUNT

For procurement of rotary-wing aircraft; combat, tactical and support vehicles; other weapons; and other procurement items for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, \$750,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this paragraph may be used to procure manned fixed wing aircraft, or procure or modify missiles, munitions, or ammunition: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \$100,522,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", \$78,323,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", \$67,905,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$159,919,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section

251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Defense Working Capital Funds", \$140,633,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Defense Health Program", \$331,764,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense", \$215,333,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund", \$339,472,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 5 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Inspector General", \$22,062,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office

of Management and Budget, transfer up to \$2,500,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in section 8005 of this Act.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance or the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the United States Central Command area of responsibility: (1) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of \$75,000 per vehicle; and (2) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$450,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9005. Not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the amounts appropriated by this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Army” may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commanders’ Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small-scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each 6 months of the fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that 6-month period that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees quarterly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the CERP in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That, not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of \$500,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third-party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9006. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to allied forces participating in a combined operation with the armed forces of the United States and coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-148).

SEC. 9009. None of the funds provided for the “Afghanistan Security Forces Fund” (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of \$50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of \$100,000,000 using ASFF: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding proviso and accompanying report language for the ASFF.

SEC. 9010. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than \$250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged

in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$500,000.

SEC. 9011. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, up to \$60,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction, and site closeout activities prior to returning sites to the Government of Iraq: *Provided*, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Minister of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are needed after the end of fiscal year 2017, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): *Provided further*, That, not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2017: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9012. Up to \$500,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency in “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” may be used to provide assistance to the Government of Jordan to support the armed forces of Jordan and to enhance security along its borders.

SEC. 9013. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading “Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund” may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

SEC. 9014. For the “Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative”, \$150,000,000 is hereby appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training; equipment; lethal weapons of a defensive nature; logistics support, supplies and services; sustainment; and intelligence support to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, and for replacement of any weapons or defensive articles provided to the Government of Ukraine from the inventory of the United States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not less than 15 days prior to obligating funds provided under

this heading, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Ukraine and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts, and not yet transferred to the military or National Security Forces of Ukraine or returned by such forces to the United States, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 9015. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for replacement of funds for items provided to the Government of Ukraine from the inventory of the United States to the extent specifically provided for in section 9014 of this Act.

SEC. 9016. None of the funds made available by this Act under section 9014 for "Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine" may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems.

SEC. 9017. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" for payments under section 1233 of Public Law 110-181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar-e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) implementing policies to protect judicial independence and due process of law;

(6) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(7) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national security interest to do so: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises such waiver authority, the Secretaries shall report to the congressional defense committees on both the justification

for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: *Provided further*, That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9018. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, \$500,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to the operation and maintenance, military personnel, and procurement accounts, to improve the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days prior to exercising the transfer authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the proposed uses of these funds: *Provided further*, That the funds provided in this section may not be transferred to any program, project, or activity specifically limited or denied by this Act: *Provided further*, That amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide funding under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2017.

SEC. 9019. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Syria in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed or military forces into hostilities in Syria, into situations in Syria where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Syrian territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of that law (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

SEC. 9020. None of the funds in this Act may be made available for the transfer of additional C-130 cargo aircraft to the Afghanistan National Security Forces or the Afghanistan Air Force until the Department of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees of the Afghanistan Air Force's medium airlift requirements. The report should identify Afghanistan's ability to utilize and maintain existing medium lift aircraft in the inventory and the best alternative platform, if necessary, to provide additional support to the Afghanistan Air Force's current medium airlift capacity.

(RESCISSESS)

SEC. 9021. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That such amounts are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985:

"Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, DSRA Coalition Support Fund", 2016/2017, \$300,000,000;

"Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund", 2016/2017, \$200,000,000;

"Afghanistan Security Forces Fund", 2016/2017, \$150,000,000; and

"Other Procurement, Air Force", 2016/2018, \$169,000,000.

(RESCISSON)

SEC. 9022. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts,

the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That amounts rescinded pursuant to this section that were previously designated by the Congress for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) and as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985:

"Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide: Coalition Support Funds", XXXX, \$11,524,000.

SEC. 9023. (a) The Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund provided for by section 123 of Public Law 110-92 (121 Stat. 992) is hereby terminated, effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Any unobligated balances in the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall, notwithstanding any provision of subchapter IV of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, or the procedures under such subchapter, be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 9024. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1301, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.R. 1301, the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2017.

In total, this bill provides \$577.9 billion in funding for the Department of Defense: \$516.1 billion in discretionary funding and \$61.8 billion in overseas contingency operations and global war on terrorism funding.

When combined with the funding provided in the continuing resolution supplemental enacted in December, total defense funding for fiscal year 2017 equals \$584 billion, consistent with the top line provided in the National Defense Authorization Act, and \$10.9 billion more than fiscal year 2016 levels.

Mr. Speaker, strengthening our national security and rebuilding our military starts today, with this agreement,

the first step after years of cutbacks. Our Armed Forces and intelligence community are currently operating under a continuing resolution, which denies them stability and predictability, both of which they have not had for many years.

H.R. 1301 provides that stability, removing defense funding from under continuing resolution autopilot, preventing further damage to our national defense and providing additional support for our men and women in uniform and their families.

Our troops serve with honor in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, South Korea, Japan, across the Baltics, the Sinai, and Africa on the ground, in the air, and aboard ships across the globe doing the work of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement rejects the troop reductions proposed by the previous administration, providing for increased end-strength levels authorized by the NDAA: 1.3 million Active Duty troops and 813,000 National Guard and Reserve troops, all of whom work as one team.

Our bill also fully funds the authorized 2.1 percent pay raise and provides increased funding for Defense Health Programs to ensure full care for all of our warfighters, their families, and military retirees.

This agreement also ensures that our Armed Forces have the training and equipment they need to conduct successful missions. Funding is increased for key readiness programs that prepare and train our troops and that modernize essential military installations. It reverses the previous administration's cuts to procurement, providing for additional production of state-of-the-art aircraft and ships.

In addition, we enhance cyber and ISR programs, or intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance programs, capabilities our combatant commanders badly need.

This reflects congressional priorities. We took into account the views of each and every Member who worked with us throughout the process. This is a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that deserves the support of the House.

I thank Chairwoman KAY GRANGER for her efforts in bringing this bill to the floor today and for taking over the leadership of the Defense Subcommittee in January.

I also thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. VISCOSKY, for his contributions to this bill and the earlier bill. He has been an excellent partner throughout this process, and I am grateful for our continued strong working relationship.

In addition, I commend NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the full committee, for her partnership and commitment to completing all of our appropriations work.

Lastly, I thank the staff of the subcommittee that is behind me, both minority and majority, as well as our personal offices and the full Appropriations Committee for their tireless work putting this bill together.

In particular, I would like to acknowledge Will Smith and David Pomerantz, the outgoing staff directors for the Appropriations Committee, both majority and minority, in this remarkable committee. Both have made immeasurable contributions to the Appropriations Committee in this institution, and we are indebted for their service. We thank both of them and wish them both the best.

Mr. Speaker, today our Nation faces a dangerous and unpredictable world. At the same time, our Armed Forces are struggling to have our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines fully trained and ready to meet every conceivable threat. That important work to address that critical situation starts with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

**EXPLANATORY STATEMENT SUBMITTED
BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN, CHAIRMAN
OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS REGARDING H.R. 1301**

The following is an explanation of the effects of this Act, which makes appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017. Unless otherwise noted, references to the House and Senate reports are to House Report 114-577 and Senate Report 114-263, respectively. The language contained in the House and Senate reports warrant full compliance and carry the same weight as language included in this explanatory statement unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the bill or this explanatory statement. While repeating some language from the House or Senate reports for emphasis, this explanatory statement does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

For the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119), and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508), the terms "program, project, and activity" for appropriations contained in this Act shall be defined as the most specific level of budget items identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017, the related classified annexes and explanatory statements, and the P-1 and R-1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by congressional action.

The following exception to the above definition shall apply: the military personnel and the operation and maintenance accounts, for which the term "program, project, and activity" is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

At the time the President submits the budget request for fiscal year 2018, the Secretary of Defense is directed to transmit to the congressional defense committees budget justification documents to be known as the "M-1" and the "O-1" which shall identify, at the budget activity, activity group, and sub-activity group level, the amounts requested by the President to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel and operation and maintenance in any budget request, or amended budget request, for fiscal year 2018.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE

The Secretary of Defense is directed to continue to follow the reprogramming guid-

ance for acquisition accounts as specified in the report accompanying the House version of the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008 (House Report 110-279). For operation and maintenance accounts, the Secretary of Defense shall continue to follow the reprogramming guidelines specified in the conference report accompanying H.R. 3222, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008. The dollar threshold for reprogramming funds shall remain at \$10,000,000 for military personnel; \$15,000,000 for operation and maintenance; \$20,000,000 for procurement; and \$10,000,000 for research, development, test and evaluation.

Also, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is directed to continue to provide the congressional defense committees annual DD Form 1416 reports for titles I and II and quarterly, spreadsheet-based DD Form 1416 reports for Service and defense-wide accounts in titles III and IV of this Act. Reports for titles III and IV shall comply with guidance specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006. The Department shall continue to follow the limitation that prior approval reprogramming are set at either the specified dollar threshold or 20 percent of the procurement or research, development, test and evaluation line, whichever is less. These thresholds are cumulative from the base for reprogramming value as modified by any adjustments. Therefore, if the combined value of transfers into or out of a military personnel (M-1), an operation and maintenance (O-1), a procurement (P-1), or a research, development, test and evaluation (R-1) line exceeds the identified threshold, the Secretary of Defense must submit a prior approval reprogramming to the congressional defense committees. In addition, guidelines on the application of prior approval reprogramming procedures for congressional special interest items are established elsewhere in this statement.

FUNDING INCREASES

The funding increases outlined in the tables for each appropriation account shall be provided only for the specific purposes indicated in the tables.

CONGRESSIONAL SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided or items for which funding is specifically reduced as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrase "only for" or "only to" are congressional special interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount, as specifically addressed in the explanatory statement.

CLASSIFIED ANNEX

Adjustments to classified programs are addressed in the accompanying classified annex.

BUDGET LIAISON SUPPORT TO THE HOUSE AND SENATE DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES

The House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees rely heavily on offices within the Comptroller organizations of the military departments and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to conduct their oversight responsibilities and make funding recommendations for the Department of Defense. Established in the 1970s in accordance with a recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, these offices facilitate the appropriate flow of information between the House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees and the Comptroller of the respective department or agency. In the early 1990s, the House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees restated the

support these organizations provide to the Committees and noted that “while the various offices of legislative affairs offer great assistance to DoD and the Congress, they do not provide the expertise and the direct relationship to the Comptroller organizations which are essential to the effective communication between DoD and the Committees on Appropriations.”

Further, the explanatory statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016 echoed the imperative to maintain the existing liaison structure to achieve the highest level of communication and trust between the Department of Defense and the House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees.

The House and Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittees repeat this support for the budget liaison organizations and reiterate previously stated concerns that efforts to incorporate these organizations into the military and Office of the Secretary of Defense legislative affairs offices would be deleterious to the appropriations process and to the utility of the budget liaison operation. Therefore, the agreement retains a provision in title II of this Act from previous years that prohibits the use of funds in this Act to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the Service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office.

CYBERSPACE ACTIVITIES

The agreement fully funds the fiscal year 2017 base budget requirement of \$6,734,000,000 for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air

Force, and the defense agencies cyberspace activities, an increase of \$992,000,000 over the fiscal year 2016 enacted level.

While the Service and defense-wide budget justification material, as well as the Department of Defense classified cyberspace activities information technology investments budget justification materials, provide some level of detail, much of the funding is encompassed within larger programs and funding lines, which limits visibility and congressional oversight of requested funding for cyberspace activities specifically.

Beginning in fiscal year 2018, the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer is directed to modify the cyberspace activities exhibit in order to provide increased visibility and clarity into the cyberspace activities funding requirements and changes to funding requirements from the previous fiscal year enacted levels, to segregate civilian and military pay, and to provide a crosswalk between the cyberspace activities justification books and the Services and defense-wide budget justification material.

Further, in order to provide additional clarity and to enhance oversight, the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Service Secretaries, is directed to conduct a review of the budget justification material and provide a proposal to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees not later than September 1, 2017, for how to clearly delineate the Department of Defense cyber investment activities requested in the operation and maintenance, procurement, and research, development, test and evaluation accounts as part of the budget justification material begin-

ning with the fiscal year 2019 budget submission. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Chief Information Officer are encouraged to consider establishing a unique cyber sub-activity group for operation and maintenance accounts and individual cost codes, projects, or program elements for procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts as part of this review.

The Department of Defense cyberspace activities table provided shows the amount of funding provided to each Service and defense-wide account in fiscal years 2016 and 2017. Funding appropriated therein may be used only for cyberspace activities as defined by the classified cyberspace activities information technology investment budget request for fiscal year 2017. The Secretary of Defense is directed to use normal prior approval reprogramming procedures to transfer funding out of any operation and maintenance, procurement, or research, development, test and evaluation accounts as identified in the table titled “Department of Defense Cyberspace Activities” for any purpose other than cyberspace activities. The Department of Defense Chief Information Officer shall submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees two reports not later than May 30, 2017, and November 30, 2017, which provide the mid-year and end of fiscal year financial obligation and execution data for cyberspace activities of each year.

This language replaces the language included under the heading “Cyberspace Operations” in House Report 114-577.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**CYBERSPACE ACTIVITIES**

(Includes cybersecurity, cyberspace operations, and research and development)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2016 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2017 Recommended
DEPARTMENT OF ARMY		
Military Personnel	159,366	163,409
Operation and Maintenance	606,353	760,989
Procurement	94,268	233,789
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	85,131	171,389
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ARMY	945,118	1,329,576
DEPARTMENT OF NAVY		
Working Capital Fund, Defense	116,954	127,484
Military Personnel	220,828	263,388
Operation and Maintenance	395,951	452,003
Procurement	150,890	104,228
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	65,580	91,057
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF NAVY	950,203	1,038,160
DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE		
Military Personnel	257,054	286,464
Operation and Maintenance	766,756	1,020,518
Procurement	268,253	326,627
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	253,519	356,922
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE	1,545,582	1,990,531
DEFENSE-WIDE		
Working Capital Fund, Defense	345,221	323,513
Operation and Maintenance	1,222,789	1,311,556
Procurement	74,125	60,628
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	658,702	679,723
TOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,300,837	2,375,420
TOTAL, CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,741,740	6,733,687

QUARTERLY CYBER OPERATIONS
BRIEFING

The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide quarterly briefings to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on all of-

fensive and significant defensive military operations in cyberspace carried out by the Department of Defense not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL
The agreement provides \$128,725,978,000 in Title I, Military Personnel. The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
RECAPITULATION		
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	40,028,182	40,042,962
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	27,951,605	27,889,405
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	12,813,412	12,735,182
MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	27,944,615	27,958,795
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	4,561,703	4,524,863
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	1,924,155	1,921,045
RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	744,995	744,795
RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	1,742,906	1,725,526
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	7,910,694	7,899,423
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	3,280,065	3,283,982
GRAND TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL.....	128,902,332	128,725,978
	=====	=====

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL END STRENGTH

	Fiscal year 2016 authorized	Budget request	Final bill	Change from request	Change from fiscal year 2016
	Fiscal Year 2017				
Active Forces (End Strength)					
Army	475,000	460,000	476,000	16,000	1,000
Navy	329,200	322,900	323,900	1,000	-5,300
Marine Corps	184,000	182,000	185,000	3,000	1,000
Air Force	320,715	317,000	321,000	4,000	285
Total, Active Forces	1,308,915	1,281,900	1,305,900	24,000	-3,015
Guard and Reserve Forces (End Strength)					
Army Reserve	198,000	195,000	199,000	4,000	1,000
Navy Reserve	57,400	58,000	58,000	---	600
Marine Corps Reserve	38,900	38,500	38,500	---	-400
Air Force Reserve	69,200	69,000	69,000	---	-200
Army National Guard	342,000	335,000	343,000	8,000	1,000
Air National Guard	105,500	105,700	105,700	---	200
Total, Selected Reserve	811,000	801,200	813,200	12,000	2,200
Total, Military Personnel	2,119,915	2,083,100	2,119,100	36,000	-815

SUMMARY OF GUARD AND RESERVE FULL-TIME STRENGTH

	Fiscal year 2016 authorized	Budget request	Final bill	Change from request	Change from fiscal year 2016
	Fiscal Year 2017				
Army Reserve:					
AGR	16,261	16,261	16,261	---	---
Technicians	7,395	7,570	7,570	---	175
Navy Reserve:					
AR	9,934	9,955	9,955	---	21
Marine Corps Reserve:					
AR	2,260	2,261	2,261	---	1
Air Force Reserve:					
AGR	3,032	2,955	2,955	---	-77
Technicians	9,814	10,061	10,061	---	247
Army National Guard:					
AGR	30,770	30,155	30,155	---	-615
Technicians	26,099	25,507	25,507	---	-592
Air National Guard					
AGR	14,748	14,764	14,764	---	16
Technicians	22,104	22,103	22,103	---	-1
Totals:					
AGR/AR	77,005	76,351	76,351	---	-654
Technicians	65,412	65,241	65,241	---	-171
Total, Full-Time Support	142,417	141,592	141,592	---	-825

MILITARY PERSONNEL OVERVIEW

The agreement provides the resources required for an additional 24,000 active forces and 12,000 selected reserve forces, as authorized by current law and above the requested end strength levels, in order to meet operational needs for fiscal year 2017. The agreement also provides the funding necessary to support a 2.1 percent pay raise for all military personnel, as authorized, effective January 1, 2017.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL ACCOUNTS

The Secretary of Defense is directed to submit the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414) for each of the fiscal year 2017 appropriations accounts not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Defense is prohibited from executing any reprogramming or transfer of funds for any purpose other than originally appropriated until the aforementioned re-

port is submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to use the normal prior approval reprogramming procedures to transfer funds in the Services' military personnel accounts between budget activities in excess of \$10,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided or have been specifically reduced as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrase "only for" or "only to" in the explanatory statement are congressional special interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount as specifically addressed in the explanatory statement. Below Threshold Reprogrammings may not be used to either restore or reduce funding from congressional special interest items as identified on the DD Form 1414.

MILITARY BANDS

Military bands honor and celebrate warfighters, promote patriotism during community events, inspire servicemembers, and enhance efforts to recruit and retain troops. Band engagements play an important support role for national security and joint operations, opening diplomatic doors for political and military discussions while building trust and confidence with foreign military and civilian authorities. However, the activities of military bands must not detract from the core competencies of the military. The Secretary of Defense should review opportunities to ensure that only the critical functions of military bands are supported while minimizing impacts on funding for essential readiness, military personnel, modernization, and research and development activities.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
50	MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY		
100	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
150	BASIC PAY.....	6,846,876	6,846,876
200	RETired PAY ACCRUAL.....	2,015,554	2,015,554
250	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	2,241,563	2,241,563
300	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	285,488	285,488
350	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	85,542	85,542
400	SPECIAL PAYS.....	367,175	367,175
450	ALLOWANCES.....	212,392	212,392
500	SEPARATION PAY.....	201,125	201,125
550	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	521,218	521,218
600	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	12,776,933	12,776,933
650	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
700	BASIC PAY.....	12,429,886	12,429,886
750	RETired PAY ACCRUAL.....	3,663,328	3,663,328
800	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	4,701,364	4,701,364
850	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	90,342	90,342
900	SPECIAL PAYS.....	395,840	395,840
950	ALLOWANCES.....	707,120	707,120
1000	SEPARATION PAY.....	523,385	523,385
1050	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	950,887	950,887
1100	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	23,462,152	23,462,152
1150	ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS		
1200	ACADEMY CADETS.....	81,184	81,184
1250	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
1300	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	1,240,112	1,240,112
1350	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND.....	594,481	574,481
1400	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE.....	813	813
1450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	1,835,406	1,815,406

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
1500	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION		
1550	ACCESSION TRAVEL.....	155,211	155,211
1600	TRAINING TRAVEL.....	149,240	149,240
1650	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	428,891	428,891
1700	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	710,007	710,007
1750	SEPARATION TRAVEL.....	302,576	302,576
1800	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS.....	4,033	4,033
1850	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE.....	14,073	14,073
1900	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE.....	47,766	47,766
1950	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5.....	1,811,797	1,811,797
2000	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
2050	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS.....	621	621
2100	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS.....	132	132
2150	DEATH GRATUITIES.....	38,000	38,000
2200	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.....	168,656	168,656
2250	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	634	634
2300	ADOPTION EXPENSES.....	576	576
2350	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.....	11,284	11,284
2400	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE.....	251	251
2450	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC).....	97,362	97,362
2500	JUNIOR ROTC.....	27,522	27,522
2550	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6.....	345,038	345,038
2600	LESS REIMBURSABLES.....	-284,328	-284,328
2650	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	34,780
		=====	=====
2700	TOTAL, ACTIVE FORCES, ARMY.....	40,028,182	40,042,962
6300	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	40,028,182	40,042,962
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	594,481	574,481
Excess growth		-20,000
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		34,780
Increase in Army end strength/pay raise		-37,220
Excess to requirement		843,000
		-771,000

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1649

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
6400	MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY		
6450	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
6500	BASIC PAY.....	4,120,767	4,120,767
6550	RETired PAY ACCRUAL.....	1,214,093	1,214,093
6600	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	1,497,045	1,497,045
6650	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	170,255	170,255
6700	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	132,868	132,868
6750	SPECIAL PAYS.....	428,731	428,731
6800	ALLOWANCES.....	118,231	118,231
6850	SEPARATION PAY	47,200	47,200
6900	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	313,964	313,964
6950	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	8,043,154	8,043,154
7000	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
7050	BASIC PAY.....	8,940,145	8,940,145
7100	RETired PAY ACCRUAL.....	2,636,817	2,636,817
7150	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	4,254,377	4,254,377
7200	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	103,685	103,685
7250	SPECIAL PAYS.....	752,380	752,380
7300	ALLOWANCES.....	544,072	544,072
7350	SEPARATION PAY.....	161,985	161,985
7400	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	683,920	683,920
7450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	18,077,381	18,077,381
7500	ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MIDSHIPMEN		
7550	MIDSHIPMEN.....	81,580	81,580
7600	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
7650	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	804,972	804,972
7700	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND.....	378,674	378,674
7750	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE.....	10	10
7800	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	1,183,656	1,183,656

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
7850	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION		
7900	ACCESSION TRAVEL.....	84,530	84,530
7950	TRAINING TRAVEL.....	66,298	66,298
8000	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	184,700	184,700
8050	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	228,489	228,489
8100	SEPARATION TRAVEL.....	123,633	123,633
8150	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS.....	24,746	24,746
8200	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE.....	12,686	12,686
8250	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE.....	16,225	16,225
8350	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5.....	741,307	741,307
8400	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
8450	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS.....	71	71
8500	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS.....	1,060	1,060
8550	DEATH GRATUITIES.....	13,500	13,500
8600	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.....	78,956	78,956
8650	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	16,505	16,505
8700	ADOPTION EXPENSES.....	250	250
8750	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.....	8,434	8,434
8800	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE.....	30	30
8900	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC).....	20,234	20,234
8950	JUNIOR ROTC.....	14,990	14,990
9000	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6.....	154,030	154,030
9050	LESS REIMBURSABLES.....	-329,503	-329,503
9100	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-62,200
		=====	=====
9200	TOTAL, ACTIVE FORCES, NAVY.....	27,951,605	27,889,405
11000	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	27,951,605	27,889,405
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-62,200
Increase in Navy end strength/pay raise		-175,000
		112,800

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1653

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
12000	MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
12050	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
12100	BASIC PAY.....	1,543,145	1,543,145
12150	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL.....	454,866	454,866
12200	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	511,997	511,997
12250	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	65,927	65,927
12300	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	31,661	31,661
12350	SPECIAL PAYS.....	3,582	3,582
12400	ALLOWANCES.....	35,359	35,359
12450	SEPARATION PAY.....	13,077	13,077
12500	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	117,478	117,478
12550	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	2,777,092	2,777,092
12600	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
12650	BASIC PAY.....	4,840,416	4,840,416
12700	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL.....	1,425,856	1,425,856
12750	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	1,557,367	1,557,367
12800	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	9,137	9,137
12850	SPECIAL PAYS.....	116,757	116,757
12900	ALLOWANCES.....	289,349	289,349
12950	SEPARATION PAY.....	97,926	97,926
13000	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	369,924	369,924
13050	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	8,706,732	8,706,732
13100	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
13150	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	440,800	440,800
13200	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND.....	386,455	386,455
13250	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE.....	10	10
13300	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	827,265	827,265

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
13350	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION		
13400	ACCESSION TRAVEL.....	64,291	64,291
13450	TRAINING TRAVEL.....	7,185	7,185
13500	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	130,620	130,620
13550	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	107,630	107,630
13600	SEPARATION TRAVEL.....	109,224	109,224
13650	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS.....	380	380
13700	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE.....	7,942	7,942
13750	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE.....	5,473	5,473
13850	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5.....	432,745	432,745
13900	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
13950	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS.....	395	395
14000	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS.....	19	19
14050	DEATH GRATUITIES.....	12,900	12,900
14100	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.....	77,928	77,928
14150	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	7,125	7,125
14200	ADOPTION EXPENSES.....	116	116
14250	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.....	2,122	2,122
14300	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE.....	101	101
14400	JUNIOR ROTC.....	3,589	3,589
14450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6.....	104,295	104,295
14500	LESS REIMBURSABLES.....	-34,717	-34,717
14600	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-78,230
14650	TOTAL, ACTIVE FORCES, MARINE CORPS.....	12,813,412	12,735,182
16000	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	12,813,412	12,735,182

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-78,230
Permanent change of station restoral		-112,030
Increase in Marine Corps end strength/pay raise		20,000
		13,800

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
17000	MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
17050	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
17100	BASIC PAY.....	4,886,786	4,886,786
17150	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL.....	1,433,571	1,433,571
17200	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	1,507,570	1,507,570
17250	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	199,210	199,210
17300	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	230,325	230,325
17350	SPECIAL PAYS.....	303,925	303,925
17400	ALLOWANCES.....	110,509	110,509
17450	SEPARATION PAY	54,540	54,540
17500	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX.....	373,187	373,187
17550	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	9,099,623	9,099,623
17600	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
17650	BASIC PAY.....	8,811,898	8,811,898
17700	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL.....	2,591,637	2,591,637
17750	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	3,674,509	3,674,509
17800	INCENTIVE PAYS.....	35,601	35,601
17850	SPECIAL PAYS.....	357,581	357,581
17900	ALLOWANCES.....	503,008	503,008
17950	SEPARATION PAY.....	109,908	109,908
18000	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	674,109	674,109
18050	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	16,758,251	16,758,251
18100	ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS		
18150	ACADEMY CADETS.....	72,144	72,144
18200	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
18250	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.....	1,007,662	1,007,662
18300	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND.....	131,986	131,986
18350	FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE.....	8	8
18400	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	1,139,656	1,139,656

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
18450	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION		
18500	ACCESSION TRAVEL.....	90,791	90,791
18550	TRAINING TRAVEL.....	71,207	71,207
18600	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	265,682	265,682
18650	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	567,998	567,998
18700	SEPARATION TRAVEL.....	147,938	147,938
18750	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS.....	9,204	9,204
18800	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE.....	23,664	23,664
18850	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE.....	34,701	34,701
18950	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5.....	1,211,185	1,211,185
19000	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
19050	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS.....	16	16
19100	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS.....	2,691	2,691
19150	DEATH GRATUITIES.....	16,000	16,000
19200	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.....	53,431	53,431
19300	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	79	79
19350	ADOPTION EXPENSES.....	435	435
19400	TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY.....	4,841	4,841
19450	PARTIAL DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE.....	723	723
19550	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC).....	29,445	29,445
19600	JUNIOR ROTC.....	18,200	18,200
19650	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6.....	125,861	125,861
19700	LESS REIMBURSABLES.....	-462,105	-462,105
19750	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	14,180
19800	TOTAL, ACTIVE FORCES, AIR FORCE.....	27,944,615	27,958,795
21000	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	27,944,615	27,958,795

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		14,180
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-192,220
Increase in Air Force end strength/pay raise		206,400

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
23000	RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY		
23050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
23100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	1,549,028	1,549,028
23150	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	41,018	41,018
23200	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	216,524	216,524
23250	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	11,514	11,514
23300	MOBILIZATION TRAINING	326	326
23350	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	224,758	224,758
23400	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	281,611	281,611
23450	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	2,120,835	2,120,835
23500	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	4,124	4,124
23550	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	59,937	59,937
23600	OTHER PROGRAMS	52,028	52,028
23650	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	4,561,703	4,561,703
23800	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-36,840
24000	TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	4,561,703	4,524,863
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-36,840
Increase in Army Reserve end strength/pay raise		-89,940
		53,100

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
26000	RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY		
26050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
26100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	625,660	625,660
26150	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	7,369	7,369
26200	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	62,904	62,904
26250	MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	8,732	8,732
26300	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	50,441	50,441
26350	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	112,504	112,504
26400	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	1,004,041	1,004,041
26450	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	105	105
26500	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP.....	52,399	52,399
26550	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,924,155	1,924,155
26600	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-3,110
27000	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	1,924,155	1,921,045
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances	-3,110	-8,010
Navy Reserve pay raise		4,900

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
28000	RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
28050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
28100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	274,555	274,555
28150	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY).....	43,539	43,539
28200	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	124,902	124,902
28300	MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	2,096	2,096
28350	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	24,607	24,607
28400	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	29,000	29,000
28450	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	237,484	237,484
28500	PLATOON LEADER CLASS.....	8,124	8,124
28550	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	688	688
28600	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	744,995	744,995
28700	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-200
29000	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	744,995	744,795
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-200
Marine Corps Reserve pay raise		-2,100
		1,900

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
30000	RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
30050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
30100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	696,068	696,068
30150	PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	98,133	98,133
30200	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	55,568	55,568
30250	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	2,559	2,559
30300	MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	703	703
30350	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	159,593	159,593
30400	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	244,844	244,844
30450	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	409,615	409,615
30500	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	12,533	12,533
30550	HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP.....	60,301	60,301
30600	OTHER PROGRAMS (ADMIN & SUPPORT).....	2,989	2,989
30650	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,742,906	1,742,906
30750	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-17,380
31000	TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	1,742,906	1,725,526
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-17,380
Air Force Reserve pay raise		-21,780
		4,400

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1673

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
32000	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY		
32050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
32100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	2,561,418	2,561,418
32150	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	551,868	551,868
32200	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	46,202	46,202
32250	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	546,563	536,563
32300	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	570,009	590,659
32350	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	3,632,138	3,632,138
32400	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	2,496	2,496
32450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	7,910,694	7,921,344
32600	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	-21,921
33000	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	7,910,694	7,899,423
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
SCHOOL TRAINING	546,563	536,563
Unjustified increase		-10,000
SPECIAL TRAINING	570,009	590,659
Program increase - State Partnership Program		3,750
Cyber protection teams		6,900
Operation Phalanx		10,000
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		-21,921
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-120,000
Program increase - trauma training		1,579
Increase in Army National Guard end strength/pay raise		96,500

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR
FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
34000	NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
34050	ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND SUPPORT		
34100	PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	934,650	934,650
34150	PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	131,022	131,022
34200	PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	10,555	10,555
34250	SCHOOL TRAINING.....	349,904	349,904
34300	SPECIAL TRAINING.....	167,077	169,027
34350	ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	1,678,355	1,678,355
34400	EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	8,502	8,502
34450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	3,280,065	3,282,015
34700	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT.....	---	1,967
35000	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	3,280,065	3,283,982
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
SPECIAL TRAINING		
Program increase - State Partnership Program	167,077	169,027
		1,950
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		1,967
Unobligated/Unexpended balances		-8,000
Program increase - trauma training		1,367
Air National Guard pay raise		8,600

TITLE II—OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE

The agreement provides \$167,603,260,000 in Title II, Operation and Maintenance. The

agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
RECAPITULATION		
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY.....	33,809,040	32,738,173
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY.....	39,483,581	38,552,017
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS.....	5,954,258	5,676,152
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE.....	37,518,056	36,247,724
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	32,571,590	32,373,949
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE.....	2,712,331	2,743,688
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE.....	927,656	929,656
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE.....	270,633	271,133
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE.....	3,067,929	3,069,229
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.....	6,825,370	6,861,478
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD.....	6,703,578	6,615,095
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES...	14,194	14,194
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY.....	170,167	170,167
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY.....	281,762	289,262
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE.....	371,521	371,521
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	9,009	9,009
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	197,084	222,084
OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID.....	105,125	123,125
COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT.....	325,604	325,604
GRAND TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE.....	171,318,488	167,603,260
	=====	=====

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACCOUNTS

The Secretary of Defense is directed to submit the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414) for each of the fiscal year 2017 appropriation accounts not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Defense is prohibited from executing any reprogramming or transfer of funds for any purpose other than originally appropriated until the aforementioned report is submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to use the normal prior approval reprogramming procedures to transfer funds in the Services' operation and maintenance accounts between O-1 budget activities in excess of \$15,000,000. In addition, the Secretary of Defense should follow prior approval reprogramming procedures for transfers in excess of \$15,000,000 out of the following budget sub-activities:

Army:

- Maneuver units
- Modular support brigades
- Land forces operations support
- Force readiness operations support
- Land forces depot maintenance
- Base operations support
- Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization

Navy:

- Mission and other flight operations
- Aircraft depot maintenance
- Mission and other ship operations
- Ship depot maintenance

- Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization

Marine Corps:

- Depot maintenance
- Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization

Air Force:

- Primary combat forces
- Combat enhancement forces
- Operating forces depot maintenance
- Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization
- Mobilization depot maintenance
- Training and recruiting depot maintenance
- Administration and service-wide depot maintenance

Air Force Reserve:

- Depot maintenance

Air National Guard:

Depot maintenance

Additionally, the Secretary of Defense should follow prior approval reprogramming procedures for transfers in excess of \$15,000,000 into the following budget sub-activities:

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard:

- Other personnel support/recruiting and advertising

With respect to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, proposed transfers of funds to or from the levels specified for defense agencies in excess of \$15,000,000 shall be subject to prior approval reprogramming procedures.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided or have been specifically reduced as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrase "only for" or "only to" in the explanatory statement are congressional special interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount as specifically addressed in the explanatory statement. Below Threshold Reprogrammings may not be used to either restore or reduce funding from congressional special interest items as identified on the DD Form 1414.

READINESS

The agreement provides additional readiness funds for the Services within the operation and maintenance accounts. This funding shall be used only to improve military readiness, including increased training, depot maintenance, and base operations support. None of the funding provided may be used for recruiting, marketing, or advertising programs. The funding provided is a congressional special interest item. The Secretary of Defense and the Service Secretaries are directed to submit a detailed spending plan by sub-activity group to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees not less than 30 days prior to the obligation of these funds. These transfers may be implemented 30 days after congressional notification unless an objection is received from either the House or Senate Appropriations Committees.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT

The agreement does not include a provision included in the House-passed version of

H.R. 5293 that referenced the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. It is noted that the enforcement of section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 may lead to higher fuel costs for federal fleets in the absence of competitively priced new generation fuels that emit fewer emissions. In carrying out this statute, the Secretary of Defense and the Service Secretaries should work to ensure that costs associated with fuel purchases necessary to carry out their respective missions should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

CIVILIAN PAY RAISE

Although the agreement does not include additional funds specifically for the civilian pay increase from 1.6 percent to 2.1 percent, sufficient funding is available within the appropriations accounts to fully fund the increase due to assets created by the civilian hiring freeze and the extended length of H.R. 2028, the Further Continuing and Security Assistance Appropriations Act, 2017.

AQUEOUS FILM FORMING FOAM

The use of the fire-extinguishing agent Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) by the Department of Defense has been linked to elevated levels of perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs) on military bases and in neighboring communities. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health, PFCs have adverse impacts on human health. The Navy and Air Force have begun remediation of PFC contamination. The Secretary of Defense is encouraged to require all Services to establish procedures for prompt and cost-effective remediation. In addition, the Secretary of Defense is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act that assesses the number of formerly used and current military installations where AFFF was or is currently used and the impact of PFC contaminated drinking water on surrounding communities. The report should also include plans for prompt community notification of such contamination, when the contamination was detected, and the procedures for timely remediation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES		
10	MANEUVER UNITS.....	791,450	561,026
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES.....	68,373	68,373
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADES.....	438,823	436,313
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS.....	660,258	650,258
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	863,928	863,928
60	AVIATION ASSETS.....	1,360,597	1,357,686
	LAND FORCES READINESS		
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	3,086,443	2,537,011
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS.....	439,488	439,488
90	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	1,013,452	376,128
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT		
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	7,816,343	7,816,343
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION..	2,234,546	2,259,546
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS.....	452,105	441,256
130	COMBATANT COMMANDER'S CORE OPERATIONS.....	155,658	155,658
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS.....	441,143	441,143
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	19,822,607	18,404,157
BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS		
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY.....	336,329	336,329
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS.....	390,848	415,848
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	7,401	7,401
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	734,578	759,578

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	ACCESSION TRAINING OFFICER ACQUISITION.....	131,942	131,942
220	RECRUIT TRAINING.....	47,846	47,846
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING.....	45,419	45,419
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS.....	482,747	482,747
 BASIC SKILL AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING.....	921,025	927,525
260	FLIGHT TRAINING.....	902,845	902,845
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION.....	216,583	214,583
280	TRAINING SUPPORT.....	607,534	593,534
 RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	550,599	535,599
300	EXAMINING.....	187,263	187,263
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION.....	189,556	189,556
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING.....	182,835	182,835
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS.....	171,167	176,667
 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3.....		4,637,361	4,618,361
 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	230,739	230,739
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES.....	850,060	850,060
370	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	778,757	743,757
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT.....	370,010	370,010

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
390	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION.....	451,556	451,556
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	1,888,123	1,896,523
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT.....	276,403	276,403
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT.....	369,443	369,443
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT.....	1,096,074	1,096,074
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES.....	207,800	207,800
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT.....	240,641	240,641
460	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	250,612	250,612
470	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS.....	416,587	416,587
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS.....	36,666	36,666
	OTHER PROGRAMS OTHER PROGRAMS.....	1,151,023	1,120,423
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	8,614,494	8,557,294
	EXCESS WORKING CAPITAL FUND CARRYOVER.....	---	-150,000
	OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS.....	---	-60,000
	RESTORE READINESS.....	---	285,000
	PROGRAMMED SAVINGS UNACCOUNTED FOR.....	---	-15,000
	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY END STRENGTH.	---	337,000
	LONG TERM TDY WAIVERS.....	---	1,783
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY.....	33,809,040	32,738,173

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
111 MANEUVER UNITS Unjustified growth OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX	791,450	561,026 -5,424 -225,000
113 ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE Unjustified program growth	438,823	436,313 -2,510
114 THEATER LEVEL ASSETS Unjustified growth	660,258	650,258 -10,000
116 AVIATION ASSETS Unjustified program growth	1,360,597	1,357,686 -2,911
121 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT Travel - unjustified program growth Program decrease not properly accounted for Program increase - trauma training OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX	3,086,443	2,537,011 -6,592 -43,000 160 -500,000
123 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE Program increase OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX	1,013,452	376,128 5,000 -642,324
132 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION Program increase	2,234,546	2,259,546 25,000
133 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS Unjustified program growth	452,105	441,256 -10,849
212 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS Program increase	390,848	415,848 25,000
321 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING Program increase - language capabilities	921,025	927,525 6,500
323 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION Unjustified program growth	216,583	214,583 -2,000
324 TRAINING SUPPORT Unjustified growth	607,534	593,534 -14,000
331 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING Unjustified program growth	550,599	535,599 -15,000
335 JUNIOR ROTC Program increase	171,167	176,667 5,500
411 SECURITY PROGRAMS Classified adjustment OPM rates - unjustified growth	1,151,023	1,120,423 -6,600 -24,000
423 LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES Program decrease not properly accounted for	778,757	743,757 -35,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
432 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS Program increase - Biometrics Identity Management Activity	1,888,123	1,896,523 8,400
435 OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 funding increase Army support to Capitol 4th	1,096,074	1,096,074 -5,500 5,500
LONG-TERM TEMPORARY DUTY WAIVERS		1,783
OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS		-60,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND CARRYOVER		-150,000
PROGRAMMED SAVINGS NOT PROPERLY ACCOUNTED FOR		-15,000
RESTORE READINESS		285,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY END STRENGTH		337,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS.....	4,094,765	3,674,765
20	FLEET AIR TRAINING.....	1,722,473	1,703,873
30	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA AND ENGINEERING SERVICES.....	52,670	52,670
40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT.....	97,584	97,584
50	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT.....	446,733	449,233
60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	1,007,681	990,681
70	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	38,248	38,248
80	AVIATION LOGISTICS.....	564,720	582,220
SHIP OPERATIONS			
90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS.....	3,513,083	3,088,083
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT AND TRAINING.....	743,765	743,765
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	5,168,273	4,790,873
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	1,575,578	1,652,338
COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS/SUPPORT			
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS.....	558,727	558,727
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE.....	105,680	105,680
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE.....	180,406	180,406
160	WARFARE TACTICS.....	470,032	470,032
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY.....	346,703	351,703
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES.....	1,158,688	1,154,688
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE.....	113,692	113,692
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	2,509	2,509
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS.....	91,019	91,019
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT.....	74,780	74,780

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
230	WEAPONS SUPPORT CRUISE MISSILE.....	106,030	106,030
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE.....	1,233,805	1,239,891
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT.....	163,025	163,025
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE.....	553,269	553,269
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	350,010	350,010
<hr/>			
280	BASE SUPPORT ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.....	790,685	790,685
290	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	1,642,742	1,667,742
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	4,206,136	4,176,136
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	31,173,511	30,014,357
<hr/>			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
<hr/>			
310	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE.....	893,517	893,517
320	READY RESERVE FORCE.....	274,524	274,524
<hr/>			
320	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS.....	6,727	6,727
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS.....	288,154	234,154
<hr/>			
340	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM.....	95,720	95,720
360	INDUSTRIAL READINESS.....	2,109	2,109
370	COAST GUARD SUPPORT.....	21,114	21,114
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	1,581,865	1,527,865

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
380	ACCESSION TRAINING OFFICER ACQUISITION.....	143,815	143,815
390	RECRUIT TRAINING.....	8,519	8,519
400	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS.....	143,445	143,445
 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
410	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING.....	699,214	699,214
420	FLIGHT TRAINING.....	5,310	5,310
430	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION.....	172,852	172,852
440	TRAINING SUPPORT.....	222,728	222,728
 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
450	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	225,647	225,639
460	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION.....	130,569	130,569
470	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING.....	73,730	73,730
480	JUNIOR ROTC.....	50,400	50,400
 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3.....			1,876,229
 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
490	ADMINISTRATION.....	917,453	893,453
500	EXTERNAL RELATIONS.....	14,570	14,570
510	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.....	124,070	124,070
520	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.....	369,767	365,767
530	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT.....	285,927	285,927
540	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	319,908	319,908

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
570	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	171,659	171,659
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.....	270,863	270,863
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	1,112,766	1,112,766
610	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT.....	49,078	49,078
620	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS.....	24,989	24,989
630	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS.....	72,966	72,966
640	SECURITY PROGRAMS NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE.....	595,711	595,711
700	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES.....	4,809	4,809
	OTHER PROGRAMS OTHER PROGRAMS.....	517,440	511,840
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	4,851,976	4,818,376
	RESTORE READINESS.....	---	280,000
	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN NAVY END STRENGTH.	---	33,800
	LONG TERM TDY WAIVERS.....	---	1,398
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY.....	39,483,581	38,552,017

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1A1A MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,094,765	3,674,765
Unjustified growth		-20,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-400,000
1A2A FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,722,473	1,703,873
Unjustified growth		-18,600
1A4N AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	446,733	449,233
Program increase - MV-22B readiness		1,200
Program increase - H-1 readiness		5,300
Unjustified growth		-4,000
1A5A AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,007,681	990,681
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-17,000
1A9A AVIATION LOGISTICS	564,720	582,220
Program increase - MV-22B readiness		10,700
Program increase - KC-130J readiness		6,800
1B1B MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,513,083	3,088,083
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-425,000
1B4B SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,168,273	4,790,873
Program increase		5,000
Program increase		9,500
Cruiser modernization - transfer from SMOSF		8,100
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-400,000
1B5B SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,575,578	1,652,338
Unjustified program growth		-2,500
Program increase		2,500
Cruiser modernization - transfer from SMOSF		76,760
1C5C OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	346,703	351,703
Program increase		5,000
1C6C COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,158,688	1,154,688
Reduce duplication		-4,000
1D2D FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,233,805	1,239,891
Program increase		6,086
BSM1 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,642,742	1,667,742
Program increase		25,000
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,206,136	4,176,136
Excess to requirement		-15,000
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-15,000
2B2G SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	288,154	234,154
Navy-identified asset for inactivation costs for the CVN 65 due to change in acquisition strategy		-54,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
3C1L RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING Unjustified program growth Naval Sea Cadet Corps	225,647	225,639 -1,230 1,222
4A1M ADMINISTRATION Unjustified growth	917,453	893,453 -24,000
4A4M MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT Excess to need	369,767	365,767 -4,000
9999 OTHER PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	517,440	511,840 -5,600
LONG-TERM TEMPORARY DUTY WAIVERS		1,398
RESTORE READINESS		280,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN NAVY END STRENGTH		33,800

READINESS COST ASSESSMENT TOOL

The recently published Naval Aviation Vision 2016–2025 offered strong support for the Readiness Cost Assessment Tool, which is the first phase of the Proficiency Optimization initiative. In lieu of the reporting re-

quirement in House Report 114–577, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act that describes the Naval Aviation Enterprise Proficiency Optimization initiative, the current funding profile,

and the potential to accelerate or streamline the program strategy.

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE,
MARINE CORPS**

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
10	OPERATIONAL FORCES.....	674,613	519,613
20	FIELD LOGISTICS.....	947,424	954,624
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	206,783	208,783
40	USMC PREPOSITIONING MARITIME PREPOSITIONING.....	85,276	85,276
50	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	632,673	640,424
60	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	2,136,626	1,933,626
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....		4,683,395	4,342,346
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
ACCESSION TRAINING			
70	RECRUIT TRAINING.....	15,946	15,946
80	OFFICER ACQUISITION.....	935	935
90	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING.....	99,305	99,305
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION.....	45,495	45,495
110	TRAINING SUPPORT.....	369,979	369,979
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	165,566	165,566
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION.....	35,133	35,133
140	JUNIOR ROTC.....	23,622	23,622
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3.....		755,981	755,981

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	34,534	34,534
160	ADMINISTRATION.....	355,932	341,932
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	76,896	76,896
	SECURITY PROGRAMS		
	SECURITY PROGRAMS.....	47,520	47,520
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	514,882	500,882
	OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS.....	---	-35,000
	RESTORE READINESS.....	---	59,000
	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN MARINE CORPS END STRENGTH.....	---	52,600
	LONG TERM TDY WAIVERS.....	---	343
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS.....	5,954,258	5,676,152
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1A1A OPERATIONAL FORCES	674,613	519,613
Program decrease not properly accounted		-7,000
Program increase - enhanced combat helmets		22,000
Program increase - corrosion control		5,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-175,000
1A2A FIELD LOGISTICS	947,424	954,624
Program increase - rifle sights		13,200
Unjustified growth		-6,000
1A3A DEPOT MAINTENANCE	206,783	208,783
Program increase - corrosion control		2,000
BSM1 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	632,673	640,424
Program increase		7,751
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,136,626	1,933,626
Unjustified program growth		-3,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-200,000
4A4G ADMINISTRATION	355,932	341,932
Program decrease not properly accounted		-14,000
LONG-TERM TEMPORARY DUTY WAIVERS		343
OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS		-35,000
RESTORE READINESS		59,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN MARINE CORPS END STRENGTH		52,600

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR
FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES.....	3,294,124	2,871,874
20	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES.....	1,682,045	1,650,045
30	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING.....	1,730,757	1,730,757
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	7,042,988	6,957,988
50	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	1,657,019	1,682,019
60	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	2,787,216	2,785,216
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING.....	887,831	890,831
80	OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS.....	1,070,178	1,070,678
SPACE OPERATIONS			
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES.....	208,582	208,582
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	362,250	362,250
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT.....	907,245	907,245
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS.....	199,171	199,171
OPERATING FORCES			
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	930,757	932,850
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....			
		22,760,163	22,249,506

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION		
140	MOBILITY OPERATIONS AIRLIFT OPERATIONS.....	1,703,059	1,273,059
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS.....	138,899	138,899
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	1,553,439	1,139,439
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	258,328	262,328
180	BASE SUPPORT.....	722,756	722,756
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	4,376,481	3,536,481
<hr/>			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
190	ACCESSION TRAINING OFFICER ACQUISITION.....	120,886	115,886
200	RECRUIT TRAINING.....	23,782	23,782
210	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC).....	77,692	77,692
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	236,254	240,454
230	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY).....	819,915	831,615
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING.....	387,446	395,246
250	FLIGHT TRAINING.....	725,134	725,134
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION.....	264,213	262,213
270	TRAINING SUPPORT.....	86,681	86,681
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	305,004	305,004
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION		
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	104,754	104,754
300	EXAMINING.....	3,944	3,944
310	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION.....	184,841	184,841
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING.....	173,583	171,883
330	JUNIOR ROTC.....	58,877	58,877
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3.....	3,573,006	3,588,006
<hr/>			

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS LOGISTICS OPERATIONS.....	1,107,846	1,087,846
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.....	924,185	912,185
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	48,778	48,778
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	321,013	321,013
380	BASE SUPPORT.....	1,115,910	1,115,910
 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
390	ADMINISTRATION.....	811,650	811,650
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	269,809	269,809
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES.....	961,304	956,304
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION.....	25,735	28,000
 SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT.....	90,573	90,573
 SECURITY PROGRAMS			
	SECURITY PROGRAMS.....	1,131,603	1,123,403
 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....			
	6,808,406	6,765,471	
OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS.....			
	---	-40,000	
RESTORE READINESS.....			
	---	124,000	
UNJUSTIFIED GROWTH.....			
	---	-57,000	
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN AIR FORCE END STRENGTH.....			
	---	79,900	
LONG TERM TDY WAIVERS.....			
	---	1,360	
 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE.....			
	37,518,056	36,247,724	
 ===== =====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
011A PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,294,124	2,871,874
Unjustified program growth		-4,250
Program increase - Air Force RCS turntable modification		7,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-425,000
011C COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,682,045	1,650,045
Unjustified program growth		-17,000
Classified program transfer		-15,000
011M DEPOT MAINTENANCE	7,042,988	6,957,988
Unjustified program growth		-85,000
011R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,657,019	1,682,019
Program increase		25,000
011Z BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,787,216	2,785,216
Unjustified program growth		-2,000
012A GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	887,831	890,831
Removal of one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-7,000
Program increase - Global C3I and early warning		10,000
012C OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	1,070,178	1,070,678
Unjustified progam growth		-10,000
Program increase - Eagle Vision		10,500
012F CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	930,757	932,850
Classified adjustment		2,093
021A AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,703,059	1,273,059
Program decrease not properly accounted		-30,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-400,000
021M DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,553,439	1,139,439
Removal of one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-14,000
OCO/GWOT operations - transfer to title IX		-400,000
021R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	258,328	262,328
Program increase		4,000
031A OFFICER ACQUISITION	120,886	115,886
Unjustified program growth		-5,000
031R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	236,254	240,454
Program increase - cybersecurity training		4,200
031Z BASE SUPPORT	819,915	831,615
Program increase - cybersecurity training		11,700
032A SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	387,446	395,246
Program increase - cybersecurity training		7,800
032C PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	264,213	262,213
Unjustified program growth		-2,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
033D CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING Unjustified program growth	173,583	171,883 -1,700
041A LOGISTICS OPERATIONS Unjustified growth	1,107,846	1,087,846 -20,000
041B TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES Program transfer not properly accounted	924,185	912,185 -12,000
042G OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES Price growth requested as program growth	961,304	956,304 -5,000
042I CIVIL AIR PATROL Program increase	25,735	28,000 2,265
043A SECURITY PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	1,131,603	1,123,403 -8,200
LONG-TERM TEMPORARY DUTY WAIVERS		1,360
OVERESTIMATION OF CIVILIAN FTE TARGETS		-40,000
UNJUSTIFIED GROWTH		-57,000
RESTORE READINESS		124,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN AIR FORCE END STRENGTH		79,900

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE,
DEFENSE-WIDE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.....	506,113	504,113
20	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.....	524,439	524,439
30	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.....	4,898,159	4,814,759
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	5,928,711	5,843,311
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
40	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY.....	138,658	138,658
50	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION.....	85,701	85,701
70	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.....	365,349	361,349
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3.....	589,708	585,708
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
80	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS.....	160,480	205,819
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY.....	630,925	623,925
110	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY.....	1,356,380	1,346,380
120	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY.....	683,620	718,620
130	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY.....	1,439,891	1,427,591
150	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY.....	24,984	24,984
160	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY.....	357,964	352,664
170	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY.....	223,422	224,122
180	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE.....	112,681	112,681
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY.....	496,754	495,504
180	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE.....	538,711	535,711
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY.....	35,417	35,417
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY.....	448,146	444,346
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY.....	2,671,143	2,618,143

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
240	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY.....	446,975	440,725
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT.....	155,399	136,199
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.....	1,481,643	1,478,205
280	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.....	89,429	88,929
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES.....	629,874	625,874
	OTHER PROGRAMS.....	14,069,333	13,973,975
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	26,053,171	25,909,814
	IMPACT AID.....	---	30,000
	IMPACT AID FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.....	---	5,000
	LONG-TERM TEMP DUTY WAIVERS.....	---	116
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	32,571,590	32,373,949

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1PL1 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	506,113	504,113
Support to info ops capabilities - unjustified growth		-2,000
1PL2 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	4,898,159	4,814,759
Overestimation of civilian FTE targets		-15,000
Contract support - unjustified growth		-6,000
Base support - unjustified growth		-8,000
Combat development activities - unjustified growth for equipment purchases		-3,000
Flight operations - unjustified growth for flight operations		-12,000
Intelligence - unjustified growth		-5,600
Maintenance - unjustified growth		-15,000
Other operations - unjustified growth		-1,300
Program decrease		-4,500
Operational support - program decrease not properly accounted		-5,000
Management headquarters - unjustified growth		-8,000
3EV7 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND / TRAINING AND RECRUITING	365,349	361,349
Specialized skill training - unjustified growth		-4,000
4GT3 CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	160,480	205,819
Program increase - National Guard Youth Challenge		10,339
Program increase - STARBASE		30,000
Program increase - innovative readiness training		5,000
4GT6 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	630,925	623,925
Reduce planned growth		-7,000
4GTC DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,356,380	1,346,380
Unjustified growth and removal of one-time fiscal year		
2016 costs		-10,000
4GT8 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES AGENCY	683,620	718,620
Enterprise Human Resources Information System - unjustified growth		-4,000
Defense Travel Management Office - unjustified growth		-7,000
Program increase - Joint Advertising, Market Research, and Studies		1,000
Program increase - Special Victims' Counsel		25,000
Program increase - Beyond Yellow Ribbon		20,000
4GT9 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,439,891	1,427,591
Program increase - secure communications		5,000
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-7,300
Unjustified growth		-10,000
4GTE DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	357,964	352,664
Program increase - Procurement Technical Assistance		
Program		11,700
Enterprise Business Systems - unjustified growth		-6,000
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 congressional increase		-11,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
ES18 DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	223,422	224,122
Imagery services - unjustified growth		-3,000
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-1,300
Program increase - IP streaming upgrades		5,000
4GTC DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	496,754	495,504
Administration expenses - unjustified growth		-250
Fellowship programs - unjustified growth		-1,000
4GTE DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	538,711	535,711
Overestimation of civilian FTE targets		-3,000
4GTI DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	448,146	444,346
CWMD sustainment - unjustified growth		-3,800
4GTJ DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,671,143	2,618,143
Overestimation of civilian FTE targets		-30,000
Unjustified program growth		-3,000
Remove one-time fiscal year 2016 costs		-3,000
Program increase - youth serving organizations		5,000
Armed Forces Retirement Home addressed in the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act		-22,000
011A MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	446,975	440,725
THAAD sustainment early to need		-6,250
4GTM OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	155,399	136,199
Authorization adjustment - public health laboratory funding ahead of need		-19,200
4GTO OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,481,643	1,478,205
Overestimation of civilian FTE targets		-14,000
OSD policy rewards program - unjustified growth		-1,000
OSD Strategy Development - unjustified growth		-820
BRAC 2016 round planning and analyses - program decrease		-3,500
Program increase - Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative		14,980
CWMD - program decrease		-4,498
Program decrease not properly accounted		-7,000
OUSD (AT&L) - unjustified growth		-2,600
Program increase - Operation Live Well		3,000
Program increase - fresh fruit and vegetable prescription plan		2,000
Program increase - Women in Military Service Memorial		5,000
Program increase - information assurance scholarship program		5,000
4GT1 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	89,429	88,929
Acquisition/program management - unjustified growth		-500
4GTC WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	629,874	625,874
Unjustified growth		-4,000
999 OTHER PROGRAMS	14,069,333	13,973,975
Classified adjustment		-95,358
IMPACT AID		30,000
IMPACT AID for children with disabilities		5,000
LONG-TERM TEMPORARY DUTY WAIVERS		116

BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION SYSTEMS

The agreement fully funds the budget request for the Department of Defense to develop, replace, and sustain federal government security and suitability background investigation technology systems. In lieu of the language included under this heading in House Report 114-577, the Director of the Defense Information Systems Agency is di-

rected to submit a progress report to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, and semiannually thereafter, that includes the information technology development and implementation plan, associated timeline with milestones, costs for each phase of implementation, anticipated outyear costs, personnel structure, and any other signifi-

cant issues related to the establishment and sustainment of a new federal government background information technology system housed within the Department of Defense.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES			
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES.....	11,435	11,435
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADES.....	491,772	491,772
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS.....	116,163	116,163
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	563,524	563,524
60	AVIATION ASSETS.....	91,162	91,162
LAND FORCES READINESS			
70	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	347,459	344,659
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS.....	101,926	101,926
90	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	56,219	56,219
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	573,843	566,043
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	214,955	223,912
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS HEADQUARTERS.....	37,620	37,620

	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	2,606,078	2,604,435
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	11,027	11,027
140	ADMINISTRATION.....	16,749	16,749
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	17,825	17,825
160	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	6,177	6,177
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	54,475	53,475

	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	106,253	105,253
RESTORE READINESS.....			
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY RESERVE END STRENGTH.....			
		---	12,000
		---	22,000
===== =====			
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE....	2,712,331	2,743,688
===== =====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
121 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	347,459	344,659
Unjustified program growth		-3,000
Program increase - language capabilities		200
131 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	573,843	566,043
Program decrease not properly accounted		-7,800
132 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	214,955	223,912
Program increase		8,957
434 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	54,475	53,475
Unjustified program growth		-1,000
RESTORE READINESS		12,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY RESERVE END STRENGTH		22,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

RESERVE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS.....	526,190	523,690
20	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE.....	6,714	6,714
40	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	86,209	86,209
50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	389	389
60	AVIATION LOGISTICS.....	10,189	10,189
RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS			
70	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING.....	560	560
RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
90	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS.....	13,173	13,173
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES.....	109,053	109,053
RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT			
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.....	27,226	27,226
BASE OPERATING SUPPORT			
130	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	27,571	30,071
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	99,166	99,166
<hr/>			
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....		906,440	906,440
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION.....	1,351	1,351
160	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL.....	13,251	13,251
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	3,445	3,445
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	3,169	3,169
<hr/>			
TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....		21,216	21,216
RESTORE READINESS.....		---	2,000
<hr/>			
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE.....		927,656	929,656
<hr/>			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1A1A MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS Projected underexecution	526,190	523,690 -2,500
BSMF FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION Program increase	27,571	30,071 2,500
RESTORE READINESS		2,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE,
MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES		
10	OPERATING FORCES.....	94,154	94,154
20	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	18,594	18,594
30	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	25,470	26,470
40	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	111,560	110,050

	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	249,768	249,268
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
50	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	902	902
60	ADMINISTRATION.....	11,130	11,130
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	8,833	8,833

	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	20,865	20,865
RESTORE READINESS.....			
===== =====			
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	270,633	271,133
===== =====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
BSM1 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION Program increase	25,470	26,470 1,000
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT Unjustified program growth	111,550	110,050 -1,500
RESTORE READINESS		1,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR
FORCE RESERVE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES.....	1,707,882	1,690,882
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS.....	230,016	228,516
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	541,743	541,743
40	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	113,470	132,270
50	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	384,832	384,832
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	2,977,943	2,978,243
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
60	ADMINISTRATION.....	54,939	54,939
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	14,754	14,754
80	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.....	12,707	12,707
90	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT.....	7,210	7,210
100	AUDIOVISUAL.....	376	376
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	89,986	89,986
RESTORE READINESS.....			
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE.	3,067,929	3,069,229
<hr/>			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
011A PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES Unjustified growth	1,707,882	1,690,882 -17,000
011G MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS Justification does not match summary of price and program changes	230,016	228,516 -1,500
011R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION Program increase	113,470	132,270 18,800
RESTORE READINESS		1,000

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1721

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES		
10	MANEUVER UNITS.....	708,251	708,251
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES.....	197,251	197,251
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE.....	792,271	788,271
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS.....	80,341	84,341
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	37,138	37,138
60	AVIATION ASSETS.....	887,625	881,125
	LAND FORCES READINESS		
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	696,267	669,993
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS.....	61,240	56,240
90	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	219,948	219,948
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT		
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT.....	1,040,012	1,029,512
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	676,715	692,947
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS.....	1,021,144	1,011,144
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	6,418,203	6,376,161
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION.....	6,396	6,396
140	ADMINISTRATION.....	68,528	69,678
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS.....	76,524	76,524
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT.....	7,712	7,712
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	245,046	245,046
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT.....	2,961	2,961
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	407,167	408,317
	RESTORE READINESS.....	---	20,000
	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD END STRENGTH.....	---	57,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.	6,825,370	6,861,478
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
113 ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE Unjustified program growth	792,271	788,271 -4,000
114 THEATER LEVEL ASSETS Program increase - Operation Phalanx	80,341	84,341 4,000
116 AVIATION ASSETS Program increase - Operation Phalanx Unjustified program growth	887,625	881,125 5,000 -11,500
121 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT Unjustified program growth Program increase - cyber protection teams Program increase - language capabilities Program increase - trauma training	696,267	669,993 -30,000 3,000 200 526
122 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS Program decrease not properly accounted	61,240	56,240 -5,000
131 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT Unjustified program growth	1,040,012	1,029,512 -10,500
132 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION Program increase	676,715	692,947 16,232
133 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS Unjustified program growth	1,021,144	1,011,144 -10,000
431 ADMINISTRATION Program increase - State Partnership Program	68,528	69,678 1,150
RESTORE READINESS		20,000
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INCREASE IN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD END STRENGTH		57,000

**NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAM/LANGUAGE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

For more than twenty years, the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) has been successfully building unique security relationships with more than 75 nations around the globe. To build on the success of this program, the agreement recommends that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau

encourage the enhancement of individual language skills and prioritize language school appointments of soldiers and airmen within the program to help further strengthen these international relationships. Additionally, servicemembers of the National Guard that participate in, and are from states with units assigned to state partnership activities should strive to attend lan-

guage schools, both defense-sponsored and otherwise; obtain computer-assisted language-learning software; and use international visits through the SPP as a means of language skill immersion.

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR
NATIONAL GUARD**

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS		
10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS.....	3,282,238	3,193,238
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS.....	723,062	713,579
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE.....	1,824,329	1,816,329
40	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION ..	245,840	255,840
50	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT.....	575,548	566,548
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	6,651,017	6,545,534
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
60	ADMINISTRATION.....	23,715	23,715
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING.....	28,846	28,846
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4.....	52,561	52,561
RESTORE READINESS.....			
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD..	6,703,578	6,615,095
<hr/>			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
011F AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,282,238	3,193,238
Unjustified growth		-74,000
MIP program decrease not properly accounted		-15,000
011G MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	723,062	713,579
Program increase - State Partnership Program		1,150
Maintain program affordability - unjustified growth		-12,000
Program increase - trauma training		1,367
011M DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,824,329	1,816,329
MIP program unjustified growth		-8,000
011R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,840	255,840
Program increase		10,000
011Z BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	575,548	566,548
Unjustified growth		-9,000
RESTORE READINESS		17,000

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The agreement provides \$14,194,000 for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

The agreement provides \$170,167,000 for Environmental Restoration, Army.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

The agreement provides \$289,262,000, an increase of \$7,500,000 above the budget request, for Environmental Restoration, Navy.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR
FORCE

The agreement provides \$371,521,000 for Environmental Restoration, Air Force.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,
DEFENSE-WIDE

The agreement provides \$9,009,000 for Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,
FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

The agreement provides \$222,084,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 above the budget request, for Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER,
AND CIVIC AID

The agreement provides \$123,125,000, an increase of \$18,000,000 above the budget request, for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid. Specifically, \$3,000,000 is a general increase and \$15,000,000 is for South China Sea Regional Engagement.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION
ACCOUNT

The agreement provides \$325,604,000 for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Account, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination	11,791	11,791
Chemical Weapons Destruction	2,942	2,942
Biological Threat Reduction	213,984	213,984
Threat Reduction Engagement	2,000	2,000
Other Assessments/Admin Costs	27,279	27,279
Global Nuclear Security	16,899	16,899
WMD Proliferation Prevention	50,709	50,709
TOTAL, COOPERATIVE THREAT RE- DUCTION ACCOUNT	325,604	325,604

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

The agreement provides \$108,426,827,000 in Title III, Procurement. The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SUMMARY		
ARMY		
AIRCRAFT.....	3,614,787	4,587,598
MISSILES.....	1,519,966	1,533,804
WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES.....	2,265,177	2,229,455
AMMUNITION.....	1,513,157	1,483,566
OTHER.....	5,873,949	6,147,328
TOTAL, ARMY.....	14,787,036	15,981,751
NAVY		
AIRCRAFT.....	14,109,148	16,135,335
WEAPONS.....	3,209,262	3,265,285
AMMUNITION.....	664,368	633,678
SHIPS.....	18,354,874	21,156,886
OTHER.....	6,338,861	6,308,919
MARINE CORPS.....	1,362,769	1,307,456
TOTAL, NAVY.....	44,039,282	48,807,559
AIR FORCE		
AIRCRAFT.....	13,922,917	14,253,623
MISSILES.....	2,426,621	2,348,121
SPACE.....	3,055,743	2,733,243
AMMUNITION.....	1,677,719	1,589,219
OTHER.....	17,438,056	17,768,224
TOTAL, AIR FORCE.....	38,521,056	38,692,430
DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE-WIDE.....	4,524,918	4,881,022
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES.....	44,065	64,065
	=====	=====
TOTAL PROCUREMENT.....	101,916,357	108,426,827
	=====	=====

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE FOR ACQUISITION ACCOUNTS

The Secretary of Defense is directed to continue to follow the reprogramming guidance as specified in the report accompanying the House version of the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008 (House Report 110-279). Specifically, the dollar threshold for reprogramming funds shall remain at \$20,000,000 for procurement and \$10,000,000 for research, development, test and evaluation.

Also, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is directed to continue to provide the congressional defense committees quarterly, spreadsheet-based DD Form 1416 reports for Service and defense-wide accounts in titles III and IV of this Act. Reports for titles III and IV shall comply with the guidance specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006. The Department shall continue to follow the limitation that prior approval reprogrammings are set at either the specified dollar threshold or 20 percent of the procurement or research, development, test and evaluation line, whichever is less. These thresholds are cumulative from the base for reprogramming value as modified by any adjustments. Therefore, if the combined value of transfers into or out of a procurement (P-1) or research, development, test and evaluation (R-1) line exceeds the identified threshold, the Secretary of Defense must submit a prior approval reprogramming to the congressional defense committees. In addition, guidelines

on the application of prior approval reprogramming procedures for congressional special interest items are established elsewhere in this statement.

FUNDING INCREASES

The funding increases outlined in these tables shall be provided only for the specific purposes indicated in the tables.

PROCUREMENT SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrase "only for" or "only to" in the explanatory statement are congressional special interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount as specifically addressed in the explanatory statement.

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS AND CONTRACTING

Throughout the fiscal year 2017 budget review process, the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Joint Program Office provided insufficient justification and incomplete information in an untimely manner. It is imperative that requested information is received promptly for proper congressional oversight of this major defense acquisition program.

It is understood that the Secretary of Defense is reviewing potential alternative management structures for the JSF program as directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328). This review will provide an opportunity to improve communication between the JSF Program Executive Officer (PEO), the Services, and the congressional defense committees to ensure the program's funding requirements are fully understood, communicated, and justified.

Additionally, there is concern that the number of F-35s enacted in annual Department of Defense Appropriations Acts are not being placed on contract by the JSF PEO in a timely manner. Four F-35s included in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 and 13 F-35s included in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016 were not part of their respective low rate initial production (LRIP) contracts due to the PEO's contracting strategy. Specifically, only four F-35Cs were included on LRIPs 9 and 10, rather than the ten F-35Cs enacted in the Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, 2015 and 2016, impeding production efficiencies. The agreement directs the JSF PEO to use a contracting approach that would award all aircraft included in each Department of Defense Appropriations Act on the respective production contract for that fiscal year. The agreement includes funding for 74 F-35 aircraft. The JSF PEO is directed to brief the congressional defense committees not later than 45 days after the enactment of this Act on the contracting strategy for these aircraft.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
	AIRCRAFT		
	FIXED WING		
1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT.....	57,529	41,342
3	MQ-1 UAV.....	55,388	250,388
	ROTARY		
5	UH-72 LAKOTA LIGHT UTILITY HELICOPTER.....	---	187,000
6	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN.....	803,084	774,072
6A	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA NEW BUILD.....	---	190,100
7	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN (AP-CY).....	185,160	185,160
7A	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA NEW BUILD (AP-CY).....	---	71,800
8	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP).....	755,146	1,085,046
9	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY).....	174,107	174,107
10	UH-60 BLACKHAWK A AND L MODELS.....	46,173	46,173
11	CH-47 HELICOPTER.....	556,257	553,257
12	CH-47 HELICOPTER (AP-CY).....	8,707	8,707
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT.....		2,641,551	3,567,152
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT			
13	MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS.....	43,735	63,735
15	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP).....	94,527	94,527
16	AH-64 MODS.....	137,883	137,883
17	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS.....	102,943	102,943
18	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP).....	4,055	4,055
19	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP).....	6,793	6,793

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
20	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP).....	13,197	12,197
21	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS.....	17,526	17,526
22	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS.....	10,807	10,807
23	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN.....	74,752	74,752
24	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE.....	69,960	76,960
25	GATM ROLLUP.....	45,302	45,302
26	RQ-7 UAV MODS.....	71,169	71,169
27	UAS MODS.....	21,804	21,804
	TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT.....	714,453	740,453
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS		
28	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT.....	67,377	89,377
29	SURVIVABILITY CM.....	9,565	9,565
30	CMWS.....	41,626	41,626
	OTHER SUPPORT		
32	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	7,007	6,217
33	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT.....	48,234	48,234
34	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS.....	30,297	30,297
35	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.....	50,405	50,405
36	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	1,217	1,217
37	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET.....	3,055	3,055
	TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.....	258,783	279,993
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY.....	3,614,787	4,587,598
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT Excess program management Unit cost growth	57,529	41,342 -3,587 -12,600
3 MQ-1 UAV Program increase - 12 aircraft	55,388	250,388 195,000
5 UH-72 LAKOTA LIGHT UTILITY HELICOPTER Program increase - 28 aircraft	0	187,000 187,000
6 AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN Unit cost efficiencies from multiyear procurement contract Excess government furnished equipment	803,084	774,072 -9,600 -19,412
6A AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA NEW BUILD Program increase - five aircraft	0	190,100 190,100
7A AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA NEW BUILD (AP-CY) Program increase	0	71,800 71,800
8 UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) Program increase - 15 for Army National Guard and ten for active Army Excess tooling	755,146	1,085,046 339,900 -10,000
11 CH-47 HELICOPTER Excess program management cost growth Excess support cost growth	556,257	553,257 -1,500 -1,500
13 MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS Program increase - CSP HD upgrade	43,735	63,735 20,000
20 EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP) Excess program management	13,197	12,197 -1,000
24 COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE Program increase - assured PNT	69,960	76,960 7,000
28 AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT Program increase - modernized radar warning system	67,377	89,377 22,000
32 AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT ANVIS unit cost growth	7,007	6,217 -790

UH-72 LAKOTA LIGHT UTILITY HELICOPTER

The agreement provides \$187,000,000 to procure 28 UH-72 Lakota Light Utility Helicopters for the Army in support of ongoing mission requirements at the Army Aviation Center of Excellence at Fort Rucker, the

Combat Training Centers, and the Army Test and Evaluation Center. The agreement notes that this investment is consistent with previous appropriations and was included in the Army's unfunded priority list. The Secretary of the Army is encouraged to request

funding for UH-72 Lakota Light Utility Helicopters to address ongoing mission requirements in future budget submissions.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
	OTHER MISSILES		
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM		
1	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD).....	126,470	126,470
2	MSE MISSILE.....	423,201	423,201
3	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY.....	19,319	19,319
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY.....	42,013	42,013
5	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLS (JAGM)	64,751	61,911
6	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLS (JAGM) (AP-CY).....	37,100	37,100
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM		
7	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY.....	73,508	102,808
8	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY.....	64,922	64,922
9	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY).....	19,949	10,716
10	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS).....	172,088	172,088
11	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR).....	18,004	18,004
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.....		1,061,325	1,078,552
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
	MODIFICATIONS		
13	PATRIOT MODS.....	197,107	197,107
14	ATACMS MODS.....	150,043	150,043
15	GMLRS MOD.....	395	395
17	AVENGER MODS.....	33,606	33,606
18	ITAS/TOW MODS.....	383	383
19	MLRS MODS.....	34,704	31,315
20	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS.....	1,847	1,847
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES.....		418,085	414,696

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
21	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	34,487	34,487
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
22	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS.....	4,915	4,915
24	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT.....	1,154	1,154
	TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.....	6,069	6,069
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY.....	1,519,966	1,533,804
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
5	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSL (JAGM)	64,751	61,911
	Unjustified increase		-2,840
7	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	73,508	102,808
	Engineering services cost growth		-1,700
	Program increase		31,000
9	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY)	19,949	10,716
	Advance procurement excess to need		-9,233
19	MLRS MODS	34,704	31,315
	Program cost growth		-3,389

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES (W&TCV), ARMY			
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
1	STRYKER VEHICLE.....	71,680	71,680
2	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES STRYKER (MOD).....	74,348	74,348
3	STRYKER UPGRADE.....	444,561	418,561
5	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD).....	276,433	265,333
7	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD).....	63,138	63,138
8	PALADIN PIPM MOD IN SERVICE.....	469,305	461,505
9	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES).....	91,963	91,963
10	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD).....	3,465	3,465
11	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE.....	2,928	2,928
12	M88 FOV MODS.....	8,685	8,685
13	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE.....	64,752	64,752
14	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD).....	480,166	492,044
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES			
	TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES.....	2,051,424	2,018,402
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES			
17	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY.....	9,764	7,064
18	MORTAR SYSTEMS.....	8,332	8,332
19	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM).....	3,062	3,062
20	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM.....	992	---
21	CARBINE.....	40,493	40,493
22	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION.....	25,164	25,164
23	MODULAR HANDGUN SYSTEM.....	---	2,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH		
24	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS.....	4,959	4,959
25	M777 MODS.....	11,913	11,913
26	M4 CARBINE MODS.....	29,752	27,752
27	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS.....	48,582	48,582
28	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS.....	1,179	1,179
29	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS.....	1,784	1,784
30	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS.....	971	1,963
31	M119 MODIFICATIONS.....	6,045	6,045
32	MORTAR MODIFICATION.....	12,118	12,118
33	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV).....	3,157	3,157
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV).....	2,331	2,331
37	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG).....	3,155	3,155
	TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES.....	213,753	211,053
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY.....	2,265,177	2,229,455

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
3 STRYKER UPGRADE Unjustified growth	444,561	418,561 -26,000
5 BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) Contractor support unjustified growth Excess to need - negotiated contract savings	276,433	265,333 -8,000 -3,100
8 PALADIN PIM MOD IN SERVICE Estimated contract savings	469,305	461,505 -7,800
14 M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) Excess program engineering support Industrial support	480,166	492,044 -4,400 16,278
17 INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY Program delay	9,764	7,064 -2,700
20 COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM Army requested transfer to line 30	992	0 -992
23 MODULAR HANDGUN SYSTEM Army requested transfer from line 26	0	2,000 2,000
26 M4 CARBINE MODS Army requested transfer to line 23	29,752	27,752 -2,000
30 SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS Army requested transfer from line 20	971	1,963 992

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1741

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY			
AMMUNITION			
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION			
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES.....	40,296	40,296
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES.....	39,237	39,237
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES.....	5,193	5,193
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES.....	46,693	46,693
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES.....	7,000	7,000
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES.....	7,753	7,753
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES.....	47,000	47,000
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES.....	118,178	111,824
MORTAR AMMUNITION			
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES.....	69,784	69,784
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES.....	36,125	36,125
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES.....	69,133	69,133
TANK AMMUNITION			
12	CTG TANK 105MM AND 120MM: ALL TYPES.....	120,668	117,853
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION			
13	CTG, ARTY, 75MM AND 105MM: ALL TYPES.....	64,800	61,300
14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES.....	109,515	94,515
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982.....	39,200	36,025
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL TYPES...	70,881	66,881
ROCKETS			
19	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES.....	38,000	33,000
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES.....	87,213	87,213

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
21	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES.....	4,914	4,914
22	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES.....	6,380	6,380
23	GRENADES, ALL TYPES.....	22,760	22,760
24	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES.....	10,666	6,166
25	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES.....	7,412	7,412
<hr/>			
	MISCELLANEOUS		
26	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES.....	12,726	12,726
27	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES.....	6,100	5,100
28	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	10,006	9,506
29	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT.....	17,275	13,528
30	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO).....	14,951	14,951
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, AMMUNITION.....	1,129,859	1,080,268
<hr/>			
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		
32	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	222,269	242,269
33	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL.....	157,383	157,383
34	ARMS INITIATIVE.....	3,646	3,646
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT.....	383,298	403,298
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY.....	1,513,157	1,483,566
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
8 CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		118,178	111,824
Program delays			-6,354
12 CTG TANK 105MM AND 120MM: ALL TYPES		120,668	117,853
Excess to requirement			-2,815
13 CTG, ARTY, 75MM AND 105MM: ALL TYPES		64,800	61,300
Change to acquisition strategy for 75mm blank			-3,500
14 ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		109,515	94,515
Unjustified growth			-15,000
15 PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		39,200	36,025
Eliminate program growth			-3,175
16 ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL TYPES		70,881	66,881
Maintain level of effort for PGK			-4,000
19 SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		38,000	33,000
Change to acquisition strategy			-5,000
24 SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		10,666	6,166
Excess to requirement			-4,500
27 NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		6,100	5,100
Unobligated balances			-1,000
28 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		10,006	9,506
Unobligated balances			-500
29 AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		17,275	13,528
Excess to requirement			-3,747
32 PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		222,269	242,269
Program increase			20,000

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL

	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS.....	3,733	2,578
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED.....	3,716	3,716
3	HIGH MOBILITY MULTI-PURPOSE WHEELED VEHICLE (HMMWV)...	---	50,000
4	GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLES (GMV).....	4,907	4,907
5	ARNG HMMWV MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	---	160,000
6	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE.....	587,514	587,514
7	TRUCK, DUMP, 20t (CCE).....	3,927	3,927
8	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV).....	53,293	53,293
9	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN.....	7,460	7,460
10	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV).....	39,564	33,594
11	PLS ESP.....	11,856	11,856
13	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS.....	49,751	45,251
14	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP.....	64,000	64,000
15	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED MODS.....	10,611	10,611
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES		
16	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN.....	394	394
18	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER.....	1,755	1,755
	TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES.....	842,481	1,040,856

	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS		
19	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK.....	427,598	541,598
20	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	58,250	58,250
21	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY.....	5,749	5,749
22	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM).....	5,068	5,068
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
23	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS.....	143,805	143,805
24	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS.....	36,580	36,580
25	SHF TERM.....	1,985	1,985
27	SMART-T (SPACE).....	9,165	9,165

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM		
31	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS).....	2,530	2,530
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS		
33	HANDHELD MANPACK SMALL FORM FIT (HMS).....	273,645	273,645
34	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR).....	25,017	25,017
35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2).....	12,326	12,326
37	TRACTOR DESK.....	2,034	2,034
38	TRACTOR RIDE.....	2,334	2,334
39	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT.....	1,985	1,428
40	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCREASE.....	10,796	8,796
42	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.....	3,607	3,607
43	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE.....	14,295	14,295
45	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE.....	19,893	19,893
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM		
47	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE (MIP).....	1,388	1,388
48	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT.....	5,494	5,494
49	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS.....	2,978	2,978
	INFORMATION SECURITY		
51	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC).....	131,356	131,356
52	DEFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS.....	15,132	19,132
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS		
53	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS.....	27,452	32,852
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS		
54	INFORMATION SYSTEMS.....	122,055	114,555
55	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	4,286	4,286
56	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM.....	131,794	126,794

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	ELECT EQUIP		
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
59	JTT/CIBS-M (MIP).....	5,337	5,337
62	DCGS-A (MIP).....	242,514	230,214
63	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS).....	4,417	4,417
64	TROJAN (MIP).....	17,455	17,455
65	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP).....	44,965	44,965
66	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)(MIP).....	7,658	7,658
67	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR).....	7,970	7,970
68	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM.....	545	545
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
70	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR.....	74,038	68,453
71	EW PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT TOOLS.....	3,235	3,235
72	AIR VIGILANCE (AV).....	733	733
74	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES.....	1,740	1,740
75	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES.....	455	455
76	CI MODERNIZATION (MIP).....	176	176
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)		
77	SENTINEL MODS.....	40,171	40,171
78	NIGHT VISION DEVICES.....	163,029	151,029
79	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF.....	15,885	15,885
80	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS.....	48,427	58,427
81	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS).....	55,536	49,536
82	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP.....	4,187	4,187
85	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND - PLATFORM (JBC-P).....	137,501	137,501
86	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS).....	50,726	48,375
87	MOD OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT (LLDR).....	28,058	28,058
88	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32.....	5,924	5,924
89	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM.....	22,331	22,331
90	COUNTERFIRE RADARS.....	314,509	297,509

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS		
91	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY.....	8,660	8,660
92	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD.....	54,376	54,376
93	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM.....	204,969	204,969
94	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS).....	4,718	4,718
95	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE.....	11,063	11,063
96	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS).....	151,318	151,318
97	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY.....	155,660	135,809
98	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY.....	4,214	4,214
99	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET.....	16,185	16,185
100	MOD OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE).....	1,565	1,565
<hr/>			
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION		
101	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION.....	17,693	17,693
102	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT.....	107,960	107,960
103	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM.....	6,416	6,416
104	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PROGRAM.....	58,614	58,614
105	CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM.....	986	986
106	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS).....	23,828	23,828
<hr/>			
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)		
107	TACTICAL DIGITAL MEDIA.....	1,191	1,191
108	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT).....	1,995	1,995
<hr/>			
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT		
109	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E).....	403	403
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	4,436	4,436
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT....	3,632,369	3,675,625

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
111	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS.....	2,966	2,966
112	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE).....	9,795	9,795
114	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION.....	17,922	17,922
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT		
115	TACTICAL BRIDGING.....	13,553	13,553
116	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON.....	25,244	25,244
117	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET.....	983	---
118	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER RECAP.....	25,176	25,176
<hr/>			
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		
119	GROUND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS).....	39,350	39,350
120	AREA MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (AMIDS).....	10,500	10,500
121	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS).....	274	274
122	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	2,951	2,951
123	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION.....	1,949	1,949
124	ROBOTICS AND APPLIQUE SYSTEMS.....	5,203	5,203
125	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT).....	5,570	5,570
126	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS.....	6,238	5,238
127	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT.....	836	836
128	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS.....	3,171	3,171
<hr/>			
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
129	HEATERS AND ECU'S.....	18,707	17,707
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT.....	2,112	2,112
131	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS).....	10,856	10,856
132	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM.....	32,419	32,419
133	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER.....	30,014	22,014
135	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT.....	12,544	12,544
136	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM.....	18,509	18,509
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS.....	29,384	29,384

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT		
139	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT.....	4,487	3,407
140	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER.....	42,656	35,656
<hr/>			
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		
141	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL.....	59,761	69,761
<hr/>			
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT		
142	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS.....	35,694	33,694
143	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ).....	2,716	2,716
<hr/>			
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		
144	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE).....	1,742	1,742
145	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING.....	26,233	26,233
147	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR.....	1,123	1,123
149	ALL TERRAIN CRANES.....	65,285	65,285
151	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS.....	1,743	16,743
152	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP.....	2,779	2,779
154	CONST EQUIP ESP.....	26,712	19,172
155	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP).....	6,649	6,649
<hr/>			
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT		
156	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP.....	21,860	21,860
157	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL).....	1,967	1,967
<hr/>			
	GENERATORS		
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT.....	113,266	113,266
<hr/>			
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
159	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION.....	7,867	7,867
160	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS.....	2,307	2,307

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
161	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT.....	75,359	75,359
162	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM.....	253,050	253,050
163	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER.....	48,271	48,271
164	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA.....	40,000	40,000
165	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING.....	11,543	11,543
<hr/>			
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)		
166	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT.....	4,963	4,963
167	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE).....	29,781	29,781
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD).....	6,342	6,342
<hr/>			
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
169	M25 STABILIZED BINOCULAR.....	3,149	3,149
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	18,003	20,003
171	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3).....	44,082	44,082
172	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT.....	2,168	2,168
173	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3).....	67,367	74,867
174	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH).....	1,528	1,528
175	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING.....	8,289	14,289
177	TRACTOR YARD.....	6,888	6,888
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	1,371,856	1,383,753
<hr/>			
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		
179	INITIAL SPARES - C&E.....	27,243	27,243
XX	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION.....	---	19,851
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY.....	5,873,949	6,147,328
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS PVT early to need	3,733	2,578 -1,155
3	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) Program increase - HMMWV ambulance modernization for active Army	0	50,000 50,000
5	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD HMMWV MODERNIZATION PROGRAM Program increase - HMMWV for Army National Guard Program increase - HMMWV ambulances for Army National Guard and Army Reserve	0	160,000 100,000 60,000
10	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) Unit cost growth	39,564	33,594 -5,970
13	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS Unit cost growth	49,751	45,251 -4,500
19	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK Program increase	427,598	541,598 114,000
39	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT Fielding cost growth	1,985	1,428 -557
40	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCREASE Engineering cost growth	10,796	8,796 -2,000
52	DEFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS Program increase	15,132	19,132 4,000
53	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS Program increase - USAEUR land mobile radio upgrade	27,452	32,852 5,400
54	INFORMATION SYSTEMS Underexecution	122,055	114,555 -7,500
56	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM Excess government management cost growth	131,794	126,794 -5,000
62	DCGS-A (MIP) Technology refresh growth	242,514	230,214 -12,300
70	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR Unit cost growth	74,038	68,453 -5,585
78	NIGHT VISION DEVICES Maintain level of effort	163,029	151,029 -12,000
80	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS Program increase - RAM warn communication enhancement	48,427	58,427 10,000
81	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS) Underexecution	55,536	49,536 -6,000

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
86 JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS) Non-recurring engineering previously funded	50,726	48,375 -2,351
90 COUNTERFIRE RADARS Unit cost growth	314,509	297,509 -17,000
97 GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY Army requested transfer to Logistics Automation	155,660	135,809 -19,851
117 BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET Procurement early to need	983	0 -983
126 REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS Schedule slip	6,238	5,238 -1,000
129 HEATERS AND ECUS Underexecution	18,707	17,707 -1,000
133 MOBILE SOLDIER POWER Underexecution	30,014	22,014 -8,000
139 QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT Unit cost growth	4,487	3,407 -1,080
140 DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER Maintain level of effort	42,656	35,656 -7,000
141 COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL Program increase	59,761	69,761 10,000
142 MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS Maintain level of effort	35,694	33,694 -2,000
151 HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) Program increase	1,743	16,743 15,000
154 CONST EQUIP ESP Unit cost growth	26,712	19,172 -7,540
170 RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Program increase	18,003	20,003 2,000
173 MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) Program increase - laser leveling systems	67,367	74,867 7,500
175 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING Program increase	8,289	14,289 6,000
XX LOGISTICS AUTOMATION Army requested transfer from line 97	0	19,851 19,851

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY			
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT		
2	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP).....	---	979,000
3	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	890,650	1,312,250
4	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (AP-CY).....	80,908	80,908
5	JSF STOVL.....	2,037,768	2,291,968
6	JSF STOVL (AP-CY).....	233,648	233,648
7	CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT)	348,615	332,315
8	CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT) (AP-CY).....	88,365	84,169
9	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT).....	1,264,134	1,392,134
10	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY).....	19,674	19,674
11	UH-1Y/AH-1Z.....	759,778	805,778
12	UH-1Y/AH-1Z (AP-CY).....	57,232	49,208
14	MH-60R.....	61,177	53,177
16	P-8A POSEIDON.....	1,940,238	1,820,238
17	P-8A POSEIDON (AP-CY).....	123,140	123,140
18	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE.....	916,483	916,483
19	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE (AP-CY).....	125,042	125,042
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT.....		8,946,852	10,619,132
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
20	JPATS.....	5,849	5,849
TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT.....		5,849	5,849

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
21	KC-130J.....	128,870	118,882
22	KC-130J (AP-CY).....	24,848	24,848
23	MQ-4 TRITON.....	409,005	444,242
24	MQ-4 TRITON (AP-CY).....	55,652	55,652
25	MQ-8 UAV.....	72,435	113,635
27A	C-40.....	---	207,000
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT.....	690,810	964,259
<hr/>			
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
29	AEA SYSTEMS.....	51,900	50,457
30	AV-8 SERIES.....	60,818	54,895
31	ADVERSARY.....	5,191	5,191
32	F-18 SERIES.....	1,023,492	988,192
34	H-53 SERIES.....	46,095	48,895
35	SH-60 SERIES.....	108,328	106,506
36	H-1 SERIES.....	46,333	69,733
37	EP-3 SERIES.....	14,681	14,681
38	P-3 SERIES.....	2,781	2,781
39	E-2 SERIES.....	32,949	30,949
40	TRAINER A/C SERIES.....	13,199	11,328
41	C-2A.....	19,066	19,066
42	C-130 SERIES.....	61,788	53,788
43	FEWSG.....	618	618
44	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES.....	9,822	9,822
45	E-6 SERIES.....	222,077	208,544
46	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES.....	66,835	63,754

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT.....	16,497	16,497
48	T-45 SERIES.....	114,887	105,267
49	POWER PLANT CHANGES.....	16,893	14,893
50	JPATS SERIES.....	17,401	13,414
51	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT.....	143,773	140,773
52	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES.....	164,839	159,839
53	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM.....	4,403	4,403
54	ID SYSTEMS.....	45,768	42,270
55	P-8 SERIES.....	18,836	18,036
56	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION.....	5,676	4,244
57	MQ-8 SERIES.....	19,003	19,003
58	RQ-7 SERIES.....	3,534	1,534
59	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY.....	141,545	141,545
60	F-35 STOVL SERIES.....	34,928	31,436
61	F-35 CV SERIES.....	26,004	21,833
62	QUICK REACTION CAPABILITY (QRC).....	5,476	5,476
	TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT.....	2,565,436	2,479,663
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	1,407,626	1,602,551
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
64	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT.....	390,103	365,282
65	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	23,194	23,194
66	WAR CONSUMABLES.....	40,613	36,740
67	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES.....	860	860
68	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	36,282	36,282
69	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	1,523	1,523
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES.....	492,575	463,881
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY.....	14,109,148	16,135,335
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
2 F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) Program increase - 12 additional aircraft	0	979,000 979,000
3 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER Program increase - two additional aircraft for the Navy and two additional aircraft for the Marine Corps Unit cost growth	890,650	1,312,250 500,000 -78,400
5 JSF STOVL Program increase - two additional aircraft	2,037,768	2,291,968 254,200
7 CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT) Recurring costs excess to need Support equipment early to need	348,615	332,315 -6,300 -10,000
8 CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT) (AP-CY) Excess to need	88,365	84,169 -4,196
9 V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) Program adjustment Support cost growth Program increase - two additional aircraft	1,264,134	1,392,134 -5,000 -15,000 148,000
11 UH-1Y/AH-1Z Unit cost growth Excess program growth Program increase - two additional aircraft	759,778	805,778 -12,000 -6,000 64,000
12 UH-1Y/AH-1Z (AP-CY) Funding carryover from reduction in aircraft	57,232	49,208 -8,024
14 MH-60R Field activity funding early to need	61,177	53,177 -8,000
16 P-8A POSEIDON Unit cost growth Excess program growth	1,940,238	1,820,238 -77,000 -43,000
21 KC-130J Contract savings carryover	128,870	118,882 -9,988
23 MQ-4 TRITON Unit cost savings Unit cost growth Production engineering support excess growth Program increase - one additional system	409,005	444,242 -12,880 -32,750 -14,133 95,000
25 MQ-8 UAV Unit cost savings Program increase - four additional aircraft	72,435	113,635 -6,400 47,600
27A C-40 Two additional aircraft for the Navy Reserve	0	207,000 207,000

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
29 AEA SYSTEMS	51,900	50,457
Other support growth (OSIP 007-11)		-1,033
Hardback cost growth (OSIP 007-11)		-410
30 AV-8 SERIES	60,818	54,895
Installation kit cost growth (OSIP 006-06)		-1,500
Excess installation (OSIP 006-06)		-4,423
32 F-18 SERIES	1,023,492	988,192
Program adjustment		-40,300
Program increase - electronic warfare upgrades		5,000
34 H-53 SERIES	46,095	48,895
Program increase - CH-53 readiness		2,800
35 SH-60 SERIES	108,328	106,506
Installations kit non-recurring cost growth (OSIP 018-12)		-1,822
36 H-1 SERIES	46,333	69,733
Program increase - H-1 readiness		23,400
39 E-2 SERIES	32,949	30,949
Excess support growth (OSIP 009-16)		-2,000
40 TRAINER A/C SERIES	13,199	11,328
Installation kit carryover (OSIP 005-04)		-1,871
42 C-130 SERIES	61,788	53,788
Prior year carryover		-8,000
45 E-6 SERIES	222,077	208,544
Installation kit non-recurring growth (OSIP 003-04)		-3,000
Excess support growth (OSIP 003-04)		-5,309
Installation kit non-recurring growth (OSIP 012-07)		-3,000
Training growth (OSIP 008-10)		-424
APU kit cost growth (OSIP 002-12)		-1,800
46 EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	66,835	63,754
Excess support growth (OSIP 014-02)		-3,081
48 T-45 SERIES	114,887	105,267
Main landing gear kit previously funded (OSIP 008-95)		-169
Installation previously funded (OSIP 008-95)		-2,858
Installation kits previously funded (OSIP 003-03)		-2,602
Support carryover (OSIP 006-16)		-3,991
49 POWER PLANT CHANGES	16,893	14,893
Excess support growth		-2,000
50 JPATS SERIES	17,401	13,414
Aircraft retrofit kits previously funded (OSIP 007-16)		-3,050
Installation cost growth (OSIP 007-16)		-937
51 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	143,773	140,773
ALQ-214 kit cost growth (OSIP 004-12)		-3,000
52 COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	164,839	159,839
Excess cost growth		-5,000

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
54 ID SYSTEMS Installation kit cost growth (OSIP 15-03)	45,768	42,270 -3,498
55 P-8 SERIES Prior year carryover	18,836	18,036 -800
56 MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION ALQ-23(V)3 installation kits previously funded (OSIP 010-13)	5,676	4,244 -1,432
58 RQ-7 SERIES Prior year carryover	3,534	1,534 -2,000
60 F-35 STOVL SERIES Support carryover (OSIP 023-14)	34,928	31,436 -3,492
61 F-35 CV SERIES Support carryover (OSIP 016-14) Support carryover (OSIP 024-14)	26,004	21,833 -1,050 -3,121
63 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS MQ-4 Triton spares excess to need Program increase - spares and repair parts for the Marine Corps	1,407,626	1,602,551 -10,575 205,500
64 COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT H-60S technology refresh upgrades contract delay Prior year carryover	390,103	365,282 -5,821 -19,000
66 WAR CONSUMABLES BRU-66 unit cost growth	40,613	36,740 -3,873

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY			
	BALLISTIC MISSILES		
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
1	TRIDENT II MODS.....	1,103,086	1,099,086
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	6,776	6,776
	TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES.....	1,109,862	1,105,862
	OTHER MISSILES		
	STRATEGIC MISSILES		
3	TOMAHAWK.....	186,905	219,105
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
4	AMRAAM.....	204,697	197,263
5	SIDEWINDER.....	70,912	70,912
6	JSOW.....	2,232	2,232
7	STANDARD MISSILE.....	501,212	491,212
8	RAM.....	71,557	71,557
9	JOINT AIR GROUND MISSILE (JAGM).....	26,200	21,922
12	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITION.....	3,316	3,316
13	AERIAL TARGETS.....	137,484	136,684
14	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT.....	3,248	3,248
15	LRASM.....	29,643	29,643
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
16	ESSM.....	52,935	50,817
18	HARM MODS.....	178,213	176,252
19	STANDARD MISSILES MODS.....	8,164	8,164
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
20	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.....	1,964	1,964
21	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON.....	36,723	33,723
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
22	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	59,096	59,096
	TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.....	1,574,501	1,577,110

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
23	SSTD.....	5,910	5,910
24	MK-48 TORPEDO.....	44,537	43,037
25	ASW TARGETS.....	9,302	9,106
26	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS.....	98,092	97,092
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
27	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS.....	46,139	46,139
28	QUICKSTRIKE MINE.....	1,236	1,236
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
29	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	60,061	54,971
30	ASW RANGE SUPPORT.....	3,706	3,706
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		
31	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	3,804	3,804
	TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT.....	272,787	265,001
	OTHER WEAPONS		
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
32	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS.....	18,002	18,002
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
33	CIWS MODS.....	50,900	50,900
34	COAST GUARD WEAPONS.....	25,295	25,295
35	GUN MOUNT MODS.....	77,003	77,003
36	LCS MODULE WEAPONS.....	2,776	2,776
37	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS.....	---	67,200
38	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS.....	15,753	13,753
	TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS.....	189,729	254,929
40	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	62,383	62,383
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY.....	3,209,262	3,265,285
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 TRIDENT II MODS Excess program growth	1,103,086	1,099,086 -4,000
3 TOMAHAWK Tomahawk unit cost growth MK 14 canister unit cost growth Program increase	186,905	219,105 -22,000 -2,000 56,200
4 AMRAAM Unit cost growth	204,697	197,263 -7,434
7 STANDARD MISSILE ECP cost growth	501,212	491,212 -10,000
9 JOINT AIR GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) Unit cost savings	26,200	21,922 -4,278
13 AERIAL TARGETS Other targets cost savings Excess support growth	137,484	136,684 -500 -300
16 ESSM Excess program growth	52,935	50,817 -2,118
18 HARM MODS Training equipment prior year carryover	178,213	176,252 -1,961
21 FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON Ground system updates excess growth	36,723	33,723 -3,000
24 MK-48 TORPEDO Excess program growth	44,537	43,037 -1,500
25 ASW TARGETS MK-39 targets unit cost growth	9,302	9,106 -196
26 MK-54 TORPEDO MODS Diminishing manufacturing sources excess growth	98,092	97,092 -1,000
29 TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT VLA kits excess growth F8100 contract delays	60,061	54,971 -3,000 -2,090
37 CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS Transfer from SMOSF	0	67,200 67,200
38 AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS Contract delay	15,753	13,753 -2,000

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY
AND MARINE CORPS

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS			
	PROC AMMO, NAVY		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS.....	91,659	91,659
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES.....	65,759	63,381
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION.....	8,152	8,152
4	PRACTICE BOMBS.....	41,873	41,873
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES.....	54,002	48,635
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES.....	57,034	56,609
7	JATOS.....	2,735	2,735
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION.....	19,220	17,620
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION.....	30,196	28,096
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION.....	39,009	46,209
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO.....	46,727	46,727
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION.....	9,806	9,806
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	2,900	2,900
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, NAVY.....		469,072	464,402

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	PROC AMMO, MARINE CORPS		
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.....	27,958	27,022
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES.....	14,758	13,188
18	60MM, ALL TYPES.....	992	992
20	120MM, ALL TYPES.....	16,757	10,427
21	GRENADES, ALL TYPES.....	972	---
22	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES.....	14,186	12,436
23	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES.....	68,656	64,906
24	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES.....	1,700	1,700
25	FUZE, ALL TYPES.....	26,088	20,640
27	AMMO MODERNIZATION.....	14,660	13,396
28	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	8,569	4,569
	TOTAL, PROC AMMO, MARINE CORPS.....	195,296	169,276
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS....	664,368	633,678
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
2 AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	65,759	63,381
APKWS product improvement and production engineering support growth		-2,378
5 CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	54,002	48,635
CCU-107 impulse CTG previously funded		-295
MK-122 rockets unit cost growth		-367
MK-123 and MK-124 underseat rocket motors contract delays		-615
Miscellaneous devices program growth		-4,090
6 AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	57,034	56,609
ALE-55 unit cost growth		-425
9 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	19,220	17,620
Renovation components previously funded		-1,600
10 INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	30,196	28,096
57MM MK 296 contract delay		-2,100
11 OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	39,009	46,209
Program increase		7,200
15 SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	27,958	27,022
Production engineering excess growth		-936
17 40 MM, ALL TYPES	14,758	13,188
MK281 unit cost growth		-1,570
20 120MM, ALL TYPES	16,757	10,427
Precision extended range munition developmental delay		-6,330
21 GRENADES, ALL TYPES	972	0
Excess production engineering		-972
22 ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	14,186	12,436
HX07 contract delay		-1,750
23 ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	68,656	64,906
HE M795 previously funded		-3,750
25 FUZE, ALL TYPES	26,088	20,640
Precision guided fuze unit cost savings		-4,320
Excess production engineering and ECP growth		-1,128
27 AMMO MODERNIZATION	14,660	13,396
Program underexecution		-1,264
28 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	8,569	4,569
Unobligated balances		-4,000

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY			
	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS		
1	OHIO REPLACEMENT SUBMARINE.....	773,138	773,138
	OTHER WARSHIPS		
2	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM.....	1,291,783	1,255,783
3	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY).....	1,370,784	1,370,784
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE.....	3,187,985	3,187,985
5	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP-CY).....	1,767,234	1,852,234
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAUL.....	1,743,220	1,699,120
7	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY).....	248,599	233,149
8	DDG 1000.....	271,756	271,756
9	DDG-51.....	3,211,292	3,614,792
11	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.....	1,125,625	1,563,692
TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS.....		14,218,278	15,049,295
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		
14	LPD-17.....	---	1,786,000
16	LHA REPLACEMENT	1,623,024	1,617,719
TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS.....		1,623,024	3,403,719

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM COSTS		
20	TAO FLEET OILER (AP-CY).....	73,079	73,079
22	MOORED TRAINING SHIP.....	624,527	624,527
25	OUTFITTING.....	666,158	626,158
26	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR.....	128,067	128,067
27	SERVICE CRAFT.....	65,192	65,192
28	LCAC SLEP.....	1,774	82,074
29	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP.....	21,363	21,363
30	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS.....	160,274	160,274
31	POLAR ICEBREAKERS (AP).....	---	150,000
	TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM... .	1,740,434	1,930,734
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY.....	18,354,874	21,156,886
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
2 CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1,291,783	1,255,783
Excess cost growth		-20,000
Reduction in change orders growth		-16,000
5 VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP-CY)	1,767,234	1,852,234
Program increase		85,000
6 CVN REFUELING OVERHAUL	1,743,220	1,699,120
C4ISR cost growth		-7,500
Integrated communication network cost growth		-5,000
UCLASS early to need		-26,700
Aviation equipment and support cost growth		-2,100
ROAR cost growth		-2,800
7 CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	248,599	233,149
Other costs growth		-7,500
Basic plans growth		-4,300
Electronics cost growth		-3,650
9 DDG-51	3,211,292	3,614,792
Program increase - only for DDG-51 Flight IIA ship partially funded in fiscal year 2016		433,000
Change orders reduction from two ships requested for fiscal year 2017		-29,500
11 LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,125,625	1,563,692
Basic construction excess growth		-21,000
Other electronics cost growth		-3,933
Other costs excess growth		-12,000
Program increase - one additional ship		475,000
14 LPD-17	0	1,786,000
Program increase - additional funding to support LPD 29		1,550,000
Realignment of fiscal year 2016 funds to support LPD 29		236,000
16 LHA REPLACEMENT	1,623,024	1,617,719
Excess change orders		-5,305
25 OUTFITTING	666,158	626,158
Outfitting and post delivery funds early to need		-40,000
28 LCAC SLEP	1,774	82,074
Program increase		80,300
31 POLAR ICEBREAKERS (AP)	0	150,000
Program increase - advance procurement for the polar icebreaker recapitalization project		150,000

DDG-51 FLIGHT IIA DESTROYERS

The Navy currently is procuring DDG-51 Flight IIA destroyers under a fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2017 multi-year procurement shipbuilding contract awarded in June 2013, as authorized by section 8010 of Public Law 113-6. Additionally, the Navy is addressing increasing ballistic and cruise missile threats through the development and acquisition of an Air and Missile Defense Radar, which is planned for integration on the DDG-51 class of ships through an engineering change proposal, resulting in a new Flight III configuration. However, a recent Government Accountability Office report (GAO 16-613) details concerns regarding a lack of suf-

ficient acquisition and limited detail design knowledge to support the Navy's current Flight III procurement strategy. Further concerns remain regarding the full costs of DDG-51 Flight III destroyers. Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy should award and complete the additional DDG-51 ship, fully funded in fiscal years 2016 and 2017, as an additional DDG-51 Flight IIA ship. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to expeditiously award this ship construction contract.

POLAR ICEBREAKER RECAPITALIZATION PROJECT

The Navy and the Coast Guard are collaborating to refine requirements and an acquisi-

tion strategy for procurement of an affordable polar icebreaker. This collaboration continues to refine program costs and requirements in an effort to award a detailed design and construction contract for the lead ship in fiscal year 2019. The agreement supports this effort and provides \$150,000,000 in advance procurement funding to buy long-lead time material for the program's initial ship. The Coast Guard is encouraged to budget for follow-on efforts.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY			
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		
3	SURFACE POWER EQUIPMENT.....	15,514	15,514
4	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED).....	40,132	35,933
	GENERATORS		
5	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E.....	29,974	27,447
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		
6	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT.....	63,942	62,971
	PERISCOPES		
7	SUB PERISCOPES AND IMAGING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM..	136,421	133,963
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
9	DDG MOD.....	367,766	364,614
10	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT.....	14,743	13,752
11	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD.....	2,140	2,140
12	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE.....	24,939	22,768
14	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT.....	20,191	16,510
15	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	8,995	8,995
16	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	66,838	63,908
17	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	54,823	43,819
18	SUBMARINE BATTERIES.....	23,359	22,459
19	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	40,321	33,992
20	DOG-1000 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	33,404	33,404
21	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP.....	15,836	14,571
22	DSSP EQUIPMENT.....	806	806
23	CRUISER MODERNIZATION.....	---	248,820
24	LCAC.....	3,090	3,090
25	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS.....	24,350	24,350
26	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	88,719	64,054

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
27	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS.....	2,873	2,873
28	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	6,043	4,543
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
30	REACTOR COMPONENTS.....	342,158	342,158
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
31	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT.....	8,973	8,176
	SMALL BOATS		
32	STANDARD BOATS.....	43,684	59,033
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		
34	OPERATING FORCES IPE.....	75,421	71,921
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		
35	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS.....	172,718	172,718
36	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT.....	27,840	15,670
37	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES.....	57,146	29,724
38	LCS ASW MISSION MODULES.....	31,952	---
39	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES.....	22,466	21,064
	LOGISTICS SUPPORT		
41	LSD MIDLIFE.....	10,813	10,813
	TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	1,878,390	1,996,573
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		
	SHIP SONARS		
42	SPQ-9B RADAR.....	14,363	10,376
43	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM.....	90,029	87,824
45	SSN ACOUSTICS EQUIPMENT.....	248,765	268,765
46	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	7,163	7,163

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
48	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM.....	21,291	21,291
49	SSTD.....	6,893	6,893
50	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.....	145,701	145,701
51	SURTASS.....	36,136	33,743
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT		
53	AN/SLQ-32.....	274,892	244,001
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT		
54	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT.....	170,733	169,021
55	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS).....	958	764
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
57	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY.....	22,034	17,965
59	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS).....	12,336	12,336
60	ATDLS.....	30,105	27,921
61	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS).....	4,556	4,556
62	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT.....	56,675	35,444
63	SHALLOW WATER MCM.....	8,875	8,875
64	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE).....	12,752	7,701
65	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV.....	4,577	4,577
66	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP.....	8,972	8,972
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
69	ASHORE ATC EQUIPMENT.....	75,068	71,892
70	AFLOAT ATC EQUIPMENT.....	33,484	32,011
76	ID SYSTEMS.....	22,177	22,177
77	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS.....	14,273	13,910
80	TACTICAL/MOBILE C41 SYSTEMS.....	27,927	24,178

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
81	DCGS-N.....	12,676	11,610
82	CANES.....	212,030	207,730
83	RADIAC.....	8,092	8,092
84	CANES-INTELL.....	36,013	35,313
85	GPETE.....	6,428	6,428
87	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY.....	8,376	8,376
88	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION.....	3,971	3,971
89	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	58,721	47,664
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
90	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS.....	17,366	10,383
91	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION.....	102,479	101,087
92	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M.....	10,403	10,403
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS		
93	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT.....	34,151	31,459
94	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT.....	64,529	62,879
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
95	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.....	14,414	14,414
96	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT).....	38,365	33,992
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		
97	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.....	4,156	4,156
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
99	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP).....	85,694	93,205
100	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM.....	920	920
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
101	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP.....	21,098	21,098
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
102	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT.....	32,291	32,291
	TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....	2,122,908	2,033,528

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
SONOBOOYS			
103 SONOBOOYS - ALL TYPES.....	162,588	158,588	
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
104 WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	58,116	58,116	
105 AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	120,324	115,551	
106 METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT.....	29,253	29,253	
107 OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT (DCRS/DPL).....	632	632	
108 AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	29,097	27,542	
109 AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	39,099	29,528	
TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	439,109		419,210
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT			
110 SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT.....	6,191	6,191	
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT			
111 SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	320,446	307,446	
112 TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	71,046	67,062	
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
113 STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP.....	215,138	215,138	
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
114 SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	130,715	130,715	
115 ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	26,431	26,431	
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
116 EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP.....	11,821	11,821	
117 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	6,243	6,243	
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE			
118 SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS.....	48,020	46,746	
120 SURFACE TRAINING EQUIPMENT.....	97,514	87,714	
TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	933,565		905,507

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>		
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
121 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES.....	8,853	8,853
122 GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS.....	4,928	4,794
123 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP.....	18,527	18,527
124 FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT.....	13,569	13,569
125 TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	14,917	13,824
126 AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT.....	7,676	7,676
127 POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT.....	2,321	2,321
128 ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION.....	12,459	8,436
129 PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES.....	1,095	1,095
TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	84,345	79,095
<hr/>		
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
131 SUPPLY EQUIPMENT.....	16,023	16,023
133 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	5,115	5,115
134 SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS.....	295,471	295,471
TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	316,609	316,609

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
TRAINING DEVICES			
136 TRAINING AND EDUCATION EQUIPMENT.....	9,504	6,347	
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
137 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	37,180	29,980	
139 MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	4,128	11,959	
141 NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	1,925	1,925	
142 OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	4,777	4,777	
143 C4ISR EQUIPMENT.....	9,073	9,073	
144 ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	21,107	19,439	
145 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	100,906	100,906	
146 ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.....	67,544	66,200	
150 NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE.....	98,216	98,216	
TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	354,360	348,822	
151 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	199,660	199,660	
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	9,915	9,915	
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY.....	6,338,861	6,308,919	
	=====	=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
4 HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED) Installation early to need	40,132	35,933 -4,199
5 SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E Ship control systems unit cost growth Excess installation	29,974	27,447 -2,180 -347
6 OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT Surface AN/WSN-9 excess installation	63,942	62,971 -971
8 SUB PERISCOPES, IMAGING AND SUPT EQUIP PROG ISIS technical insertion NRE growth	136,421	133,963 -2,458
9 DDG MOD Wireless communications installation early to need AWS upgrade kit cost growth VLS upgrades engineering services excess growth	367,766	364,614 -796 -1,500 -856
10 FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT EEBD prior year carryover Magazine sprinkling improvement prior year carryover Firefighter access kits early to need	14,743	13,752 -262 -255 -474
12 LHA/LHD MIDLIFE Brushless generator for PMP installation early to need HESC engineering services excess growth	24,939	22,768 -1,000 -1,171
14 POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT HF062 lightering systems unit cost growth HF031 pollution control equipment field changes (expeditionary warfare) previously funded	20,191	16,510 -850 -2,831
16 VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Ship control system modernization backfit excess installation	66,838	63,908 -2,930
17 LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT MT-30 gas turbine engine unit cost growth Prior year carryover	54,823	43,819 -10,000 -1,004
18 SUBMARINE BATTERIES OHIO class main storage battery previously funded	23,359	22,459 -900
19 LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT HM&E electrical upgrades kits unit cost growth Installation funding early to need due to contract delays	40,321	33,992 -1,463 -4,866
21 STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP Equipment HM&E SWS/SS alteration previously funded	15,836	14,571 -1,265
23 CG MODERNIZATION Transfer from SMOSF	0	248,820 248,820

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
26 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	88,719	64,054
Propellers and shafts unit cost growth		-849
Training test equipment unjustified request		-3,800
LHD/LHA davits excess installation		-790
JSF support prior year carryover		-838
Machinery plant upgrades installation early to need		-6,135
LSD boat davit installation early to need		-2,153
PCMS excess to need		-10,100
28 SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	6,043	4,543
Prior year carryover		-1,500
31 DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	8,973	8,176
Contaminated water diving equipment unit cost growth		-213
Submarine support system unit cost growth		-584
32 STANDARD BOATS	43,684	59,033
Prior year carryover		-1,051
Program increase		16,400
34 OPERATING FORCES IPE	75,421	71,921
Shipyard capital investment program excess growth		-3,500
36 LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	27,840	15,670
Mission bay training devices excess growth		-12,170
37 LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	57,146	29,724
ALMDS unit cost growth		-4,822
Unmanned surface sweep system early to need		-11,800
Knifefish early to need		-10,800
38 LCS ASW MISSION MODULES	31,952	0
ASW mission module early to need		-31,952
39 LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	22,466	21,064
MK-46 gun weapons system prior year contract savings		-1,402
42 SPQ-9B RADAR	14,363	10,376
AN/SPQ-9B engineering change proposals contract delays		-3,636
AN/SPQ-9B radar FMP kit cost growth		-351
43 AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	90,029	87,824
Flight I/II upgrade installation funding early to need		-2,205
45 SSN ACOUSTIC EQUIPMENT	248,765	268,765
Program increase		20,000
51 SURTASS	36,136	33,743
Integrated common processor kit cost growth		-2,393
53 AN/SLQ-32	274,892	244,001
Block 3 excess support		-4,270
Block 3T installation prior year carryover		-2,981
Block 2 unit cost growth		-2,640
Block 3 concurrency		-21,000
54 SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	170,733	169,021
Increment F kit cost growth		-1,712

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
55 AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS) AIS procurement unit cost growth	958	764 -194
57 COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY SDP processor backfits prior year carryover Common array block antenna prior year carryover	22,034	17,965 -755 -3,314
60 ATDLS Installation funding early to need	30,105	27,921 -2,184
62 MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT SSQ-94 trainer excess growth MSF measurement system upgrade excess growth Knifefish early to need Unmanned influence sweep system trainers early to need	56,675	35,444 -916 -4,518 -11,807 -3,990
64 NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) NAWWAR kit cost growth	12,752	7,701 -5,051
69 ASHORE ATC EQUIPMENT AN/FPN-63 par tech refresh kit cost growth	75,068	71,892 -3,176
70 AFLOAT ATC EQUIPMENT Production engineering excess growth	33,484	32,011 -1,473
77 NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS JMPS-M flight planning seat unit cost growth	14,273	13,910 -363
80 TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS MTOC kit cost growth Excess installation	27,927	24,178 -2,986 -763
81 DCGS-N DCGS-N tech refresh kit cost growth Excess installation	12,676	11,610 -526 -540
82 CANES Installation funding early to need	212,030	207,730 -4,300
84 CANES-INTELL Installation funding early to need	36,013	35,313 -700
89 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION Calibration standards unit cost growth DBR engineering change proposals excess growth AN/SPS-48G radar excess installation	58,721	47,664 -1,798 -5,259 -4,000
90 SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS DMR IW and MUOS waveforms upgrade kits previously funded Installation funding early to need	17,366	10,383 -5,869 -1,114
91 SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION Shore tactical assured command and control kit cost growth	102,479	101,087 -1,392
93 SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT TACAMO unit cost growth	34,151	31,459 -2,692

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
94 SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT Reliability improvements unit cost growth	64,529	62,879 -1,650
96 NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) Afloat sub kit cost growth Ashore excess installation	38,365	33,992 -1,319 -3,054
99 INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) Key management - ashore previously funded Program increase	85,694	93,205 -2,489 10,000
103 SONOBOOYS - ALL TYPES Unit cost growth	162,588	158,588 -4,000
105 AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Lighting engineering change proposals excess growth BIK I/ISNS kits excess installation SRQ(KU)-4 kit cost growth	120,324	115,551 -1,118 -751 -2,904
108 AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES Modifications unjustified growth	29,097	27,542 -1,555
109 AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT EPUK HW/SW excess growth JHMCS night vision unit cost growth Program delay	39,099	29,528 -861 -1,172 -7,538
111 SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AEGIS training and readiness center upgrade early to need NATO seasparrrow previously funded	320,446	307,446 -8,000 -5,000
112 TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TTWCS product improvement previously funded	71,046	67,062 -3,984
118 SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS Navigation training unjustified growth	48,020	46,746 -1,274
120 SURFACE TRAINING EQUIPMENT Unjustified growth BFFT ship sets previously funded	97,514	87,714 -5,000 -4,800
122 GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS Truck unit cost growth	4,928	4,794 -134
125 TACTICAL VEHICLES JLTV unit cost savings	14,917	13,824 -1,093
128 ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION Prior year carryover	12,459	8,436 -4,023
136 TRAINING AND EDUCATION EQUIPMENT Lifecycle management unit cost growth Ballistic missile defense unit cost growth	9,504	6,347 -363 -2,794
137 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT CNIC building control systems unjustified request	37,180	29,980 -7,200

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
139 MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Program increase - expeditionary medical facilities	4,128	11,959 7,831
144 ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Master clock systems unit cost growth Integrated sub bottom profiler unit cost growth	21,107	19,439 -879 -789
146 ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY Telephony replacement excess installation	67,544	66,200 -1,344

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1787

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS			
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES			
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES			
1	AAV7A1 PIP.....	73,785	69,785
2	LAV PIP.....	53,423	48,219
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS			
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	3,360	3,360
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER.....	3,318	3,318
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM.....	33,725	31,169
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION.....	8,181	7,191
OTHER SUPPORT			
7	MODIFICATION KITS.....	15,250	15,250
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	1,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES.....			191,042
179,292			
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT			
GUIDED MISSILES			
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE.....	9,170	9,170
10	JAVELIN.....	1,009	1,009
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW.....	24,666	22,918
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H).....	17,080	17,080
TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT.....			51,925
50,177			

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
15	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS.....	47,312	52,487
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
16	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT.....	16,469	14,469
	COMMAND AND CONTROL		
19	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC).....	7,433	6,839
20	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS.....	15,917	15,917
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
21	RADAR SYSTEMS.....	17,772	17,772
22	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR.....	123,758	122,693
23	RQ-21 UAS.....	80,217	78,217
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
24	GCSS-MC.....	1,089	1,089
25	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	13,258	13,258
26	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	56,379	51,213
29	RQ-11 UAV.....	1,976	1,976
31	DCGS-MC.....	1,149	1,149
32	UAS PAYLOADS.....	2,971	2,971
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
34	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN).....	76,302	68,083
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
35	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES.....	41,802	38,802
36	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS.....	90,924	90,924
37	RADIO SYSTEMS.....	43,714	43,714
38	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	66,383	62,383
39	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT.....	30,229	30,229
	TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....	735,054	714,185
	SUPPORT VEHICLES		
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES		
41	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES.....	88,312	84,812

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
43	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS.....	13,292	13,292
45	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE.....	113,230	104,230
46	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS.....	2,691	2,691
	TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES.....	217,525	205,025
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
48	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT.....	18	---
50	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS.....	78	---
51	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED.....	17,973	17,973
52	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	7,371	7,371
53	EOD SYSTEMS.....	14,021	14,021
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
54	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	31,523	24,582
	GENERAL PROPERTY		
58	TRAINING DEVICES.....	33,658	33,658
60	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT.....	21,315	20,278
61	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEHICLE (ITV).....	9,654	9,282
	OTHER SUPPORT		
62	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION.....	6,026	6,026
	TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT.....	141,637	133,191
64	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	22,848	22,848
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	2,738	2,738
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS.....	1,362,769	1,307,456
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 AAV7A1 PIP Excess program growth	73,785	69,785 -4,000
2 LAV PIP Unit cost savings Program management support excess growth Training devices prior year carryover	53,423	48,219 -3,024 -964 -1,216
5 HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM Unit cost growth	33,725	31,169 -2,556
6 WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION Unjustified growth	8,181	7,191 -990
8 WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM Program increase	0	1,000 1,000
11 FOLLOW ON TO SMAW Unjustified growth	24,666	22,918 -1,748
15 COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS Unit cost growth Program increase	47,312	52,487 -825 6,000
16 REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT Lack of budget justification materials	16,469	14,469 -2,000
19 ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) Unjustified growth	7,433	6,839 -594
22 GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR Excess engineering change orders	123,758	122,693 -1,065
23 RQ-21 UAS Inconsistent budget justification	80,217	78,217 -2,000
26 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Software enhancement unjustified growth	56,379	51,213 -5,166
34 NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN) Unjustified growth	76,302	68,083 -8,219
35 COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES Prior year carryover	41,802	38,802 -3,000
38 COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS Program execution	66,383	62,383 -4,000
41 COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES Excess program growth	88,312	84,812 -3,500
45 JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE Test support unjustified growth	113,230	104,230 -9,000

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
48 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT Unjustified request	18	0 -18
50 TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS Unjustified request	78	0 -78
54 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT Collateral equipment early to need	31,523	24,582 -6,941
60 FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT Garrison mobile engineering equipment excess growth	21,315	20,278 -1,037
61 FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEHICLE (ITV) Testing and FDT excess growth	9,654	9,282 -372

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1793

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE			
COMBAT AIRCRAFT			
TACTICAL FORCES			
1	F-35.....	4,401,894	4,602,894
2	F-35 (AP-CY).....	404,500	404,500

	TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT.....	4,806,394	5,007,394
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT			
OTHER AIRLIFT			
3	KC-46A TANKER.....	2,884,591	2,567,191
4	C-130J.....	145,655	305,655
6	HC-130J.....	317,576	317,576
7	HC-130J.....	20,000	20,000
8	MC-130J.....	548,358	499,358
9	MC-130J (AP).....	50,000	50,000

	TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT.....	3,966,180	3,759,780
OTHER AIRCRAFT			
HELICOPTERS			
10	UH-1N REPLACEMENT.....	18,337	93,337
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT			
12	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C.....	2,637	10,337
OTHER AIRCRAFT			
13	TARGET DRONES.....	114,656	114,656
14	RQ-4 UAV.....	12,966	7,217
15	MQ-9.....	122,522	122,522
15X	COMPASS CALL.....	---	103,000

	TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT.....	271,118	451,069

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT			
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT			
16	B-2A.....	46,729	46,729
17	B-1B.....	116,319	116,319
18	B-52.....	109,020	109,020
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT			
20	A-10.....	1,289	1,289
21	F-15.....	105,685	145,405
22	F-16.....	97,331	113,231
23	F-22A.....	163,008	146,008
24	F-35 MODIFICATIONS.....	175,811	115,811
25	INCREMENT 3.2b.....	76,410	76,410
26	INCREMENT 3.2b (AP-CY).....	2,000	2,000
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT			
27	C-5.....	24,192	24,192
29	C-17A.....	21,555	17,455
30	C-21.....	5,439	439
31	C-32A.....	35,235	30,235
32	C-37A.....	5,004	5,004
TRAINER AIRCRAFT			
33	GLIDER MODS.....	394	394
34	T6.....	12,765	12,765
35	T-1.....	25,073	13,373
36	T-38.....	45,090	33,590

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
OTHER AIRCRAFT			
37	U-2 MODS.....	36,074	36,074
38	KC-10A (ATCA).....	4,570	4,570
39	C-12.....	1,995	1,995
40	VC-25A MOD.....	102,670	102,670
41	C-40.....	13,984	13,984
42	C-130.....	9,168	106,668
43	C130J MODS.....	89,424	89,424
44	C-135.....	64,161	64,161
45	COMPASS CALL MODS.....	130,257	130,257
46	RC-135.....	211,438	211,438
47	E-3.....	82,786	82,786
48	E-4.....	53,348	53,348
49	E-8.....	6,244	25,944
50	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM.....	223,427	223,427
51	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS.....	4,673	4,673
52	H-1.....	9,007	9,007
54	H-60.....	91,357	86,357
55	RQ-4 UAV MODS.....	32,045	32,045
56	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS.....	30,767	30,767
57	OTHER AIRCRAFT.....	33,886	33,886
59	MQ-9 MODS.....	141,929	149,929
60	CV-22 MODS.....	63,395	63,395
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT.....		2,504,954	2,566,474

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
61	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS.....	686,491	834,691
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
62	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP.....	121,935	48,935
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		
63	B-2A.....	154	154
64	B-2A.....	43,330	43,330
65	B-52.....	28,125	28,125
66	C-17A.....	23,559	83,859
69	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT.....	2,980	2,980
70	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT.....	15,155	28,190
71	F-22A.....	48,505	48,505
72	RQ-4 POST PRODUCTION CHARGES.....	99	99
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		
75	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS.....	14,126	14,126
	WAR CONSUMABLES		
76	WAR CONSUMABLES.....	120,036	120,036
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		
77	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES.....	1,252,824	1,198,924
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES....	1,670,828	1,617,263
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	16,952	16,952
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....	13,922,917	14,253,623
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [in thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 F-35 Program increase - five aircraft Program efficiencies Prior year carryover	4,401,894	4,602,894 495,000 -96,000 -198,000
3 KC-46 Program excess Air Force requested transfer to line 61 for initial spares	2,884,591	2,567,191 -167,200 -150,200
4 C-130J Program increase - two additional aircraft for Air National Guard	145,655	305,655 160,000
8 MC-130J Excess due to multiyear savings	548,358	499,358 -49,000
10 UH-1N REPLACEMENT Program increase	18,337	93,337 75,000
12 CIVIL AIR PATROL (CAP) AIRCRAFT Program increase	2,637	10,337 7,700
14 RQ-4 Excess other production support	12,966	7,217 -5,749
15X COMPASS CALL Program increase	0	103,000 103,000
21 F-15 Cost efficiencies Program increase - F-15E AESA radars	105,685	145,405 -5,280 45,000
22 F-16 Program increase - fully fund AESA radar upgrades	97,331	113,231 15,900
23 F-22A RAMMP kits unit cost growth	163,008	146,008 -17,000
24 F-35 MODIFICATIONS Prior year carryover	175,811	115,811 -60,000
29 C-17A Program management growth	21,555	17,455 -4,100
30 C-21 Unobligated balances	5,439	439 -5,000
31 C-32 Prior year carryover	35,235	30,235 -5,000
35 T-1 Production schedule slip	25,073	13,373 -11,700
36 T-38 Pacer Classic installs ahead of need	45,090	33,590 -11,500

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
42 C-130	9,168	106,668
Program increase - eight-blade propeller upgrade		16,000
Program increase - electronic propeller control system		13,500
Program increase - in-flight propeller balancing system		1,500
Program increase - engine enhancement program		41,500
Program increase - C-130H modernization		25,000
49 E-8	6,244	25,944
Program increase - PME-DMS		19,700
54 H-60	91,357	86,357
Gun replacement		-5,000
59 MQ-9 MODS	141,929	149,929
Unjustified request		-12,000
Program increase - wide-area sensors		20,000
61 INITIAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	686,491	834,691
MQ-9 spares underexecution		-13,000
Air Force requested transfer from line 3 for KC-46 initial spares		150,200
Air Force requested transfer from line 62 for initial spares to support C-17 base conversions		11,000
62 AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	121,935	48,935
Air Force requested transfer to lines 61 and 66 to support C-17 base conversions		-73,000
66 C-17 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	23,559	83,859
Prior year carryover		-1,700
Air Force requested transfer from line 62 for peculiar support equipment to support C-17 base conversions		20,000
Air Force requested transfer from line 62 for common support equipment to support C-17 base conversions		42,000
70 F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	15,155	28,190
Program increase - F-16 mission training center simulators		24,800
Excess production line shutdown costs		-11,765
77 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	1,252,824	1,198,924
Prior year carryover for unclassified programs		-34,000
Transfer to RDTE,AF line 999 for classified programs		-19,900

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE			
	BALLISTIC MISSILES		
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC		
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC.....	70,247	50,247
	OTHER MISSILES		
	TACTICAL		
2	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM).....	431,645	431,645
3	LONG RANGE ANTI-SHIP MISSILE (LRASMO).....	59,511	59,511
4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X).....	127,438	127,438
5	AMRAAM.....	350,144	337,844
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE.....	33,955	33,955
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB.....	92,361	92,361
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		
8	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POLLUTION PREVENTION.....	977	977
	TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES.....	1,096,031	1,083,731
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		
	CLASS IV		
9	ICBM FUZE MOD.....	17,095	17,095
10	MM III MODIFICATIONS.....	68,692	68,692
11	AGM-65D MAVERICK.....	282	282
13	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE.....	21,762	21,762
14	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB.....	15,349	15,349
	TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES.....	123,180	123,180
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
15	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS.....	81,607	70,607
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		
30	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS.....	46,125	46,125
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	1,009,431	974,231
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....	2,426,621	2,348,121
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT-BALLISTIC TERP program delays	70,247	50,247 -20,000
5	AMRAAM Pricing adjustment	350,144	337,844 -12,300
15	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS Unjustified growth	81,607	70,607 -11,000
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	1,009,431	974,231 -35,200

March 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1803

SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE			
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
1	ADVANCED EHF.....	645,569	645,569
2	AF SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM.....	42,375	37,375
3	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS.....	26,984	26,984
4	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS.....	88,963	88,963
5	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES.....	86,272	48,772
6	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT.....	34,059	34,059
7	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE).....	2,169	2,169
8	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC).....	46,708	31,708
9	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE).....	13,171	10,171
10	MILSATCOM.....	41,799	41,799
11	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH INFRASTRUCTURE (SPACE) ..	768,586	716,586
12	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (SPACE).....	737,853	536,853
13	SBIR HIGH (SPACE).....	362,504	357,504
14	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM SPACE.....	4,395	4,395
15	SPACE MODS SPACE.....	8,642	8,642
16	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE.....	123,088	121,088
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
17	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS.....	22,606	20,606
TOTAL, SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....		3,055,743	2,733,243
=====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
2	AIR FORCE SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK Unjustified request	42,375	37,375 -5,000
5	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES Prior year carryover COMSATCOM Pathfinder 3 - transfer to RDTE,AF line 82	86,272	48,772 -7,500 -30,000
8	SPACEBORNE EQUIPMENT Unjustified request	46,708	31,708 -15,000
9	GLOBAL POSITIONING SATELLITES SPACE AND CONTROL Unjustified support services and launch and checkout growth	13,171	10,171 -3,000
11	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY Change to acquisition strategy	768,586	716,586 -52,000
12	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE Change to acquisition strategy	737,853	536,853 -201,000
13	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEMS Prior year carryover	362,504	357,504 -5,000
16	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM Unjustified request	123,088	121,088 -2,000
17	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS Unjustified request	22,606	20,606 -2,000

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR
FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE			
1	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		
1	ROCKETS.....	18,734	18,734
2	CARTRIDGES.....	220,237	224,237
	BOMBS		
3	PRACTICE BOMBS.....	97,106	97,106
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS.....	581,561	501,561
5	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP).....	3,600	3,600
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION.....	303,988	291,488
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B		
7	CAD/PAD.....	38,890	38,890
8	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD).....	5,714	5,714
9	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	740	740
10	MODIFICATIONS.....	573	573
11	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000.....	5,156	5,156
	FUZES		
12	FLARES.....	134,709	134,709
13	FUZES.....	229,252	229,252
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE.....		1,640,260	1,551,760
	WEAPONS		
14	SMALL ARMS.....	37,459	37,459
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE.....		1,677,719	1,589,219
=====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final bill
2 CARTRIDGES	220,237	224,237
PGU-48 unit cost		-2,000
Program increase - PGU-27		6,000
4 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	581,561	501,561
BLU-134 ahead of need		-80,000
6 JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION (JDAM)	303,988	291,488
Unit cost pricing adjustment		-12,500

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLE.....	14,437	11,437
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES		
2	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE.....	24,812	16,812
3	CAP VEHICLES.....	984	1,684
4	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (CARGO).....	11,191	7,191
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	5,361	5,361
6	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SPECIAL).....	4,623	4,623
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES.....	12,451	12,451
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
8	ITEMS LESS THAT \$5,000,000.....	18,114	18,114
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING EQUIP.....	2,310	2,310
10	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M.....	46,868	46,868
	TOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT.....	141,151	126,851
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)		
12	COMSEC EQUIPMENT.....	72,359	81,859
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS		
14	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT.....	6,982	6,982
15	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP.....	30,504	30,504
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS		
16	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING.....	55,803	49,403
17	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM.....	2,673	2,673
18	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM - FIXED.....	5,677	5,677
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO.....	1,163	1,163
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST.....	21,667	21,667
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL.....	39,803	39,803
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX.....	24,618	24,618
23	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS.....	15,868	15,868
25	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN AND ANALY NETWORK (ISPLAN).....	9,331	9,331

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
26	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.....	41,779	50,679
27	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEM.....	15,729	15,729
28	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL.....	9,814	9,814
29	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM.....	99,460	99,460
30	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES.....	34,850	34,850
31	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N.....	198,925	198,925
32	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE (WAS).....	6,943	6,943
33	C3 COUNTERMEASURES.....	19,580	14,580
34	GCSS-AF FOS.....	1,743	1,743
36	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS.....	9,659	9,659
37	AIR AND SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYSTEM.....	15,474	15,474
38	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC).....	30,623	8,180
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
39	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS.....	40,043	40,043
40	AFNET.....	146,897	131,897
41	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE).....	5,182	5,182
42	USCENTCOM.....	13,418	13,418

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
52	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT.....	109,836	109,836
53	RADIO EQUIPMENT.....	16,266	16,266
54	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT.....	7,449	7,449
55	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE.....	109,215	88,215
	MODIFICATIONS		
56	COMM ELECT MODS.....	65,700	65,700
	TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP....	1,285,033	1,233,590
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP		
58	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (SAFETY).....	54,416	46,416
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ		
59	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING.....	7,344	7,344
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
60	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT.....	6,852	6,852
63	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT.....	8,146	23,146
64	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (BASE SUPPORT).....	28,427	28,427
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
66	DARP RC135.....	25,287	25,287
67	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS.....	169,201	169,201
69	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM.....	576,710	576,710
	TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP....	876,383	883,383
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		
72	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	15,784	15,784
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	15,119,705	15,508,616
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE.....	17,438,056	17,768,224
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final bill
1 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES Unjustified growth	14,437	11,437 -3,000
2 MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES Unobligated balances	24,812	16,812 -8,000
3 CIVIL AIR PATROL VEHICLES Program increase	984	1,684 700
4 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (CARGO/UTILITY) Unjustified growth	11,191	7,191 -4,000
12 COMSEC EQUIPMENT Program increase - cybersecurity upgrades	72,359	81,859 9,500
16 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYSTEMS RAPCON schedule slip	55,803	49,403 -6,400
26 GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY Program increase - cybersecurity training	41,779	50,679 8,900
33 C3 COUNTERMEASURES Unjustified increase	19,580	14,580 -5,000
38 AOC 10.2 Fielding	30,623	8,180 -22,443
40 AFNET Unobligated balances	146,897	131,897 -15,000
55 BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE Unobligated balances	109,215	88,215 -21,000
58 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (SAFETY & RESCUE) LSS program delays	54,416	46,416 -8,000
63 MOBILITY EQUIPMENT Program increase Program increase - other base maintenance and support equipment	8,146	23,146 10,000 5,000
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	15,119,705	15,508,616 388,911

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA		
1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M.....	2,964	2,964
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA		
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	92	---
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA		
3	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION.....	14,232	14,232
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
6	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY.....	21,347	21,347
7	TELEPORT PROGRAM.....	50,597	50,597
8	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M.....	10,420	10,420
9	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES).....	1,634	1,634
10	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK.....	87,235	87,235
11	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE.....	4,528	4,528
12	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY.....	36,846	36,846
13	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE.....	599,391	599,391
15	JOINT REGIONAL SECURITY STOCKS (JRSS).....	150,221	150,221
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA		
17	MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	2,055	2,055
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT		
18	A - WEAPON SYSTEM COST.....	8,060	8,060
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA		
19	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS.....	288	288
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	1,057	1,057
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		
21	VEHICLES.....	200	200
22	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	6,437	6,437

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MDA		
23	THAAD SYSTEM.....	369,608	415,504
24	AEGIS BMD.....	463,801	513,801
25	BMDS AN/TPY-2 RADARS.....	5,503	5,503
26	ARROW WEAPON SYSTEM.....	---	120,000
27	DAVID'S SLING WEAPON SYSTEM.....	---	150,000
28	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III.....	57,493	57,493
29	IRON DOME SYSTEM.....	42,000	62,000
30	AEGIS BMD HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE.....	50,098	50,098
30X	REDESIGNED KILL VEHICLE--AP.....	---	50,000
<hr/>			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA		
36	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP).....	4,399	4,399
<hr/>			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		
37	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD.....	29,211	29,211
<hr/>			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		
38	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS.....	7,988	7,988
<hr/>			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		
40	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS.....	24,979	24,979
<hr/>			
	TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT.....	2,052,684	2,488,488
<hr/>			
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
42	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT.....	150,396	150,396
43	UNMANNED ISR.....	21,190	21,190
45	NON-STANDARD AVIATION.....	4,905	4,905
46	SOF U-28.....	3,970	3,970
47	MH-47 CHINOOK.....	25,022	25,022
49	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION.....	19,008	19,008
51	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE.....	10,598	10,598
53	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE.....	213,122	213,122
54	AC/MC-130J.....	73,548	60,498
55	C-130 MODIFICATIONS.....	32,970	41,020

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	SHIPBUILDING		
56	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS.....	37,098	37,098
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
57	SOF ORDNANCE ITEMS UNDER \$5,000,000.....	105,267	105,267
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
58	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS.....	79,963	79,963
59	DCGS-SOF.....	13,432	13,432
60	OTHER ITEMS UNDER \$5,000,000.....	66,436	66,436
61	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS.....	55,820	55,820
62	SPECIAL PROGRAMS.....	107,432	107,432
63	TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	67,849	67,849
64	WARRIOR SYSTEMS UNDER \$5,000,000.....	245,781	245,781
65	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS.....	19,566	19,566
66	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.....	3,437	3,437
67	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE.....	17,299	17,299
69	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS.....	219,945	180,245
	TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.....	1,594,054	1,549,354
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		
70	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS.....	148,203	148,203
71	CB PROTECTION AND HAZARD MITIGATION.....	161,113	161,113
	TOTAL, CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE.....	309,316	309,316
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	568,864	533,864
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	4,524,918	4,881,022
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
2 MAJOR EQUIPMENT	92	0
Ahead of need		-92
23 THAAD SYSTEM	369,608	415,504
Training previously funded		-4,104
Program increase - obsolescence upgrades		50,000
24 AEGIS BMD	463,801	513,801
Program increase - obsolescence upgrades		50,000
26 ARROW WEAPON SYSTEM	0	120,000
Program increase for co-production		120,000
27 DAVID'S SLING WEAPON SYSTEM	0	150,000
Program increase for co-production		150,000
29 IRON DOME SYSTEM	42,000	62,000
Program increase for co-production		20,000
30X REDESIGNED KILL VEHICLE (AP)	0	50,000
Program increase - RKV long lead materials only		50,000
54 AC/MC-130J	73,548	60,498
Precision Strike Package - SOCOM requested transfer to line 55		-13,050
55 C-130 MODIFICATIONS	32,970	41,020
Precision Strike Package - SOCOM requested transfer from line 54		13,050
Program delays		-5,000
64 SOF WARRIOR SYSTEMS UNDER \$5M	245,781	245,781
SCAMPI - level funding profile		-4,000
Program increase - weapons accessories		4,000
69 SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	219,945	180,245
Classified adjustment		-44,700
Program increase - rotary wing ammunition		5,000
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	568,864	533,864
Classified adjustment		-35,000

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	44,065	64,065
Program increase		20,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	44,065	64,065

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT,
TEST AND EVALUATION

The agreement provides \$72,301,587,000 in Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation. The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>		
RECAPITULATION		
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY.....	7,515,399	8,332,965
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY.....	17,276,301	17,214,530
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE.	28,112,251	27,788,548
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	18,308,826	18,778,550
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE.....	178,994	186,994
GRAND TOTAL, RDT&E.....	71,391,771	72,301,587
<hr/>		

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE FOR ACQUISITION ACCOUNTS

The Secretary of Defense is directed to continue to follow the reprogramming guidance as specified in the report accompanying the House version of the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2008 (House Report 110-279). Specifically, the dollar threshold for reprogramming funds shall remain at \$20,000,000 for procurement and \$10,000,000 for research, development, test and evaluation.

Also, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is directed to continue to provide the congressional defense committees quarterly, spreadsheet-based DD Form 1416 reports for Service and defense-wide accounts in titles III and IV of this Act. Reports for titles III and IV shall comply with the guidance specified in the explanatory statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006. The Department shall continue to follow the limitation that prior approval reprogrammings are set at either the specified dollar threshold or

20 percent of the procurement or research, development, test and evaluation line, whichever is less. These thresholds are cumulative from the base for reprogramming value as modified by any adjustments. Therefore, if the combined value of transfers into or out of a procurement (P-1) or research, development, test and evaluation (R-1) line exceeds the identified threshold, the Secretary of Defense must submit a prior approval reprogramming to the congressional defense committees. In addition, guidelines on the application of prior approval reprogramming procedures for congressional special interest items are established elsewhere in this statement.

FUNDING INCREASES

The funding increases outlined in these tables shall be provided only for the specific purposes indicated in the tables.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrase "only for"

or "only to" in the explanatory statement are congressional special interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount as specifically addressed in the explanatory statement.

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW-ON MODERNIZATION

The Joint Strike Fighter Program Executive Officer is directed to comply with the reporting requirement included under the heading "Joint Strike Fighter Follow-on Modernization" in Senate Report 114-263. The Secretary of Defense is not required to comply with the reporting requirement included under the heading "Joint Strike Fighter Follow-on Development" in House Report 114-577.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
<hr/>			
	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY		
	BASIC RESEARCH		
1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.....	12,381	12,381
2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	253,116	293,116
3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	69,166	69,166
4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS.....	94,280	112,280
	TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH.....	428,943	486,943
	APPLIED RESEARCH		
5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY.....	31,533	82,533
6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY.....	36,109	51,109
7	TRACTOR HIP.....	6,995	6,995
8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY.....	65,914	69,914
9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	25,466	35,466
10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY.....	44,313	67,813
11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	28,803	53,803
12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION.....	27,688	30,688
13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY.....	67,959	92,959
14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY.....	85,436	105,436
15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY....	3,923	3,923
16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM.....	5,545	5,545
17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	53,581	120,081
18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES.....	56,322	74,322
19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY.....	36,079	36,079
20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS.....	26,497	30,497
21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.....	23,671	23,671
22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY.....	22,151	30,151
23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	37,803	37,803
24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.....	13,811	13,811
25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.....	67,416	82,416
26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY.....	26,045	26,045

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY.....	37,403	60,103
28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	77,111	79,111
	TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH.....	907,574	1,220,274
	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
29	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	38,831	51,331
30	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	68,365	107,365
31	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	94,280	112,280
32	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	68,714	192,714
33	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY....	122,132	168,132
34	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	3,904	3,904
35	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY..	14,417	14,417
37	TRACTOR HIKE.....	8,074	8,074
38	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS.....	18,969	18,969
39	TRACTOR ROSE.....	11,910	11,910
40	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	27,686	35,686
41	TRACTOR NAIL.....	2,340	2,340
42	TRACTOR EGGS.....	2,470	2,470
43	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	27,893	41,893
44	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	52,190	115,690
45	TRACTOR CAGE.....	11,107	11,107
46	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	177,190	222,190
47	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	17,451	17,451
48	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM.....	5,839	5,839
49	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	44,468	44,468
50	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS.....	11,137	21,137
51	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	20,684	58,684
52	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE & SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	44,239	54,239
53	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY..	35,775	37,775
	TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	930,065	1,360,065

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION		
54	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION.....	9,433	47,433
55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE).....	23,056	23,056
56	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV.....	72,117	72,117
57	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV.....	28,244	28,244
58	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION.....	40,096	48,096
59	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY.....	10,506	14,006
60	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - AD.....	15,730	15,730
61	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	10,321	10,321
62	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY.....	7,785	7,785
63	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	2,300	2,300
64	AVIATION - ADV DEV.....	10,014	10,014
65	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV.....	20,834	18,126
66	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV.....	33,503	41,003
67	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	31,120	54,120
68	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES.....	6,608	6,608
69	LOWER TIER AIR MISSILE DEFENSE (LTAMID) SENSOR.....	35,132	35,132
70	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES.....	70,047	60,047
71	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT).....	83,279	83,279
73	CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS FORCES AND FORCE SUPPORT.....	40,510	30,510
	TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION.....	550,635	607,927

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT		
74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS.....	83,248	62,248
75	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	34,642	34,642
77	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO.....	12,172	12,172
78	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM.....	3,958	11,958
79	TRACTOR CAGE.....	12,525	12,525
80	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS.....	66,943	67,503
82	JAVELIN.....	20,011	20,011
83	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	11,429	11,429
84	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.....	3,421	3,421
85	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE.....	39,282	33,532
86	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES.....	494	494
87	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM) - ENG DEV.....	9,678	9,678
88	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD.....	84,519	79,519
89	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT.....	2,054	2,054
90	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD.....	30,774	29,801
91	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE -SDD....	53,332	58,332
92	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	17,887	17,887
93	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	8,813	8,813
94	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD.....	10,487	10,487
95	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE.....	15,068	15,068
96	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION.....	89,716	89,716
97	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD.....	80,365	80,365
98	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD.....	75,098	78,860
99	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD.....	4,245	4,245
100	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.	41,124	41,124
101	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD.....	39,630	33,354
102	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE...	205,590	203,274
103	RADAR DEVELOPMENT.....	15,983	15,983
104	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS).....	6,805	6,805
105	FIREFINDER.....	9,235	6,425
106	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL.....	12,393	12,393

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
107	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS.....	1,756	1,756
108	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	74,236	73,732
109	ARMY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (A-IMH)	155,584	155,584
110	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE.....	184,221	184,221
111	INTEGRATED GROUND SECURITY SURVEILLANCE RESPONSE CAPABILITY (IGSSR-C).....	4,980	4,980
112	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC).....	15,041	15,041
113	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN).....	16,014	16,014
114	TRACTOR TIRE.....	27,254	27,254
115	GROUND-BASED OPERATIONAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - EXPEDITIONARY (GBOSS-E).....	5,032	5,032
116	TACTICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (TSS).....	2,904	2,904
117	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM).....	96,977	82,977
118	COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (CWMD).....	2,089	2,089
119	DEFENSIVE CYBER TOOL DEVELOPMENT.....	33,836	33,836
120	TACTICAL NETWORK RADIO SYSTEMS (LOW-TIER).....	18,824	14,765
121	CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM.....	20,663	20,663
122	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT.....	41,133	34,133
123	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INC 2 - BLOCK 1...	83,995	83,995
125	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSSTEM.....	5,028	5,028
126	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM).....	42,972	48,972
128	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD).....	252,811	282,811
131	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION.....	4,955	4,955
132	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE ENG AND MANUFACTURING...	11,530	11,530
133	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	2,142	2,142
134	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM).....	41,498	41,498
135	TROJAN - RH12.....	4,273	4,273
136	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	14,425	14,425
	TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT.....	2,265,094	2,248,728

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
137	RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	25,675	29,675
138	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	19,122	19,122
139	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT.....	84,777	96,777
140	RAND ARROYO CENTER.....	20,658	20,658
141	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL.....	236,648	227,451
142	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM.....	25,596	25,596
144	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES.....	293,748	293,748
145	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS.....	52,404	72,404
146	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS.....	38,571	38,571
147	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION.....	4,665	4,665
148	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES.....	6,925	6,925
149	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS.....	21,677	21,677
150	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS.....	12,415	12,415
151	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING.....	49,684	49,684
152	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER.....	55,905	55,905
153	ARMY MODELING AND SIMULATION X-CMD COLLABORATION AND INTEG.....	7,959	7,959
154	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES.....	51,822	51,822
155	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES.....	33,323	33,323
156	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY...	40,545	65,545
157	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT.....	2,130	2,130
158	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)....	49,885	49,885
159	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE.....	2,000	2,000
	TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	1,136,134	1,187,937

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
161	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	9,663	9,663
162	TRACTOR PULL.....	3,960	3,960
163	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT.....	3,638	3,638
164	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS....	14,517	14,517
165	TRACTOR SMOKE.....	4,479	4,479
166	LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF).....	39,275	37,775
167	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	66,441	64,441
168	BLACKHAWK RECAP/MODERNIZATION.....	46,765	46,765
169	CHINOOK HELICOPTER PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	91,848	91,848
170	FIXED WING AIRCRAFT.....	796	796
171	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM.....	126,105	116,105
172	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE.....	2,369	2,369
173	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION.....	4,563	1,736
174	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS.....	12,098	12,098
175	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT.....	49,482	49,482
176	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE.....	45,482	6,400
178	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM....	30,455	30,455
179	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.....	316,857	304,031
180	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM.....	4,031	4,031
181	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS...	35,793	33,693
182	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	259	259
183	DIGITIZATION.....	6,483	6,483
184	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	5,122	5,122
185	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.....	7,491	7,491
186	TRACTOR CARD.....	20,333	20,333
188	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT.....	124	124
190	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM.....	69,417	63,889
191	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS).....	22,044	22,044

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
192	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM.....	12,649	12,649
194	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.....	11,619	11,619
195	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	38,280	38,280
196	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	27,223	27,223
197	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE).....	18,815	18,815
198	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.....	4,718	4,718
202	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES.....	8,218	8,218
203	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS.....	11,799	11,799
204	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	32,284	32,284
205	MQ-1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV (MQ-1C GRAY EAGLE UAS).....	13,470	13,470
206	RQ-11 UAV.....	1,613	1,613
207	RQ-7 UAV.....	4,597	4,597
209	WIN-T INCREMENT 2 - INITIAL NETWORKING.....	4,867	4,867
210	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES.....	62,287	62,287
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....		740,393	719,939
9999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	4,625	4,625
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY....		7,515,399	8,332,965
===== =====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES Program increase - basic research	253,116	293,116 40,000
4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS Materials in extreme dynamic environments Program increase - basic research	94,280	112,280 5,000 13,000
5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY High performance polymers research Program increase	31,533	82,533 20,000 31,000
6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY Program increase Signals detection research Space and small satellites technology demonstration	36,109	51,109 5,000 3,000 7,000
8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY Program increase	65,914	69,914 4,000
9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY Program increase	25,466	35,466 10,000
10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY Weapon effectiveness in urban engagement Program increase	44,313	67,813 8,500 15,000
11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY Program increase	28,803	53,803 25,000
12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION Program increase	27,688	30,688 3,000
13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY Program increase Program increase - alternative energy research	67,959	92,959 10,000 15,000
14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY Program increase	85,436	105,436 20,000
17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY Program increase High-speed vehicle mounted fire detection technology Railgun weapon technology Medium caliber lightweight composite barrel technology Guided tank fired round development for high mobility targets Armament systems concepts Hybrid projectile technology	53,581	120,081 18,000 5,000 20,000 5,000 8,500 5,000 5,000
18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES Tactical and component power technology Payload agnostic unmanned aerial systems Silicon carbide research Flexible printable electronics	56,322	74,322 2,000 4,000 10,000 2,000
20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS Program increase	26,497	30,497 4,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
22 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY Program increase	22,151	30,151 8,000
25 MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY Program increase	67,416	82,416 15,000
27 WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY H98 clothing and equipment Advanced active environmental control technology for expeditionary mobile base Program increase Soldier protection	37,403	60,103 5,000 6,000 10,000 1,700
28 MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY Military operational medical research program	77,111	79,111 2,000
29 WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Program increase	38,831	51,331 12,500
30 MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Peer-reviewed neurotoxin exposure treatment Parkinson's research Peer-reviewed neurofibromatosis research Peer-reviewed military burn research	68,365	107,365 16,000 15,000 8,000
31 AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Ballistic seating system Future Vertical Lift	94,280	112,280 7,000 11,000
32 WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Program increase Weapons mounts Accelerate extended range cannon artillery Laser defense system for small UAS Weapon effectiveness in urban engagement Armament systems integration High energy laser research	68,714	192,714 42,000 2,500 21,000 15,000 8,500 5,000 30,000
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY		
33 TECHNOLOGY Combat vehicle weight reduction initiative Advanced water harvesting technology Program increase	122,132	168,132 10,000 6,000 30,000
40 COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Force protection radar development	27,686	35,686 8,000
43 ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY Program increase	27,893	41,893 14,000
44 MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Cybersecurity and supply chain risk management research GPS-guided weapon performance improvement Next generation close combat missile Armament systems concepts Armament systems integration Program increase	52,190	115,690 10,000 5,000 8,500 5,000 5,000 30,000
46 HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM Program increase	177,190	222,190 45,000

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
50	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS Program increase	11,137	21,137 10,000
51	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Secure management of energy generation and storage Program increase Installation energy efficiency enhancements	20,684	58,684 3,000 30,000 5,000
	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE & SENSOR		
52	TECHNOLOGY Program increase	44,239	54,239 10,000
	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED		
53	TECHNOLOGY Program increase	35,775	37,775 2,000
	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION		
54	High power microwave analysis and radio frequency platform protection Program increase High energy laser research	9,433	47,433 5,000 25,000 8,000
58	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION Stryker 30mm programmable air burst ammunition	40,096	48,096 8,000
59	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY Program increase	10,506	14,006 3,500
65	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV Prior year carryover	20,834	18,126 -2,708
66	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV Program increase	33,503	41,003 7,500
67	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT Enhanced lightweight body armor	31,120	54,120 23,000
70	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES Ground vehicle prototyping excess growth	70,047	60,047 -10,000
73	CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS FORCES AND FORCE SUPPORT Lack of validated requirements	40,510	30,510 -10,000
74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS Excess DVE product development funding	83,248	62,248 -21,000
78	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM Program increase	3,958	11,958 8,000
80	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS Cannon life extension Program increase Modular handgun system delay	66,943	67,503 1,500 3,000 -3,940
85	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE EMD contract delay	39,282	33,532 -5,750
88	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD Prior year carryover	84,519	79,519 -5,000

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
90	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD Solider fitness program unjustified	30,774	29,801 -973
91	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE -SDD Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar systems	53,332	58,332 5,000
98	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD Maneuver Support Vessel-Light contract delay Next generation vehicle camouflage technology Program increase Engine driven generators schedule delay	75,098	78,860 -3,000 11,100 2,500 -6,838
101	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD Mine-neutral and detection schedule delay	39,630	33,354 -6,276
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE &			
102	SOFTWARE Solider borne sensor personal reconnaissance technology TNOM funding ahead of acquisition strategy	205,590	203,274 7,500 -9,816
105	FIREFINDER Enhanced AN/TPQ 36 carryover	9,235	6,425 -2,810
108	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Army human resource system VACE unjustified	74,236	73,732 -504
117	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) Program of record prior year carryover	96,977	82,977 -14,000
120	TACTICAL NETWORK RADIO SYSTEMS (LOW-TIER) Manpack operational test funding ahead of need	18,824	14,765 -4,059
122	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT Advanced missile warning system development funding	41,133	34,133 -7,000
126	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) Improved lethality and range	42,972	48,972 6,000
128	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD) Program increase Cybersecurity research	252,811	282,811 15,000 15,000
137	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT Program increase	25,675	29,675 4,000
139	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT Cyber vulnerabilities research	84,777	96,777 12,000
141	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL Installation services excess growth	236,648	227,451 -9,197
145	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS Cybersecurity of space and missile defense assets Program increase	52,404	72,404 10,000 10,000
156	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY Munitions standardization, effectiveness, and safety Program increase	40,545	65,545 10,000 15,000

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
166	LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF) Prior year carryover	39,275	37,775 -1,500
167	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM Support funding carryover Management services excess growth	66,441	64,441 -1,000 -1,000
171	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM PDR contract delay	126,105	116,105 -10,000
173	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION Prior year carryover	4,563	1,736 -2,827
176	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE Excess funding due to program cancellation	45,482	6,400 -39,082
179	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS Abrams program support excess growth Excess funding Stryker ECP 2 funding ahead of need	316,857	304,031 -5,000 -1,026 -6,800
181	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT Modification funding ahead of need	35,793	33,693 -2,100
190	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM Prior year carryover	69,417	63,889 -5,528

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND
EVALUATION, NAVY

The agreement on items addressed by ei-
ther the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL

	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY		
	BASIC RESEARCH		
1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	101,714	121,714
2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.....	18,508	18,508
3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	422,748	422,748
	TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH.....	542,970	562,970
	APPLIED RESEARCH		
4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH.....	41,371	61,371
5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH.....	158,745	201,745
6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY.....	51,590	69,765
7	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH.....	41,185	41,185
8	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH.....	45,467	50,467
9	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH.....	118,941	120,941
10	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH.....	42,618	81,618
11	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH.....	6,327	6,327
12	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH.....	126,313	126,313
13	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH.....	165,103	157,103
14	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH.....	33,916	33,916
15	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT - ONR HEADQUARTERS..	29,575	29,575
	TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH.....	861,151	980,326

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
16	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	96,406	96,406
17	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	48,438	85,338
18	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	26,421	26,421
19	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	140,416	140,416
20	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	13,117	13,117
21	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEV.....	249,092	266,092
22	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	56,712	56,712
23	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	4,789	40,789
24	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	25,880	25,880
25	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS.....	60,550	59,550
26	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY....	15,167	13,167
	TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	736,988	823,888
27	DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS.....	48,536	44,936
28	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY.....	5,239	15,239
30	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.....	1,519	1,519
31	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	7,041	7,041
32	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE.....	3,274	3,274
33	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	57,034	3,651
34	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	165,775	120,775
35	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE.....	87,066	71,553
36	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	7,605	7,605
37	PILOT FISH.....	132,068	132,068
38	RETRACT LARCH.....	14,546	14,546
39	RETRACT JUNIPER.....	115,435	115,435
40	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL.....	702	702
41	SURFACE ASW.....	1,081	1,081
42	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.....	100,565	118,023
43	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS.....	8,782	8,782
44	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN.....	14,590	14,590

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
45	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES.....	15,805	13,805
46	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS.....	453,313	453,313
47	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS.....	36,655	30,858
48	CHALK EAGLE.....	367,016	367,016
49	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS).....	51,630	51,630
50	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION.....	23,530	23,530
51	OHIO REPLACEMENT PROGRAM.....	700,811	700,811
52	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) MISSION MODULES.....	160,058	153,608
53	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST.....	---	15,000
54	FRIGATE DEVELOPMENT.....	84,900	84,900
55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.....	8,342	8,342
56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES.....	158,682	138,762
57	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	1,303	1,303
58	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	46,911	45,411
60	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	4,556	4,556
61	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	20,343	19,121
62	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM.....	52,479	70,879
63	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT.....	5,458	5,458
64	CHALK CORAL.....	245,860	230,860
65	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY.....	3,089	3,089
66	RETRACT MAPLE.....	323,526	314,776
67	LINK PLUMERIA.....	318,497	284,297
68	RETRACT ELM.....	52,834	52,834
69	LINK EVERGREEN.....	48,116	48,116
70	SPECIAL PROCESSES.....	13,619	13,619
71	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	9,867	8,567
72	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY.....	6,015	18,015
73	JOINT NONLETHAL WEAPONS TESTING.....	27,904	27,904
74	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS.....	104,144	102,722
75	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS.....	32,700	32,700
76	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER.....	70,528	70,528

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
77	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS).....	3,001	3,001
78	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES.....	34,920	26,920
80	MH-XX.....	1,620	1,620
81	LX (R).....	6,354	25,354
82	ADVANCED UNDERSEA PROTOTYPING.....	78,589	59,479
84	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	9,910	4,910
85	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE..	23,971	20,651
86	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT.....	252,409	300,971
87	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE ENGINEERING/MANUFACTURING	23,197	9,597
88	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT - MIP.....	9,110	9,110
89	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT - MIP.....	437	437
	TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION.....	4,662,867	4,539,200
90	ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT.....	19,938	17,938
91	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT.....	6,268	5,968
92	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV.....	33,664	32,664
93	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.....	1,300	1,300
94	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	5,275	5,275
95	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING.....	3,875	3,875
96	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	1,909	1,909
97	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	13,237	11,537
98	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM.....	36,323	36,323
99	ADVANCED HAWKEYE.....	363,792	365,178
100	H-1 UPGRADES.....	27,441	27,441
101	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS.....	34,525	29,525
102	V-22A.....	174,423	154,245
103	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	13,577	7,477
104	EA-18.....	116,761	104,444
105	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	48,766	42,378
106	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT.....	338,357	338,357
107	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ).....	577,822	577,822

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
108	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY).....	2,365	2,365
109	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) INCREMENT II.....	52,065	18,965
110	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING.....	282,764	275,764
111	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION.....	580	580
112	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB).....	97,622	91,622
113	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS.....	120,561	120,561
114	AIRBORNE MCM.....	45,622	45,622
116	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL-COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENG.	25,750	25,750
118	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS.....	85,868	72,868
119	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION.....	117,476	123,476
120	AIR CONTROL.....	47,404	44,858
121	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS.....	112,158	116,158
122	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION.....	6,283	6,283
123	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM.....	144,395	144,395
124	NEW DESIGN SSN.....	113,013	130,013
125	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM.....	43,160	52,160
126	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E.....	65,002	85,002
127	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES.....	3,098	3,098
128	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM).....	97,920	97,920
129	MINE DEVELOPMENT.....	10,490	10,490
130	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT.....	20,178	30,178
131	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	7,369	7,369
132	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS....	4,995	4,995
133	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS.....	412	412
134	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL).....	134,619	134,619
135	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL).....	114,475	119,475
136	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW).....	114,211	103,889
137	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING.....	11,029	9,029
138	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT.....	9,220	25,220
139	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM.....	42,723	42,723
140	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD.....	531,426	531,426

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
141	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF).....	528,716	528,716
142	JSF FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT-MARINE CORPS.....	74,227	29,691
143	JSF FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT-NAVY.....	63,387	25,355
144	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	4,856	4,856
145	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	97,066	90,566
146	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT.....	2,500	500
147	CH-53K.....	404,810	350,810
148	MISSION PLANNING.....	33,570	33,570
149	COMMON AVIONICS.....	51,599	49,512
150	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC).....	11,088	11,088
151	T-AO (X).....	1,095	1,095
152	CARRIER BASED AERIAL REFUELING SYSTEM (CBARS).....	89,000	76,422
153	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM).....	17,880	17,880
154	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA).....	59,126	64,126
155	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) INCREMENT 3.....	182,220	112,320
156	DDG-1000.....	45,642	45,642
159	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM - MIP.....	676	676
160	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS.....	36,747	34,047
161	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM.....	35,002	35,002
162	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	4,942	2,442
	TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT.....	6,025,655	5,755,257
	RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
163	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	16,633	16,633
164	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	36,662	36,662
165	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT.....	42,109	52,109
166	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION....	2,998	2,998
167	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY.....	3,931	3,931
168	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES.....	46,634	46,634
169	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER.....	1,200	1,200
171	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES.....	903	903
172	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT.....	87,077	100,077

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
173	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT.....	3,597	3,597
174	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT.....	62,811	62,811
175	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT.....	106,093	106,093
176	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT.....	349,146	349,146
177	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY.....	18,160	18,160
178	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT.....	9,658	9,658
179	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT.....	6,500	6,500
180	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT.....	22,247	19,766
181	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS - R&D.....	16,254	16,254
182	WARFARE INNOVATION MANAGEMENT.....	21,123	15,423
	TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	853,736	868,555
	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
188	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY (CEC).....	84,501	77,001
189	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL.....	2,970	2,970
190	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT.....	136,556	131,056
191	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	33,845	33,845
192	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	9,329	9,329
193	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS.....	17,218	17,218
195	F/A-18 SQUADRONS.....	189,125	174,425
196	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL).....	48,225	48,225
197	SURFACE SUPPORT.....	21,156	21,156
198	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) ..	71,355	43,016
199	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.....	58,542	57,058
200	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS.....	13,929	13,929
201	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR.....	83,538	81,038
202	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	38,593	45,343
203	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT.....	1,122	1,122
204	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT.....	99,998	83,292
205	HARM IMPROVEMENT.....	48,635	38,435
206	TACTICAL DATA LINKS.....	124,785	124,785

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
207	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION.....	24,583	24,583
208	MK-48 ADCAP.....	39,134	49,134
209	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS.....	120,861	118,861
210	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS.....	101,786	101,786
211	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.....	82,159	99,359
212	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	11,850	8,976
213	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS....	47,877	41,877
214	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT.....	13,194	11,700
215	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)....	17,171	17,171
216	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE.....	38,020	38,020
217	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES.....	56,285	56,285
218	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)....	40,350	40,350
219	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM - MARINE CORPS (GCSS-MC).	9,128	9,128
223	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE).....	37,372	32,116
224	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES.....	23,541	23,541
225	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	38,510	33,310
228	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS.....	6,019	6,019
229	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES.....	8,436	8,436
230	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY.....	36,509	21,909
231	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	2,100	2,100
232	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	44,571	44,571
233	MQ-4C TRITON.....	111,729	111,729
234	MQ-8 UAV.....	26,518	26,518
235	RQ-11 UAV.....	418	---
236	RQ-7 UAV.....	716	---
237	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0).....	5,071	5,071
238	RQ-21A.....	9,497	8,379
239	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT.....	77,965	64,765
240	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP).....	11,181	11,181
241	RQ-4 MODERNIZATION.....	181,266	144,566
242	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT.....	4,709	4,709

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
243	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF).....	49,322	38,277
245	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH).....	3,204	3,204
	TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	2,364,474	2,210,874
9999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	1,228,460	1,473,460
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY....	17,276,301	17,214,530
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES Program increase - basic research	101,714	121,714 20,000
4 POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH Program increase	41,371	61,371 20,000
5 FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH Program increase - littoral threat research Program increase Program increase - battery storage and safety Program increase - alternative energy research	158,745	201,745 5,000 15,000 3,000 20,000
6 MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY Littoral combat/power projection unjustified growth Program increase	51,590	69,765 -1,825 20,000
8 WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH Program increase	45,467	50,467 5,000
9 ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH Electronic warfare technology previously funded efforts Program increase - conformal phased array antenna research	118,941	120,941 -2,000 4,000
10 OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH Program increase - AGOR mid-life refit Program increase - naval special warfare maritime science and technology Program increase - space-based monitoring in the arctic basin	42,618	81,618 30,000 5,000 4,000
13 FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH FORCENET excess growth Power and energy previously funded efforts Sea shield previously funded efforts	165,103	157,103 -5,000 -2,000 -1,000
17 FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Aircraft technology excess growth Program increase - autonomous surface unmanned vehicle research	48,438	85,338 -3,100 40,000
21 FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEV Program increase - ASW research Program increase	249,092	266,092 7,000 10,000
23 WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Program increase - bone marrow registry program Program increase - tactical athlete program	4,789	40,789 31,500 4,500
25 NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS Operations analysis unjustified growth	60,550	59,550 -1,000
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED		
26 TECHNOLOGY Mine technology excess growth	15,167	13,167 -2,000

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
27 AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS		48,536	44,936
Naval integrated tactical environmental system next generation			
excess growth			-3,000
Precise timing and astrometry contract delays			-600
28 AVIATION SURVIVABILITY		5,239	15,239
Program increase			10,000
33 ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY		57,034	3,651
Rapid prototype development excess growth			-39,356
Unmanned rapid prototype development excess growth			-14,027
34 SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES		165,775	120,775
LDUUV support excess growth			-2,000
Project 2094 LDUUV - continue risk reduction and technology			
maturation efforts only			-43,000
35 SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE		87,066	71,553
Long lead material early to need			-15,513
42 ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		100,565	118,023
Flank array demonstration unjustified growth			-450
Stealth product development excess growth			-2,500
Universal launch and recovery module excess growth			-4,592
Program increase - advance materials propeller research			25,000
45 SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES		15,805	13,805
Shipboard energy conservation excess growth			-2,000
47 ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS		36,655	30,858
Energy efficiency previously funded efforts			-1,797
Cybersecurity boundary defense capability excess growth			-4,000
52 LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) MISSION MODULES		160,058	153,608
System test and evaluation prior year carryover			-6,450
53 AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST		0	15,000
Program increase			15,000
56 MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES		158,682	138,762
Product development prior year carryover			-19,920
58 JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT		46,911	45,411
VSW MCM next generation UUV early to need			-1,500
61 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION		20,343	19,121
Environmental sustainability development excess growth			-1,222
62 NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM		52,479	70,879
Aircraft energy conservation systems engineering prior year carryover			-1,600
Program increase - installation energy efficiency enhancements			5,000
Program increase - renewable energy development			15,000
64 CHALK CORAL		245,860	230,860
Program adjustment			-15,000
66 RETRACT MAPLE		323,526	314,776
Program reduction			-8,750

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
67 LINK PLUMERIA Program adjustment	318,497	284,297 -34,200
71 NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT Cooperative research and development unjustified growth	9,867	8,567 -1,300
72 LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY Program increase - fly off competition	6,015	18,015 12,000
74 JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS UCLASS test support unjustified request	104,144	102,722 -1,422
78 TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES CIRCM schedule delays	34,920	26,920 -8,000
81 LX (R) Program increase - accelerate LX (R) class of ships	6,354	25,354 19,000
82 ADVANCED UNDERSEA PROTOTYPING Program adjustment - reflects change to competitive acquisition strategy Navy requested program increase	78,589	59,479 -35,000 15,890
84 PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NGLAW program delay	9,910	4,910 -5,000
SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW)		
85 ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT Maritime concept generation and development excess growth	23,971	20,651 -3,320
OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON		
86 DEVELOPMENT Increment II early to need Program increase - Increment I Navy identified funding shortfall	252,409	300,971 -2,038 50,600
JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE		
87 ENGINEERING/MANUFACTURING Prior year carryover	23,197	9,597 -13,600
90 TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT T-45 schedule delays	19,938	17,938 -2,000
91 OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT H-53 avionics previously funded	6,268	5,968 -300
92 AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV Support carryover	33,664	32,664 -1,000
97 WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM Navy irregular warfare excess growth	13,237	11,537 -1,700
99 ADVANCED HAWKEYE Mode 5/S previously funded New start efforts excess growth Program increase - radar development	363,792	365,178 -225 -8,389 10,000
101 ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS Multi-static active coherent schedule delays	34,525	29,525 -5,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
102 V-22A Navy variant development contract award delays Aerial refueling system development contract award delay	174,423	154,245 -11,927 -8,251
103 AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT Enhanced visual acuity program delays	13,577	7,477 -6,100
104 EA-18 Design and avionics integration excess growth Developmental and operational testing excess growth	116,761	104,444 -10,000 -2,317
105 ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT Technology development unjustified new start Intrepid Tiger II excess growth	48,766	42,378 -2,016 -4,372
109 NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) INCREMENT II Program growth	52,065	18,965 -33,100
110 SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING AEGIS baseline 5.3X upgrade excess growth Program increase - small business technology insertion	282,764	275,764 -10,000 3,000
112 SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) F-18 integration test asset cost growth	97,622	91,622 -6,000
113 STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS Defer future capability demonstration efforts until completion of program of record test events Fully fund unfunded program of record test events	120,561	120,561 -14,000 14,000
118 ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS Program adjustment	85,868	72,868 -13,000
119 SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION Towed buoy antenna previously funded efforts Program increase	117,476	123,476 -1,000 7,000
120 AIR CONTROL AN/SPN-50 cost growth	47,404	44,858 -2,546
121 SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS Program increase	112,158	116,158 4,000
124 NEW DESIGN SSN Program increase - small business technology insertion Program increase	113,013	130,013 10,000 7,000
125 SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM Program increase - advanced weapons enhanced by submarine unmanned aerial system against mobile targets	43,160	52,160 9,000
126 SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E Program increase - CVN cost reduction initiatives	65,002	85,002 20,000
130 LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT Program increase - small business technology insertion	20,178	30,178 10,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
135 SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) Program increase - electronics enclosure redesign efforts	114,475	119,475 5,000
136 SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) EW RCIP unjustified growth Project 3316 decoy development effort contract award delay	114,211	103,889 -2,322 -8,000
137 INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING Excess growth	11,029	9,029 -2,000
138 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT Program increase - military dental research Program increase - wound care research	9,220	25,220 6,000 10,000
139 NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM ISIS and photonics common software and hardware capabilities prior year carryover NAVSTAR GPS equipment excess support growth Improved GPS - Department requested transfer of funds from multiple RDTE,AF lines	42,723	42,723 -3,000 -3,000 6,000
142 JSF FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT-MARINE CORPS Follow-on development excess funds	74,227	29,691 -44,536
143 JSF FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT-NAVY Follow-on development excess funds	63,387	25,355 -38,032
145 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Excess support growth NAVSEA IT excess growth BUPERS IT excess growth	97,066	90,566 -1,800 -2,200 -2,500
146 ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT Unjustified request	2,500	500 -2,000
147 CH-53K Program delay	404,810	350,810 -54,000
149 COMMON AVIONICS CNS/ATM prior year carryover	51,599	49,512 -2,087
152 CARRIER BASED AERIAL REFUELING SYSTEM (CBARS) Air segment product development early to need	89,000	76,422 -12,578
154 MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) Program execution Program increase - small business technology insertion	59,126	64,126 -5,000 10,000
155 MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) INCREMENT 3 Engineering change proposals 6 and 7 funding concurrent with combat systems architecture early to need	182,220	112,320 -69,900
160 TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS Excess support growth	36,747	34,047 -2,700
162 CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Excess growth	4,942	2,442 -2,500

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
165	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT Program increase - modeling and simulation for ground testing capabilities	42,109	52,109 10,000
172	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT Program increase - printed circuit board executive agent	87,077	100,077 13,000
180	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT Studies and analysis excess growth	22,247	19,766 -2,481
182	WARFARE INNOVATION MANAGEMENT Fleet experimentation excess growth	21,123	15,423 -5,700
188	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY (CEC) Program delays	84,501	77,001 -7,500
190	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT Technical applications programs contract delays	136,556	131,056 -5,500
195	F/A-18 SQUADRONS Multi-system integration excess growth Radar upgrade product development previously funded Infrared search and track excess growth Program increase - noise reduction research	189,125	174,425 -4,000 -2,700 -10,000 2,000
198	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER Theater mission planning center previously funded Support prior year carryover Maritime modernization program adjustment	71,355	43,016 -4,000 -6,339 -18,000
199	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM TASW prototypes excess growth	58,542	57,058 -1,484
201	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR EDM-1 refurbishment previously funded Insufficient budget documentation	83,538	81,038 -500 -2,000
202	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TACTS/LATR replacement contract delay Program increase - project 0604 training range enhancements	38,593	45,343 -2,250 9,000
204	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT Electronic warfare/information operations countermeasure capability research and development prior year carryover Twisted web excess growth Mocking jay excess growth	99,998	83,292 -3,206 -9,300 -4,200
205	HARM IMPROVEMENT AARGM threat data library unjustified growth AARGM ER change to acquisition strategy	48,635	38,435 -1,800 -8,400
208	MK-48 ADCAP Program increase	39,134	49,134 10,000
209	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS F135 engine unjustified growth	120,861	118,861 -2,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
211 MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	82,159	99,359
CREW product development prior year carryover		-800
Program increase		6,000
Program increase - radar enhancements		12,000
212 COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	11,850	8,976
Product development excess growth		-2,874
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS		
213 SYSTEMS	47,877	41,877
Project 1555 prior year carryover		-6,000
214 MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	13,194	11,700
Advanced power sources contract delay		-1,494
223 SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	37,372	32,116
Joint aerial layer network maritime unjustified growth		-2,000
MUOS contract delay		-3,256
225 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	38,510	33,310
Excess growth		-5,200
230 UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	36,509	21,909
Prior year carryover		-3,000
Increment II increase early to need		-11,600
235 RQ-11 UAV	418	0
Fully developed program		-418
236 RQ-7 UAV	716	0
Fully developed program		-716
238 RQ-21A	9,497	8,379
Inconsistent budget justification		-1,118
239 MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	77,965	64,765
Excess growth		-5,000
Project 3329 increase early to need		-8,200
241 RQ-4 MODERNIZATION	181,266	144,566
Test and evaluation excess growth		-2,550
Excess concurrency		-34,150
243 DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	49,322	38,277
Project 3384 funding early to need		-11,045
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,228,460	1,473,460
Classified adjustment		245,000

STANDARD MISSILE-6

The agreement includes \$120,561,000, as requested, for Standard Missile-6 (SM-6) improvements. It is understood that the Navy's top priority for the SM-6 research, develop-

ment, test and evaluation program in fiscal year 2017 is the completion of program of record flight tests and achieving full operational capability for the SM-6 Block I. The Secretary of the Navy is encouraged to prioritize funding allocations accordingly.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AIR FORCE			
	BASIC RESEARCH		
1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	340,812	380,812
2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	145,044	150,044
3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	14,168	14,168
	TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH.....	500,024	545,024
	APPLIED RESEARCH		
4	MATERIALS.....	126,152	159,152
5	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES.....	122,831	132,831
6	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH.....	111,647	111,647
7	AEROSPACE PROPULSION.....	185,671	195,671
8	AEROSPACE SENSORS.....	155,174	162,674
9	SPACE TECHNOLOGY.....	117,915	117,915
10	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.....	109,649	109,649
11	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY.....	127,163	127,163
12	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS.....	161,650	166,650
13	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH.....	42,300	42,300
	TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH.....	1,260,152	1,325,652
	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.....	35,137	53,137
15	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T).....	20,636	20,636
16	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS.....	40,945	40,945
17	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO.....	130,950	130,950
18	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY.....	94,594	109,594
19	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY.....	58,250	66,150
20	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY.....	61,593	71,593
21	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS).....	11,681	11,681
22	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT...	26,492	26,492

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
23	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	102,009	107,009
24	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	39,064	49,064
25	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	46,344	62,344
26	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION.....	58,110	58,110
	TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	725,805	807,705
27	ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	5,598	5,598
28	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY.....	7,534	7,534
29	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY.....	24,418	24,418
30	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	4,333	4,333
32	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP).....	32,399	32,399
33	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE.....	108,663	113,663
34	POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL).....	---	3,500
35	LONG RANGE STRIKE.....	1,358,309	1,338,309
36	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AND SENSORS.....	34,818	34,818
37	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.....	3,368	8,368
38	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM.....	74,308	54,708
39	WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON.....	118,953	93,953
40	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS.....	9,901	9,901
41	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE R&D.....	25,890	25,890
42	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE.....	7,921	18,421
43	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM.....	347,304	385,304
44	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT.....	113,919	113,919
46	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE.....	20,595	20,595
47	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR.....	49,491	49,491
48	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT)....	278,147	309,047
49	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA).....	42,338	42,338
50	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	158,002	158,002
51	ENABLED CYBER ACTIVITIES.....	15,842	15,842
52	CONTRACTING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM.....	5,782	5,782
	TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT.....	2,847,833	2,876,133

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
54	ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT.....	12,476	5,176
55	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE.....	82,380	82,380
56	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	8,458	8,458
57	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB).....	54,838	39,138
58	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS.....	34,394	34,394
59	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS.....	23,945	23,945
60	SPACE FENCE.....	168,364	168,364
61	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK.....	9,187	9,187
62	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD.....	181,966	161,966
63	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	20,312	20,312
64	SUBMUNITIONS.....	2,503	2,503
65	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT.....	53,680	50,680
66	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION.....	9,901	9,901
67	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS.....	7,520	7,520
68	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES.....	77,409	68,409
69	F-35 - EMD.....	450,467	450,467
70	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)....	296,572	396,572
71	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON.....	95,604	95,604
72	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION.....	189,751	189,751
73	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC).....	1,131	1,131
74	F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B.....	70,290	70,290
75	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT.....	937	937
76	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT KC-46.....	261,724	229,924

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
77	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING.....	12,377	7,377
78	CSAR HH-60 RECAPITALIZATION.....	319,331	273,331
80	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE).....	259,131	229,131
81	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE).....	50,815	45,815
82	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE).....	41,632	76,632
83	AIR AND SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2.....	28,911	21,911
84	B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....	315,615	289,015
85	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION.....	137,909	137,909
86	F-15 EPAWSS.....	256,669	250,669
87	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING.....	12,051	12,051
88	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR.....	29,253	29,253
89	NEXTGEN JSTARS.....	128,019	128,019
90	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT.....	351,220	322,220
91	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS.....	19,062	14,562
	TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT.....	4,075,804	3,964,904

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
92	RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	21,630	21,630
93	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT.....	66,385	66,385
94	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE.....	34,641	34,641
96	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION.....	11,529	11,529
97	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT.....	661,417	676,417
98	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE).....	11,198	11,198
99	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP).....	27,070	42,070
100	FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION - TEST & EVAL..	134,111	134,111
101	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT..	28,091	28,091
102	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION.....	29,100	34,100
103	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT.....	18,528	18,528
104	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE.....	176,666	171,666
105	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS).....	4,410	4,410
106	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	14,613	14,613
107	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING.....	1,404	1,404
109	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	4,784	4,784
	TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	1,245,577	1,275,577

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
110	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT GPS III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT.....	393,268	393,268
111	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING.....	15,427	18,427
112	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE.....	46,695	46,695
115	AIR FORCE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM..	10,368	10,368
116	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY.....	31,952	31,952
117	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION.....	42,960	42,960
118	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E.....	13,987	8,987
119	B-52 SQUADRONS.....	78,267	83,267
120	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM).....	453	453
121	B-1B SQUADRONS.....	5,830	3,930
122	B-2 SQUADRONS.....	152,458	127,458
123	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS.....	182,958	178,958
124	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM.....	39,148	39,148
126	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS.....	6,042	13,042
128	UH-1N REPLACEMENT PROGRAM.....	14,116	14,116
129	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION..	10,868	10,868
130	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM - SPACE ACTIVITIES.....	8,674	8,674
131	MQ-9 UAV.....	151,373	138,373
133	A-10 SQUADRONS.....	14,853	4,853
134	F-16 SQUADRONS.....	132,795	120,195
135	F-15E SQUADRONS.....	356,717	356,717
136	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION.....	14,773	14,773
137	F-22 SQUADRONS.....	387,564	376,464
138	F-35 SQUADRONS.....	153,045	76,713
139	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES.....	52,898	52,898
140	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)....	62,470	62,470
143	COMBAT RESCUE - PARARESCUE.....	362	362
144	AF TENCAP.....	28,413	28,413
145	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT.....	649	649
146	COMPASS CALL.....	13,723	13,723
147	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	109,859	109,859

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
148	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM).....	30,002	21,902
149	AIR AND SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC).....	37,621	30,343
150	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC).....	13,292	13,292
151	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS).....	86,644	86,644
152	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	2,442	2,442
154	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES.....	10,911	15,911
155	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY--MOD.....	11,843	11,843
156	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK.....	1,515	1,515
157	DCAPES.....	14,979	14,979
158	SEEK EAGLE.....	25,308	25,308
159	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION.....	16,666	16,666
160	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS.....	4,245	4,245
161	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES.....	3,886	3,886
162	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS.....	71,785	71,785
164	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS.....	25,025	25,025
165	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS.....	29,439	39,439
168	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN).....	3,470	3,470
169	NUCLEAR PLANNING AND EXECUTION SYSTEM (NPES).....	4,060	4,060
175	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE.....	13,880	12,380
176	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC).....	30,948	26,048
177	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLoS TERMINALS (FAB-T).....	42,378	42,378
178	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK....	47,471	40,171
179	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	46,388	37,388
180	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	52	52
181	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT - DATA INITIATIVE.....	2,099	2,099
184	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE.....	90,762	90,762
187	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM).....	4,354	4,354
188	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE).....	15,624	14,624
189	WEATHER SERVICE.....	19,974	19,974

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
190	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, & LANDING SYSTEM (ATC).	9,770	17,770
191	AERIAL TARGETS.....	3,051	3,051
194	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES.....	405	405
195	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION.....	4,844	4,844
196	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.....	339	339
199	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER.....	3,989	3,989
200	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,070	1,570
201	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE.....	8,833	8,833
202	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE).....	11,867	21,867
203	DRAGON U-2.....	37,217	37,217
204	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES.....	---	50,000
205	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS.....	3,841	13,841
206	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS.....	20,975	20,975
207	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	18,902	18,902
208	RQ-4 UAV.....	256,307	244,807
209	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGET (TIARA).....	22,610	22,610
211	NATO AGS.....	38,904	38,904
212	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE.....	23,084	23,084
213	ADVANCED EVALUATION PROGRAM.....	116,143	---
214	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT.....	141,888	171,888

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
215	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES.....	2,360	2,360
216	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM.....	72,889	72,889
217	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION.....	4,280	4,280
218	NCMC -TW/AA SYSTEM.....	4,951	4,951
219	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE).....	21,093	21,093
220	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS.....	35,002	35,002
222	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW).....	6,366	6,366
223	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON.....	15,599	15,599
224	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS.....	66,146	66,146
225	C-17 AIRCRAFT.....	12,430	12,430
226	C-130J PROGRAM.....	16,776	16,776

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
227	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM).....	5,166	5,166
228	KC-10S.....	---	3,500
229	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT.....	13,817	13,817
230	CV-22.....	16,702	16,702
231	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL.....	7,164	7,164
232	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF).....	1,518	1,518
233	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT).....	61,676	57,676
238	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	9,128	9,128
235	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING.....	1,653	1,653
236	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES.....	57	57
237	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY.....	3,663	3,663
238	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM.....	3,735	3,735
239	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION.....	5,157	5,157
240	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY.....	1,523	1,523
242	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT..	10,581	10,581
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....		4,365,499	4,175,846
9999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	13,091,557	12,817,707
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AIR FORCE		28,112,251	27,788,548
===== =====			

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
1 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES Program increase - basic research	340,812	380,812 40,000
2 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES Program increase	145,044	150,044 5,000
4 MATERIALS Program increase - electronics, optics and survivability Program increase - structures, propulsion, and subsystems Program increase - Air Force education and outreach program Program increase - coating technologies Program increase - certification of advanced materials	126,152	159,152 8,000 5,000 10,000 4,000 6,000
5 AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES Program increase - hypersonic vehicle structures	122,831	132,831 10,000
7 AEROSPACE PROPULSION Program increase - aerospace power technology Program increase	185,671	195,671 5,000 5,000
8 AEROSPACE SENSORS Program increase - electronic component technology Program increase - spectrum monitoring	155,174	162,674 4,000 3,500
12 DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS Program increase	161,650	166,650 5,000
14 ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS Program increase - metals affordability research Program increase - protective equipment	35,137	53,137 17,000 1,000
18 AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY Program increase - silicon carbide research	94,594	109,594 15,000
19 ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds from lines 38, 54, 57, 121, 137, and 148	58,250	66,150 7,900
20 ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY Program increase	61,593	71,593 10,000
23 CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY Program increase	102,009	107,009 5,000
24 ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY Program increase	39,064	49,064 10,000
25 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM Program increase - additive manufacturing Program increase	46,344	62,344 10,000 6,000
33 ICBM DEM/VAL Program growth Program increase - solid rocket motor technology	108,663	113,663 -5,000 10,000
34 POLLUTION PREVENTION DEM/VAL Program increase - aviation ground equipment	0	3,500 3,500

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
35 LONG RANGE STRIKE-BOMBER Forward financing	1,358,309	1,338,309 -20,000
37 TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER Program increase	3,368	8,368 5,000
HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM		
38 (HDBTDS) Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139	74,308	54,708 -19,600
39 WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON Unjustified request Program increase - commercial weather pilot program	118,953	93,953 -30,000 5,000
42 OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE Program increase - maintain fiscal year 2016 funding level	7,921	18,421 10,500
43 TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM Program increase - alternative energy research Program increase - logistics technologies Program increase - counter electronics high powered microwave advanced missile project	347,304	385,304 20,000 12,000 6,000
48 NAVSTAR GPS (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE) Unjustified cost growth Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds from lines 38,54,57,121,137, and 148	278,147	309,047 -4,000 34,900
54 ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to RDTE,AF lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139 Forward financing	12,476	5,176 -3,300 -4,000
57 SMALL DIAMETER BOMB Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to RDTE,AF lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139 Forward financing	54,838	39,138 -7,800 -7,900
62 SBIRS HIGH Unjustified request	181,966	161,966 -20,000
65 AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT CE readiness - forward financing Program increase	53,680	50,680 -15,000 12,000
68 COMBAT TRAINING RANGES Forward financing	77,409	68,409 -9,000
70 EELV - EMD (SPACE) Program increase	296,572	396,572 100,000
76 KC-46 EMD funds excess to need (ECO)	261,724	229,924 -31,800
77 ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING EMD schedule slip	12,377	7,377 -5,000
78 COMBAT RESCUE HELICOPTER (HH-60 RECAP) Forward financing	319,331	273,331 -46,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
80 ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) Unjustified request	259,131	229,131 -30,000
81 POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE) Unjustified request	50,815	45,815 -5,000
82 WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE) COMSATCOM pilot program COMSATCOM Pathfinder 3 - transfer from SP,AF line 5 Prior year carryover	41,632	76,632 10,000 30,000 -5,000
83 AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER 10.2 AOC 10.2 program delays	28,911	21,911 -7,000
84 B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM EMD excess funds	315,615	289,015 -26,600
86 F-15 EPAWSS Excess funds	256,669	250,669 -6,000
90 PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT Preliminary design funding early to need	351,220	322,220 -29,000
91 AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS Program growth	19,062	14,562 -4,500
97 TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT Program increase	661,417	676,417 15,000
99 SPACE TEST PROGRAM Program increase	27,070	42,070 15,000
102 REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS & MATURATION Program increase	29,100	34,100 5,000
104 SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER CIVILIAN WORKFORCE Prior year carryover	176,666	171,666 -5,000
111 SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING Program increase - remotely piloted aircraft training	15,427	18,427 3,000
118 HC/MC-130 RECAP Block 8.1 forward financing	13,987	8,987 -5,000
119 B-52 SQUADRONS Program increase	78,267	83,267 5,000
121 B-1B SQUADRONS Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139	5,830	3,930 -1,900
122 B-2 SQUADRONS AEHF strategic comms	152,458	127,458 -25,000
123 MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS ASU excess funds	182,958	178,958 -4,000
126 WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS Program increase - nuclear command, control, and communications development	6,042	13,042 7,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
131 MQ-9 Program growth	151,373	138,373 -13,000
133 A-10 SQUADRONS Funding excess to need	14,853	4,853 -10,000
134 F-16 SQUADRONS Operational flight program funding excess to need	132,795	120,195 -12,600
137 F-22 SQUADRONS Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139 Small projects unjustified growth Program increase - F-22 software	387,564	376,464 -8,100 -15,000 12,000
138 F-35 SQUADRONS Follow-on modernization ahead of need	153,045	76,713 -76,332
148 JASSM Improved GPS - Department requested realignment of funds to lines 19 and 48 and RDTE,N line 139	30,002	21,902 -8,100
149 AIR AND SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER AOC weapon system modification new start early to need AOC 10.1 - Air Force requested transfer of weapon system modification new start funds	37,621	30,343 -12,278 5,000
154 COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM Program increase	10,911	15,911 5,000
165 AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS Program increase	29,439	39,439 10,000
175 SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE Unjustified request	13,880	12,380 -1,500
176 E-4B NAOC Recap - excess funds	30,948	26,048 -4,900
178 MEECN GASNT Increment 2 - excess funds	47,471	40,171 -7,300
179 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM Forward financing	46,388	37,388 -9,000
188 SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE) Underexecution	15,624	14,624 -1,000
190 ATCALS Program increase	9,770	17,770 8,000
SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY		
200 DEVELOPMENT Unjustified request	3,070	1,570 -1,500
202 SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE) Program increase - space launch range services and capability	11,867	21,867 10,000
204 ENDURANCE UAV Program increase	0	50,000 50,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
205 AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS Program increase - wide area surveillance	3,841	13,841 10,000
208 RQ-4 Forward financing	256,307	244,807 -11,500
213 ADVANCED EVALUATION PROGRAM Program decrease	116,143	0 -116,143
214 GPS III SPACE SEGMENT Program increase - operational M-code risk mitigation for OCS	141,888	171,888 30,000
228 KC-10 Continue Mode 5 program	0	3,500 3,500
233 LOGIT Contract savings	61,676	57,676 -4,000
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	13,091,557	12,817,707 -273,850

LONG RANGE STRIKE BOMBER

The Inspector General of the Department of Defense is directed to conduct an evaluation and submit a report as described under this heading in Senate Report 114-263 not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act. In addition, the agreement designates the long range strike bomber program as a congressional special interest item for purposes of transfer of funds and prior approval reprogramming procedures.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM RECAPITALIZATION

The agreement includes a provision that prohibits the obligation or expenditure of

funds provided for the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) recapitalization program on pre-milestone B activities after March 31, 2018. The agreement fully funds the request of \$128,019,000 for the program, of which only \$68,000,000 is required to conclude sufficient progress on radar risk reduction activities. The Secretary of the Air Force should apply the remaining funds to other risk reduction activities and the source selection process to accelerate entry into the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase of the program.

The Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition,

Technology, and Logistics) are directed to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act on a compressed acquisition schedule and funding profile for the JSTARS recapitalization program to achieve initial operational capability and full operational capability as early as possible. The briefing shall detail the schedule for the EMD phase including source selection and contract award for EMD.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL., DEFENSE-WIDE			
	BASIC RESEARCH		
1	DTRA UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BASIC RESEARCH..	35,436	35,436
2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES.....	362,297	362,297
3	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES.....	36,654	68,154
4	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE.....	57,791	57,791
5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM.....	69,345	79,345
6	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES & UNIV (HBCU).....	23,572	33,572
7	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.....	44,800	44,800
	TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH.....	629,895	681,395
	APPLIED RESEARCH		
8	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	17,745	17,745
9	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	115,213	115,213
10	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION.....	30,000	10,000
11	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	48,269	48,269
12	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR ADVANCEMENT S&T PRIORITIES.....	42,206	42,206
13	INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	353,635	353,635
14	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE.....	21,250	21,250
15	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.....	188,715	193,715
16	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH.....	12,183	12,183
17	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	313,843	313,843
18	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY.....	220,456	220,456
19	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY.....	221,911	211,911
20	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES.....	154,857	154,857
21	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE.....	8,420	8,420
22	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	37,820	46,220
	TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH.....	1,786,523	1,769,923

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
23	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECH INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS AD	23,902	23,902
25	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT.....	73,002	115,502
26	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING.....	19,343	19,343
27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES--PROLIF PREV & DEFEAT	266,444	266,444
28	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT.....	17,880	15,015
30	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY.....	71,843	49,643
31	ADVANCED C4ISR.....	3,626	3,626
32	ADVANCED RESEARCH.....	23,433	23,433
33	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	17,256	17,256
35	SPECIAL PROGRAM--MDA TECHNOLOGY.....	83,745	11,795
36	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS.....	182,327	182,327
37	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY.....	175,240	160,240
38	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS.....	12,048	12,048
39	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS.....	57,020	57,020
40	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY.....	---	56,513
41	TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION.....	39,923	19,923
42	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEV	127,941	132,941
43	RETRACT LARCH.....	181,977	181,977
44	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	22,030	22,030
45	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS.....	148,184	132,184
46	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.....	9,331	9,331
47	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROG	158,398	158,398
48	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	31,259	41,259
49	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	49,895	55,895
50	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS.....	11,011	40,011
52	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	65,078	65,078
53	MICROELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT....	97,826	89,826

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
54	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM.....	7,848	4,848
55	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES.....	49,807	49,807
56	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS.....	155,081	155,081
57	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY.....	428,894	419,894
58	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY.....	241,288	241,288
59	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM.....	---	250,000
60	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE.....	14,264	14,264
61	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS.....	74,943	79,943
63	ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	17,659	22,659
64	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY.....	87,135	92,135
65	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT.....	37,329	42,329
66	CWMD SYSTEMS.....	44,836	21,236
67	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT....	61,620	90,620
	TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,190,666	3,447,064
	DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION		
68	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT..	28,498	26,498
69	WALKOFF.....	89,643	89,643
71	ACQUISITION ENTERPRISE DATA AND INFORMATION SERVICES..	2,136	2,136
72	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	52,491	46,491
73	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT....	206,834	201,834
74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT...	862,080	967,780
75	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.....	138,187	138,187
76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS.....	230,077	221,977
77	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ENABLING PROGRAMS.....	401,594	426,594
78	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA.....	321,607	304,677
79	AEGIS BMD.....	959,066	919,066
80	SPACE SURVEILLANCE & TRACKING SYSTEM.....	32,129	32,129
81	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS.....	20,690	20,690
82	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT.....	439,617	433,278

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
83	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT....	47,776	47,776
84	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE INTERGRATION AND OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC).....	54,750	54,750
85	REGARDING TRENCH.....	8,785	8,785
86	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX).....	68,787	85,787
87	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS.....	103,835	268,735
88	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST.....	293,441	294,441
89	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS.....	563,576	531,476
90	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING.....	10,007	10,007
91	COALITION WARFARE.....	10,126	10,126
92	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM.....	3,893	13,893
93	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES.....	90,266	86,392
94	MISSILE DEFEAT PROJECT.....	45,000	45,000
95	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.....	844,870	834,870
97	DOD UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT.	3,320	7,320
99	WARGAMING AND SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC ANALYSIS (SSA)....	4,000	4,000
102	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY.....	23,642	23,642
104	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR.....	162,012	170,112
105	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS.....	274,148	219,346
106	BMD TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST.....	63,444	58,444
107	AEGIS BMD TEST.....	95,012	95,012
108	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST.....	83,250	88,150
109	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3).....	43,293	43,293
110	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT.....	106,038	106,038
111	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST.....	56,481	62,781
112	MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE.....	71,513	---
114	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM.....	2,636	2,636
115	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE.....	969	969
115X	RAPID PROTOTYPING PROGRAM.....	---	100,000
	TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION.....	6,919,519	7,104,761

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
116	ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT..	10,324	10,324
117	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT.....	181,303	161,303
118	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.....	266,231	281,231
120	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,288	16,288
121	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES.....	4,568	4,568
122	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	11,505	11,505
123	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE.....	1,658	1,658
124	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM.....	2,920	2,920
126	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION..	12,631	12,631
128	DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES FINANCIAL SYSTEM.....	26,657	26,657
129	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS).....	4,949	4,949
130	TRUSTED FOUNDRY.....	69,000	69,000
131	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITY.....	9,881	8,681
132	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	7,600	7,600
133	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)...	2,703	2,703
	TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT.....	628,218	622,018
134	RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS).....	4,678	4,678
135	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT.....	4,499	3,099
136	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT....	219,199	219,199
137	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS.....	28,706	28,706
138	MISSION SUPPORT.....	69,244	69,244
139	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC).....	87,080	67,080
140	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS.....	23,069	21,469
142	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION.	32,759	32,759
143	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P).....	---	130,000
144	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.....	32,429	32,429
145	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT.....	3,797	2,797
146	NUCLEAR MATTERS - PHYSICAL SECURITY.....	5,302	5,302
147	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION.....	7,246	7,246
148	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE).....	1,874	1,874

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
149	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.....	85,754	85,754
158	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,187	2,187
159	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS.....	22,650	25,650
160	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC).....	43,834	43,834
161	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING & EVALUATION	22,240	15,240
162	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION.....	19,541	21,541
163	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT)	4,759	4,759
164	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC).....	4,400	4,400
165	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS.....	4,014	4,014
166	OPERATIONS SECURITY (OPSEC).....	2,072	2,072
167	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT.....	7,464	5,464
170	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES...	857	857
171	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE.....	916	916
172	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS.....	15,336	15,336
173	CYBER INTELLIGENCE.....	18,523	10,523
175	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION.	34,384	29,984
176	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS - MDA.....	31,160	31,160
179	JOINT SERVICE PROVIDER (JSP).....	827	827
9999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	56,799	56,799
	TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	897,599	987,199
181	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS).....	4,241	4,241
182	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH & PARTNERSHIP FOR PEAC	1,424	1,424
183	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SY	287	287
184	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT.....	16,195	16,195
185	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	4,194	4,194
186	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT.....	7,861	7,861
187	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS D	33,361	33,361
189	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM.....	3,038	3,038
190	C4I INTEROPERABILITY.....	57,501	57,501

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
192	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING.....	5,935	5,509
196	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT.....	575	575
197	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING & INTEGRATION.	18,041	18,041
198	LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS).....	13,994	13,994
199	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK....	12,206	12,206
200	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI).....	34,314	34,314
201	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI).....	36,602	36,602
202	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	8,876	8,876
203	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	159,068	161,068
204	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.....	24,438	21,438
205	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER (DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION).	13,197	13,197
207	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT (JIE).....	2,789	2,789
209	FEDERAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.	75,000	75,000
210	TELEPORT PROGRAM.....	657	657
215	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE.....	1,553	1,553
220	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS.....	6,204	3,204
221	NET CENTRICITY.....	17,971	17,971
223	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	5,415	5,415
226	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS.....	3,030	3,030
229	INSIDER THREAT.....	5,034	5,034
230	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM.....	2,037	7,037
236	INTELLIGENCE MISSION DATA (IMD).....	13,800	13,800
238	PACIFIC DISASTER CENTERS.....	1,754	1,754
239	DEFENSE PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.....	2,154	2,154
240	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS).....	826	826
241	MQ-9 UAV.....	17,804	17,804
244	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEV.....	159,143	158,253
245	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT...	7,958	5,958
246	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS.....	64,895	54,895
247	WARRIOR SYSTEMS.....	44,885	65,885
248	SPECIAL PROGRAMS.....	1,949	1,949

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
249	UNMANNED ISR.....	22,117	22,117
250	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	3,316	3,316
251	SOF MARITIME SYSTEMS.....	54,577	54,577
252	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.....	3,841	3,841
253	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE.....	11,834	11,834
	TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	985,891	994,575
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	3,270,515	3,221,615
	DARPA UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION.....	---	-50,000
	TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEF-WIDE.	18,308,826	18,778,550
		=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

R-1		Budget Request	Final Bill
3 BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES		36,654	68,154
Program increase			31,500
5 NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM		69,345	79,345
Program increase			10,000
6 HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)		23,572	33,572
Program increase			10,000
10 DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION		30,000	10,000
Program decrease			-20,000
15 CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		188,715	193,715
Program increase			5,000
19 ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY		221,911	211,911
Unjustified growth			-10,000
22 SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		37,820	46,220
Program increase			3,400
Program increase - thermal signature management technology			5,000
25 COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		73,002	115,502
Program increase - Israeli tunneling			42,500
28 ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT		17,880	15,015
Test delays			-2,865
30 WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY		71,843	49,643
Directed energy research unjustified growth			-22,200
35 SPECIAL PROGRAM - MDA TECHNOLOGY		83,745	11,795
Program decrease			-71,950
37 SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY		175,240	160,240
Unjustified growth			-15,000
40 COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY		0	56,513
MOKV - transfer from line 112			56,513
41 TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION		39,923	19,923
Classified program adjustment			-20,000
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED			
42 DEVELOPMENT		127,941	132,941
Program increase			5,000
45 JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS		148,184	132,184
Program decrease			-16,000
48 MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		31,259	41,259
Program increase			10,000
49 EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		49,895	55,895
Program increase			6,000

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
50 GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	11,011	40,011
Program increase		4,000
Program increase - national security technology accelerator		25,000
53 MICROELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	97,826	89,826
Unobligated balances		-8,000
54 JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,848	4,848
Prior year carryover		-3,000
57 NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	428,894	419,894
Program decrease		-9,000
59 DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION FUND	0	250,000
Program increase		250,000
61 QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	74,943	79,943
Forward financing		-5,000
Program increase		10,000
63 ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	17,659	22,659
Program increase		5,000
64 TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	87,135	92,135
Program increase		5,000
65 OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	37,329	42,329
Program increase		5,000
66 CWMD SYSTEMS	44,836	21,236
Program decrease		-23,600
SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY		
67 DEVELOPMENT	61,620	90,620
Program increase		29,000
NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY		
68 EQUIPMENT	28,498	26,498
Unobligated balances		-2,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION		
72 PROGRAM	52,491	46,491
Unobligated balances		-6,000
73 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	206,834	201,834
THAAD development previously funded efforts		-5,000
74 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	862,080	967,780
Software delays		-5,000
Program increase		110,700
76 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	230,077	221,977
LRDR program office - transfer to line 104		-8,100
77 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ENABLING PROGRAMS	401,594	426,594
Program increase - cyber training and enhancements		25,000
78 SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	321,607	304,677
Program decrease		-16,930

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
79 AEGIS BMD	959,066	919,066
Aegis BMD 6.x development excess growth		-10,000
SM-3 IIA development excess growth		-20,000
SM-3 Block IIA FTM-29 flight test integration not required due to program delays		-10,000
82 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE C2BMC	439,617	433,278
Development and deployment unauthorized prior year funding		-7,239
Communications unjustified growth		-3,000
Program increase - FTG-11 test acceleration		3,900
86 SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	68,787	85,787
Test previously completed		-3,000
Program increase - reliability improvements and maintenance		20,000
87 ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	103,835	268,735
Israeli Upper Tier		29,100
Israeli Arrow program		56,500
Short range ballistic missile defense		79,300
88 BMD TESTS	293,441	294,441
FTT-18 and FTT-15 efficiencies		-2,000
Program increase - tech refresh		3,000
89 BMD TARGETS	563,576	531,476
Test delays		-500
MRBM T3C2 contract award delay		-40,900
Program increase - FTG-11 test acceleration		9,300
92 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,893	13,893
Program increase		10,000
93 TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	90,266	86,392
Directed energy prototype development unjustified growth		-3,874
95 ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	844,870	834,870
Program decrease		-10,000
DOD UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON		
97 DEVELOPMENT	3,320	7,320
Program increase		4,000
104 LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR	162,012	170,112
LRDR program office - transfer from line 76		8,100
105 IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS	274,148	219,346
Schedule delay		-30,000
MD97 FTG-18 RKV flight test unit long lead materials early to need		-4,000
MD97 C3 booster lack of requirements and acquisition strategy		-20,802
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT		
106 TEST	63,444	58,444
Test delays		-5,000
108 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS TEST	83,250	88,150
Program increase - FTG-11 test acceleration		4,900

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT		
111 TEST Program increase - FTG-11 test acceleration	56,481	62,781 6,300
112 MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE Change to acquisition strategy MOKV - transfer to line 40	71,513	0 -15,000 -56,513
115X RAPID PROTOTYPING PROGRAM Program increase	0	100,000 100,000
117 PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT Program rephase due to schedule slip	181,303	161,303 -20,000
118 CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM Program increase - chemical weapon detection	266,231	281,231 15,000
131 DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITY Prior year carryover	9,881	8,681 -1,200
135 JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT Prior year carryover	4,499	3,099 -1,400
139 JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC) Eliminate program growth	87,080	67,080 -20,000
140 TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS Prior year carryover	23,069	21,469 -1,600
143 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P) Classified adjustment	0	130,000 130,000
145 STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT Eliminate program growth	3,797	2,797 -1,000
159 DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS Program increase	22,650	25,650 3,000
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING &		
161 EVALUATION Eliminate program growth	22,240	15,240 -7,000
162 DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION Program increase	19,541	21,541 2,000
167 JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT Delayed new start contract award	7,464	5,464 -2,000
173 CYBER INTELLIGENCE Eliminate program growth	18,523	10,523 -8,000
COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING		
175 TRANSFORMATION Program decrease	34,384	29,984 -4,400
192 JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING Prior year carryover	5,935	5,509 -426

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
203 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM Program increase - Sharkseer	159,068	161,068 2,000
204 GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM Eliminate program growth	24,438	21,438 -3,000
220 POLICY R&D PROGRAMS Prior year carryover	6,204	3,204 -3,000
230 HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM Program increase	2,037	7,037 5,000
SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED		
244 DEVELOPMENT Special Operation mission planning environment - prior year carryover	159,143	158,253 -890
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		
245 DEVELOPMENT Contract award delay	7,958	5,958 -2,000
246 SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS Prior year carryover	64,895	54,895 -10,000
247 WARRIOR SYSTEMS Program increase Program increase - visual augmentation devices Program increase - switchblade systems	44,885	65,885 12,000 3,000 6,000
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS Classified adjustment	3,270,515	3,221,615 -48,900
DARPA UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION DARPA undistributed reduction		-50,000 -50,000

RAPID PROTOTYPING PROGRAM

The agreement includes \$100,000,000 for a rapid prototyping program. The Secretary of Defense is directed to brief the House and

Senate Appropriations Committees on a plan for execution 20 days prior to transfer or obligation of any funds for this program.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION,
DEFENSE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	78,047	78,047
LIVE FIRE TESTING	48,316	48,316
OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSIS	52,631	60,631
Program increase—threat resource analysis	8,000	8,000
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE	178,994	186,994

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND
MANAGEMENT FUNDS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

The agreement provides \$1,511,613,000 in Title V, Revolving and Management Funds.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
TITLE V		
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS		
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.....	1,371,613	1,511,613
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND.....	---	---
TOTAL, TITLE V, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS..	1,371,613	1,511,613
	=====	=====

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	56,469	196,469
Program increase—arsenal initiative	140,000	
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	63,967	63,967
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	37,132	37,132
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,214,045	1,214,045
TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	1,371,613	1,511,613

TITLE VI—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

grams. The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

The agreement provides \$35,615,831,000 in Title VI, Other Department of Defense Pro-

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
TITLE VI		
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS		
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	32,231,390	31,277,002
PROCUREMENT.....	413,219	402,161
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION.....	822,907	2,102,107
TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.....	33,467,516	33,781,270
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	147,282	119,985
PROCUREMENT.....	15,132	15,132
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION.....	388,609	388,609
TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS.....	551,023	523,726
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	844,800	998,800
JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND.....	99,300	---
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.....	322,035	312,035
TOTAL, TITLE VI, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS.....	35,284,674	35,615,831
=====	=====	=====

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
IN-HOUSE CARE.....	9,240,160	9,159,329
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE.....	15,738,759	15,082,759
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT.....	2,367,759	2,279,627
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.....	1,743,749	1,737,749
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	311,380	307,578
EDUCATION AND TRAINING.....	743,231	691,458
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS.....	2,086,352	2,018,502
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	32,231,390	31,277,002
PROCUREMENT		
INITIAL OUTFITTING.....	20,611	20,611
REPLACEMENT AND MODERNIZATION.....	360,727	349,669
JOINT OPERATIONAL MEDICINE INFORMATION SYSTEM.....	2,413	2,413
DOD HEALTH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MODERNIZATION.....	29,468	29,468
SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT.....	413,219	402,161
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION		
RESEARCH.....	9,097	9,097
EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT.....	58,517	58,517
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.....	221,226	221,226
DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION.....	96,602	96,602
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT.....	364,057	364,057
MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT.....	58,410	58,410
CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT.....	14,998	14,998
UNDISTRIBUTED MEDICAL RESEARCH.....	---	1,279,200
SUBTOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	822,907	2,102,107
TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.....	33,467,516	33,781,270
	=====	=====

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

	Budget Request	Final Bill
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
IN-HOUSE CARE	9,240,160	9,159,329
Pharmacy supplies unjustified growth	-9,000	
Overestimation of MTF utilization	-63,200	
Printing and reproduction excess growth	-2,500	
Travel unjustified growth	-6,131	
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,738,759	15,082,759
Pharmacy benefit reform unauthorized	17,000	
Health benefit reform unauthorized	-57,000	
Other costs unjustified growth	-73,000	
Historical underexecution	-575,000	
ABA autism therapy reimbursement	32,000	
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,367,759	2,279,627
Therapeutic service dog training program	5,000	
Travel unjustified growth	-4,100	
Other health activities excess growth	-15,000	
Historical underexecution	-74,032	
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,743,749	1,737,749
Other costs unjustified growth	-6,000	
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	311,380	307,578
Travel unjustified growth	-2,232	
IT contract support services excess growth	-1,570	
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	743,231	691,458
Travel unjustified growth	-883	
Historical underexecution	-25,517	
HPSP reduction not properly accounted	-25,373	
BASE OPERATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS	2,086,352	2,018,502
Other costs unjustified growth	-1,850	
Visual information systems underexecution	-2,000	
Initial outfitting of new construction ahead of need	-60,000	
Telecommunications contract requirements unjustified growth	-4,000	
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	32,231,390	31,277,002
PROCUREMENT		
Initial outfitting of new construction ahead of need	-9,000	
Excess price growth	-2,058	
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	413,219	402,161
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
Peer-reviewed alcohol and substance abuse disorders research	4,000	
Peer-reviewed ALS research	7,500	
Peer-reviewed alzheimer research	15,000	
Peer-reviewed autism research	7,500	
Peer-reviewed bone marrow failure disease research	3,000	
Peer-reviewed breast cancer research	120,000	
Peer-reviewed cancer research	60,000	

	Budget Request	Final Bill
Peer-reviewed Duchenne muscular dystrophy research	3,200	
Peer-reviewed epilepsy research	7,500	
Peer-reviewed gulf war illness research	20,000	
Peer-reviewed hearing restoration research	10,000	
Peer-reviewed kidney cancer research	10,000	
Peer-reviewed lung cancer research	12,000	
Peer-reviewed lupus research	5,000	
Peer-reviewed medical research	300,000	
Peer-reviewed multiple sclerosis research	6,000	
Peer-reviewed orthopedic research	30,000	
Peer-reviewed ovarian cancer research	20,000	
Peer-reviewed prostate cancer research	90,000	
Peer-reviewed spinal cord research	30,000	
Peer-reviewed reconstructive transplant research	12,000	
Peer-reviewed tickborne disease research	5,000	
Peer-reviewed traumatic brain injury and psychological health research	125,000	
Peer-reviewed tuberous sclerosis complex research	6,000	
Peer-reviewed vision research	15,000	
Global HIV/AIDS prevention	8,000	
HIV/AIDS program increase	12,900	
Joint warfighter medical research	50,000	
Orthotics and prosthetics outcome research	10,000	
Trauma clinical research program	10,000	
Restore core funding reduction	264,600	
TOTAL, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	822,907	2,102,107

REPROGRAMMING GUIDANCE FOR THE DEFENSE
HEALTH PROGRAM

Concerns remain regarding the transfer of funds from the In-House Care budget sub-activity to pay for contractor-provided medical care. To limit such transfers and improve oversight within the Defense Health Program operation and maintenance account, the agreement includes a provision which caps the funds available for Private Sector Care under the TRICARE program subject to prior approval reprogramming procedures. The provision and accompanying explanatory statement language should not be interpreted as limiting the amount of funds that may be transferred to the In-House Care budget sub-activity from other budget sub-activities within the Defense Health Program. In addition, funding for the In-House Care budget sub-activity continues to be designated as a congressional special interest item. Any transfer of funds from the In-House Care budget sub-activity into the Private Sector Care budget sub-activity or any other budget sub-activity requires the Secretary of Defense to follow prior approval reprogramming procedures for operation and maintenance funds.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide written notification to the congressional defense committees of cumulative transfers in excess of \$10,000,000 out of the Private Sector Care budget sub-activity not later than fifteen days after such a transfer. Furthermore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act that delineates transfers of funds in excess of \$10,000,000, and the dates any transfers occurred, from the Private Sector Care budget sub-activity to any other budget sub-activity groups for fiscal year 2016.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) is directed to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on budget execution data for all of the Defense Health Program budget activities and to adequately reflect changes to the budget activities requested by the Services in future budget submissions.

PEER-REVIEWED CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM

The agreement provides \$60,000,000 for the peer-reviewed cancer research program to research cancers not addressed in the breast, prostate, ovarian, kidney, and lung cancer research programs.

The funds provided in the peer-reviewed cancer research program are directed to be used to conduct research in the following areas: bladder cancer, brain cancer, colorectal cancer, immunotherapy, listeria-based regimens for cancer, liver cancer, lymphoma, melanoma and other skin can-

cers, mesothelioma, neuroblastoma, pancreatic cancer, pediatric brain tumors, stomach cancer, and cancer in children, adolescents, and young adults.

The reports directed under this heading in House Report 114-577 and Senate Report 114-263 are still required.

PEER-REVIEWED MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The agreement provides \$300,000,000 for a peer-reviewed medical research program. The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Service Surgeons General, is directed to select medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health. Research areas considered under this funding are restricted to the following areas: acute lung injury, antimicrobial resistance, arthritis, burn pit exposure, chronic migraine and post-traumatic headache, congenital heart disease, constrictive bronchiolitis, diabetes, diarrheal diseases, dystonia, early trauma thermal regulation, eating disorders, emerging infectious diseases, epidermolysis bullosa, focal segmental glomerulosclerosis, Fragile X, Guillain-Barre syndrome, hepatitis B and C, hereditary angioedema, hydrocephalus, immunomonitoring of intestinal transplants, inflammatory bowel diseases, influenza, integrative medicine, interstitial cystitis, malaria, metals toxicology, mitochondrial disease, musculoskeletal disorders, nanomaterials for bone regeneration, non-opioid pain management, pancreatitis, pathogen-inactivated dried cryoprecipitate, polycystic kidney disease, post-traumatic osteoarthritis, pulmonary fibrosis, respiratory health, Rett syndrome, rheumatoid arthritis, scleroderma, sleep disorders, spinal muscular atrophy, sustained-release drug delivery, tinnitus, tuberculosis, vaccine development for infectious disease, vascular malformations, and women's heart disease. The additional funding provided under the peer-reviewed medical research program shall be devoted only to the purposes listed above.

ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD SYSTEM

Concerns remain with the progress being made by the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs to fully develop, procure, and deploy an interoperable electronic health record solution. The two systems must be completely and meaningfully interoperable, and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) is encouraged to focus on the overall goal of seamless compatibility between the two Departments' electronic health record systems.

For the necessary oversight of this important program, the Program Executive Officer (PEO) for the Defense Healthcare Management Systems (DHMS) is directed to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees and the Government Ac-

countability Office on the cost and schedule of the program, to include milestones, knowledge points, and acquisition timelines, as well as quarterly obligation reports. These reports should also include any changes to the deployment timeline, including benchmarks, for full operating capability; any refinements to the cost estimate for full operating capability and the total lifecycle cost of the program; an assurance that the acquisition strategy will comply with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the federal government; the status of the effort to achieve interoperability between the electronic health record systems of the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, including the scope, cost, schedule, mapping to health data standards, and performance benchmarks of the interoperable record; and the progress toward developing, implementing, and fielding the interoperable electronic health record throughout the two Departments' medical facilities.

The PEO DHMS is directed to continue briefing the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on a quarterly basis, coinciding with the report submission. Given that full deployment of the new electronic health record is not scheduled until fiscal year 2022, the Department of Defense is expected to continue working on interim modifications and enhancements to the current system to improve interoperability in the near-term. Additionally, the PEO DHMS is directed to provide written notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees prior to obligating any contract, or combination of contracts, for electronic health record systems in excess of \$5,000,000.

Additionally, the Director of the Interagency Program Office is directed to continue to provide quarterly briefings on standards development, how those standards are being incorporated by the two Departments, and the progress of interoperability to the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees for Defense and Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies. In an effort to ensure government-wide accountability, the PEO DHMS, in coordination with the appropriate personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, is directed to provide the Federal Chief Information Officer of the United States with monthly updates on progress made by the two Departments to reach interoperability and modernize their respective electronic health records.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS
DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	147,282	119,985
Recovered chemical warfare materiel project excess to need	-10,997
Recovered chemical warfare materiel project Panama operations ahead of need	-16,300
PROCUREMENT	15,132	15,132
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	388,609	388,609
TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE	551,023	523,726

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-
DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
COUNTER-NARCOTICS SUPPORT	730,087	626,087
Transfer to National Guard counter-drug program	—99,000
Transfer to National Guard counter-drug schools	—5,000
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	114,713	118,713
Young Marines—drug demand reduction	4,000
NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAM	0	234,000
Transfer from counter-narcotics support	99,000
NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG SCHOOLS	0	135,000
Transfer from counter-narcotics support	20,000
Program increase	5,000
TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	844,800	998,800

JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND

The agreement does not recommend funding for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	318,882	308,882
Overestimation of civilian full-time equivalents	—10,000
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	3,153	3,153
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	322,035	312,035

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL QUARTERLY
END STRENGTH REPORTS

The Department of Defense Inspector General is directed to provide quarterly reports

to the congressional defense committees on civilian personnel end strength not later than 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

TITLE VII—RELATED AGENCIES

The agreement provides \$1,029,596,000 in Title VII, Related Agencies. The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	FINAL BILL
TITLE VII		
RELATED AGENCIES		
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND.....	514,000	514,000
INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT (ICMA).....	533,596	515,596
TOTAL, TITLE VII, RELATED AGENCIES.....	1,047,596	1,029,596

CLASSIFIED ANNEX

Adjustments to classified programs are addressed in a separate, detailed, and comprehensive classified annex. The Intelligence Community, the Department of Defense, and other organizations are expected to fully comply with the recommendations and directions in the classified annex accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

The agreement provides \$514,000,000 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

The agreement provides \$515,596,000, a decrease of \$18,000,000 below the budget request, for the Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The agreement incorporates general provisions from the House and Senate versions of the bill which were not amended. Those general provisions that were addressed in the agreement are as follows:

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides general transfer authority not to exceed \$4,500,000,000. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which identifies tables as Explanation of Project Level Adjustments. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which provides for the establishment of a baseline for the application of reprogramming and transfer authorities

for the current fiscal year. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which places restrictions on multi-year procurement contracts. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House regarding management of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which restricts the use of funds to support any nonappropriated funds activity that procures malt beverages and wine. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which provides for the transfer of funds for Mentor-Protégé Programs. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House regarding limitations on the use of funds to purchase anchor and mooring chains. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which makes funds available to maintain competitive rates at the arsenals. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to demilitarize or dispose of certain small firearms. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House regarding incentive payments authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides funding

from various appropriations for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which prohibits funding from being used to establish new Department of Defense Federally Funded Research and Development Centers with certain limitations. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to disestablish, close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program on probation. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which makes permanent the authority for the Defense Intelligence Agency to use funds provided in this Act for the provisioning of information systems. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House regarding mitigation of environmental impacts on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which places restrictions on the use of funds to consolidate or relocate any element of the Air Force Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational Repair Squadron Engineer. The House bill contained no similar provision.

(RESCISSESS)

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House recommending rescissions and provides for the rescission of \$2,002,622,000. The Senate bill contained a similar provision. The rescissions agreed to are:

2015 Appropriations:

Aircraft Procurement, Army:		
Network and mission plan		\$15,000,000
Other Procurement, Army:		
Family of heavy tactical vehicles	13,210,000	
Army CA/MISO GPF equipment	4,585,000	
Information systems	5,250,000	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy:		
P-8A Poseidon	50,000,000	
EA-18G	38,000,000	
Weapons Procurement, Navy:		
Cruiser modernization weapons	4,000,000	
Tomahawk	5,000,000	
HARM mods	2,933,000	
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps		
LR LAP 6 inch long range attack projectile	43,600,000	
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:		
HC-130J	18,000,000	
MC-130J	12,000,000	
MQ-1 mods	2,000,000	
MQ-9 depot activation	25,000,000	
Other Procurement, Air Force:		
Classified programs	25,500,000	

2016 Appropriations:

Aircraft Procurement, Army:		
UH-60 Blackhawk M model (MYP)—AP	34,594,000	
Procurement of Ammunition, Army:		
Demolition munitions, all types	5,000,000	
Other Procurement, Army:		
Joint light tactical vehicle	6,100,000	
Generators and associated equipment	53,000,000	
Information systems	25,000,000	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy:		
F-35 CV	6,755,000	
Weapons Procurement, Navy:		
Sidewinder	5,307,000	
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps:		
155MM long range land attack projectile	2,100,000	
Non lethals	3,868,000	
81mm, all types	1,000,000	
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy:		
DDG-51	50,000,000	
LPD-17	14,906,000	

LX (R) (AP-CY)	236,000,000
Other Procurement, Navy:	
AQSS-20A	10,810,000
Remote minehunting system	44,247,000
Surface combatant HM&E	1,317,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:	
F-35—AP	47,000,000
C-130J—AP	20,000,000
HC-130J	12,500,000
KC-46A tanker	197,700,000
KC-135 block 40/45 installs	9,000,000
KC-135 post production support	1,500,000
MC-130J	28,500,000
Other production changes	67,000,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force:	
Classified programs	34,700,000
Space Procurement, Air Force:	
Evolved expendable launch vehicle	100,000,000
Other Procurement, Air Force:	
Comsec equipment	10,000,000
Combat training ranges	10,000,000
Night vision goggles	1,569,000
Classified programs	34,800,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide:	
Classified programs	2,600,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
Joint light tactical vehicle	5,893,000
Concepts experimentation	2,253,000
Information technology development	16,700,000
Manpower, personnel, training advanced technology	2,500,000
Tactical command and control hardware and software	6,056,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy:	
Tactical combat training system II	9,219,000
Tactical AIM missiles	22,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force:	
Ground based strategic deterrent	18,000,000
KC-46	375,300,000
Nuclear weapons modernization	27,000,000
Integrated Personnel and Pay System	26,000,000
Minuteman squadrons	22,000,000
Tactical AIM missiles	7,600,000
Airborne Warning and Control System	9,000,000
Classified programs	47,650,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide:	
Defense technology offset	51,500,000
Advanced IT services joint program office	10,000,000
Classified programs	3,000,000

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which restricts procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits the use of funds to retire or divest RQ-4 Global Hawk aircraft. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House placing restrictions on funding for competitively bid space launch services. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides funding to the United Service Organizations and the Red Cross. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits funds from being used to modify Fleet Forces Command command and control relationships. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which restricts funding for repairs and maintenance of military housing units. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the Senate which directs that up to \$1,000,000 from Operation and Maintenance, Navy shall be available for transfer to the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which places restrictions on the transfer to any nongovernmental entity certain ammunition held by the Department of Defense. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits funds from being used to separate the National Intelligence Program from the Department of Defense budget. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which provides a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House related to funding for the Israeli Cooperative Defense programs. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which reduces funding due to favorable foreign exchange rates. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which provides funds for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits changes to the Army Contracting Command-New Jersey without prior notification. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

(RESCISSON)

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the Senate recommending a rescis-

sion and provides for a rescission of \$531,000,000 from the Defense Workforce Acquisition Fund. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits the use of funds to violate the Child Soldier Prevention Act of 2008. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which makes funds available to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds to support military infrastructure in Guam. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which provides that funds appropriated in this Act may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House related to agreements with the Russian Federation pertaining to United States ballistic missile defense systems. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which provides the Director of National Intelligence with general transfer authority with certain limitations. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the transfer of detainees from Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba except in

accordance with section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) and section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328). The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits funds from being used for the purchase or manufacture of a United States flag unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, U.S.C. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House that requires the Secretary of Defense to post grant awards on a public website in a searchable format. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House regarding funding for flight demonstration teams at locations outside the United States. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds by the National Security Agency to target United States persons under authorities granted in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the treaty is ratified by the Senate. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which limits the availability of funds authorized for counterterrorism support to foreign partners. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits introducing armed forces into Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to retire the A-10 fleet. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which limits the use of funds for the T-AO(X) program. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which reduces Working Capital Funds to reflect excess cash balances. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which reduces the total

amount appropriated to reflect lower than anticipated fuel costs. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to retire the KC-10 fleet. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the retirement of EC-130H aircraft. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds for gaming or entertainment that involves nude entertainers. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds for Base Realignment and Closure. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which grants the Secretary of Defense the authority to use funds for Office of Personnel and Management background investigations. The Senate bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which restricts the use of funds for the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System recapitalization program for pre-milestone B activities after March 31, 2018. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to close or transfer from the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense the United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides authority to use readiness funds for Zika related activities. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which restricts the use of funds to maintain or establish a computer network unless it blocks pornography. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

(RESCISSION)

The agreement adds a provision which terminates the Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund and rescinds unobligated balances. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provisions.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of funds to provide arms, training, or other assistance to the Azov Battalion. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement adds a provision which provides reprogramming authority for the Global Engagement Center. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provisions.

The agreement adds a provision addressing the transfer of funds out of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provisions.

The agreement adds a provision which provides that the explanatory statement regarding this Act shall have the same effect with respect to allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a Report of the Committee on Appropriations. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provisions.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits the use of funds to impede certain investigations conducted by Inspectors General funded under this Act. The House bill contained no similar provision.

TITLE IX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

The agreement provides \$61,822,000,000 in Title IX, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The agreement includes a number of reporting requirements related to contingency operations and building capacity efforts. The Secretary of Defense is directed to continue to report incremental costs for all named operations in the Central Command Area of Responsibility on a quarterly basis and to submit, also on a quarterly basis, commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, the Counter-Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant Train and Equip Fund, and for all security cooperation programs funded under the Defense Security Cooperation Agency in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account.

The agreement eliminates the Cost of War reporting requirement for detailed monthly obligation and expenditure data by appropriation account. This reporting requirement is burdensome for the Department of Defense and the information provided is either duplicative of information available through other means or is unnecessary for effective budget oversight.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY		
BA-1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	315,786	315,786
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	74,526	74,526
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	133,911	133,911
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	11,866	11,866
INCENTIVE PAYS	1,543	1,543
SPECIAL PAYS	15,411	15,411
ALLOWANCES	11,970	11,970
SEPARATION PAY	4,541	4,541
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	24,158	24,158
TOTAL, BA-1	593,712	593,712
BA-2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	506,209	506,209
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	119,465	119,465
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	255,613	255,613
INCENTIVE PAYS	959	959
SPECIAL PAYS	47,347	47,347
ALLOWANCES	46,094	46,094
SEPARATION PAY	10,063	10,063
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	38,725	38,725
TOTAL, BA-2	1,024,475	1,024,475
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	59,079	59,079
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	222,742	222,742
TOTAL, BA-4	281,821	281,821
BA-5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	32,597	32,597
ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	12,059	12,059
TOTAL, BA-5	44,656	44,656
BA-6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	2,194	2,194
DEATH GRATUITIES	1,200	1,200
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	89,464	89,464
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	8,184	8,184
TRAUMATIC INJURY PROTECTION COVERAGE	5,872	5,872
TOTAL, BA-6	106,914	106,914
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-102,930
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	2,051,578	1,948,648
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY		
BA-1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	58,913	58,913
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	13,903	13,903
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	19,879	19,879
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	2,141	2,141
INCENTIVE PAYS	480	480
SPECIAL PAYS	3,128	3,128

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
ALLOWANCES	7,280	7,280
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	4,507	4,507
TOTAL, BA-1	110,231	110,231
BA-2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	76,964	76,964
RETired PAY ACCRUAL	18,163	18,163
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	40,353	40,353
INCENTIVE PAYS	211	211
SPECIAL PAYS	5,931	5,931
ALLOWANCES	16,913	16,913
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	5,888	5,888
TOTAL, BA-2	164,423	164,423
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	8,693	8,693
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	25,446	25,446
TOTAL, BA-4	34,139	34,139
BA-5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL		
ACCESSION TRAVEL	1,427	1,427
OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	1,825	1,825
ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	4,634	4,634
SEPARATION TRAVEL	1,937	1,937
TOTAL, BA-5	9,823	9,823
BA-6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
DEATH GRATUITIES	300	300
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	6,959	6,959
RESERVE INCOME REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	9	9
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	4,673	4,673
TOTAL, BA-6	11,941	11,941
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-3,130
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	330,557	327,427
<hr/>		
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
BA-1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	29,855	29,855
RETired PAY ACCRUAL	7,046	7,046
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	8,814	8,814
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	996	996
SPECIAL PAYS (AND INCENTIVE PAYS)	1,616	1,616
ALLOWANCES	1,939	1,939
SEPARATION PAY	5,939	5,939
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	2,284	2,284
TOTAL, BA-1	58,489	58,489
BA-2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	17,509	17,509
RETired PAY ACCRUAL	4,132	4,132
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	8,798	8,798
INCENTIVE PAYS	16	16
SPECIAL PAYS	4,449	4,449
ALLOWANCES	6,012	6,012
SEPARATION PAY	74,707	74,707
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	1,339	1,339

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
TOTAL, BA-2	116,962	116,962
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	2,103	2,103
TOTAL, BA-4	2,103	2,103
BA-6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	302	302
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	1,877	1,877
TOTAL, BA-6	2,179	2,179
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	179,733	179,733
MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
BA-1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS		
BASIC PAY	104,751	104,751
RETIRIED PAY ACCRUAL	24,721	24,721
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	33,351	33,351
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	3,745	3,745
SPECIAL PAYS	5,227	5,227
ALLOWANCES	5,610	5,610
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	8,013	8,013
TOTAL, BA-1	185,418	185,418
BA-2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC PAY	199,730	199,730
RETIRIED PAY ACCRUAL	47,136	47,136
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	86,671	86,671
SPECIAL PAYS	20,006	20,006
ALLOWANCES	19,146	19,146
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	15,279	15,279
TOTAL, BA-2	387,968	387,968
BA-4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL		
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	22,208	22,208
SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	93,369	93,369
TOTAL, BA-4	115,577	115,577
BA-6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS		
DEATH GRATUITIES	1,000	1,000
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	24,626	24,626
SGLI EXTRA HAZARD PAYMENTS	5,307	5,307
TOTAL, BA-6	30,933	30,933
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-14,190
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	719,896	705,706
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	2,773	2,773
SPECIAL TRAINING	39,733	39,733
TOTAL, BA-1	42,506	42,506
TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	42,506	42,506

M-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
SPECIAL TRAINING	11,574	11,574
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	355	355
TOTAL, BA-1	11,929	11,929
TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	11,929	11,929
RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
SPECIAL TRAINING	3,700	3,700
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	64	64
TOTAL, BA-1	3,764	3,764
TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	3,764	3,764
RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
SPECIAL TRAINING	20,535	20,535
TOTAL, BA-1	20,535	20,535
TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	20,535	20,535
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS and DRILLS 24/48)	33,702	33,702
SCHOOL TRAINING	47,658	47,658
SPECIAL TRAINING	105,939	105,939
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	9,173	9,173
TOTAL, BA-1	196,472	196,472
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	196,472	196,472
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE		
BA-1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING		
SPECIAL TRAINING	5,288	5,288
TOTAL, BA-1	5,288	5,288
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	5,288	5,288
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	3,562,258	3,442,008

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
111 MANEUVER UNITS Army requested transfer to title IX WTCV,A lines 5 and 13 OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	723,945	938,145 -10,800 225,000
112 MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	5,904	5,904
113 ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	38,614	38,614
114 THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,651,817	1,651,817
115 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT Army requested transfer to title IX WTCV,A lines 5 and 13	835,138	703,138 -132,000
116 AVIATION ASSETS Program increase - support eleventh CAB	165,044	197,544 32,500
121 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT Army requested transfer to title IX WTCV,A lines 5 and 13 OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	1,756,378	2,254,378 -2,000 500,000
122 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	348,174	348,174
123 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	350,000	350,000
131 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT Program increase - support eleventh CAB	40,000	51,000 11,000
135 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES LOGCAP - unjustified program growth	5,990,878	5,755,878 -235,000
136 COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	5,000	5,000
137 RESET OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	1,092,542	1,625,250 532,708
138 COMBATANT COMMAND DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	79,568	79,568
212 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS Army requested transfer to line 421 and title IX WTCV,A lines 5 and 13	350,200	130,000 -220,200
321 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	3,565	3,565
323 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	9,021	9,021
324 TRAINING SUPPORT	2,434	2,434
334 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	1,254	1,254
421 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION Army requested transfer from line 212	740,400	860,400 120,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
424 AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	13,974	13,974
434 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	105,508	105,508
437 REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	165,678	165,678
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	835,551	835,551
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-438,727
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	15,310,587	15,693,068
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
1A1A MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from Title II	860,621	1,260,621 400,000
1A4A AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	4,603	4,603
1A4N AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	159,049	159,049
1A5A AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	113,994	113,994
1A6A AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,840	1,840
1A9A AVIATION LOGISTICS	35,529	35,529
1B1B MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	1,073,080	1,498,080 425,000
1B2B SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	17,306	17,306
1B4B SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	2,903,431	3,303,431 400,000
1C1C COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	21,257	21,257
1C4C WARFARE TACTICS	22,603	22,603
1C5C OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	22,934	22,934
1C6C COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	568,511	568,511
1C7C EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	11,358	11,358
1D3D IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	61,000	61,000
1D4D WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	289,045	289,045
1D7D OTHER WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	8,000	8,000
BSM1 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	27,089	27,089
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	219,525	219,525
2B1G AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS / INACTIVATIONS	1,530	1,530
2C1H EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM	8,904	8,904

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
2C3H COAST GUARD SUPPORT Coast Guard funded in Department of Homeland Security bill	162,692	0 -162,692
3B1K SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	43,365	43,365
4A1M ADMINISTRATION	3,764	3,764
4A2M EXTERNAL RELATIONS	515	515
4A4M MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,409	5,409
4A5M OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,578	1,578
4A6M SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	25,617	25,617
4B1N SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	126,700	126,700
4B3N ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	9,261	9,261
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	17,281	17,281
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-2,350
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	6,827,391	7,887,349

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
1A1A OPERATIONAL FORCES OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	703,489	878,489 175,000
1A2A FIELD LOGISTICS	266,094	266,094
1A3A DEPOT MAINTENANCE	147,000	147,000
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	18,576	218,576 200,000
3B4D TRAINING SUPPORT	31,750	31,750
4A3G SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	73,800	73,800
999 OTHER PROGRAMS	3,650	3,650
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-12,100
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	1,244,359	1,607,259

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
011A PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	1,339,461	1,764,461 425,000
011C COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES Classified program transfer	1,096,021	986,021 -110,000
011D AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	152,278	152,278
011M DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,185,506	1,185,506

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
011R FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	56,700	56,700
011Z BASE SUPPORT	941,714	941,714
012A GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219	30,219
012C OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	207,696	207,696
012F TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	79,893	79,893
013A LAUNCH FACILITIES	869	869
013C SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008	5,008
015A COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,081	100,081
021A AIRLIFT OPERATIONS OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	2,774,729 400,000	3,174,729 400,000
021D MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	108,163	108,163
021M DEPOT MAINTENANCE OCO/GWOT operations - transfer from title II	891,102 400,000	1,291,102 400,000
021Z BASE SUPPORT	3,686	3,686
031Z BASE SUPPORT	52,740	52,740
032A SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	4,500	4,500
041A LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,716	86,716
041Z BASE SUPPORT	59,133	59,133
042B SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	165,348	165,348
042G OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES Authorization adjustment - Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq	141,883 -25,058	116,825 -25,058
044A INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	61	61
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,323	15,323
BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT UNJUSTIFIED GROWTH		-10,000
PREVIOUSLY FUNDED REQUIREMENT		-45,550
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FOR INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE	0	23,376
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	9,498,830	10,556,598
<hr/>		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
<hr/>		
1PL2 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND Previously funded requirement	2,650,651	2,636,522 -14,129
4GT6 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	13,436	13,436

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
4GT9 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	47,579	47,579
4GTA DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	111,986	111,986
ES18 DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	13,317	13,317
4GTJ DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	67,000	67,000
4GT0 DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	13,564	13,564
4GTD DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,412,000	1,882,000
Lift and Sustain		-100,000
Jordan and Lebanon border security - transfer to Counter-ISIL Train		-180,000
and Equip Fund		
Consolidation of building partner capacity efforts - Transfer from		
CTPF		750,000
DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	0	62,800
Mission enablers - Transfer from title IX JIDF		62,800
4GTN OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	31,106	31,106
4GTQ WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	3,137	3,137
9999 OTHER PROGRAMS	1,618,397	1,594,202
Previously funded requirement		-19,195
Classified program adjustment		-5,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	5,982,173	6,476,649
<hr/>		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE		
112 MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	708	708
113 ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	14,822	14,822
114 THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	375	375
115 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,088	2,088
116 AVIATION ASSETS	608	608
121 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	5,425	5,425
131 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	14,653	14,653
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	38,679	38,679
<hr/>		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE		
1A5A AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,500	16,500
1A9A AVIATION LOGISTICS	2,522	2,522
1C6C COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	7,243	7,243
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	26,265	26,265

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE		
1A1A OPERATING FORCES	2,500	2,500
BSS1 BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	804	804
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	3,304	3,304
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE		
011M DEPOT MAINTENANCE	51,086	51,086
011Z BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	6,500	6,500
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	57,586	57,586
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
111 MANEUVER UNITS	16,149	16,149
112 MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	748	748
113 ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	34,707	34,707
114 THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	10,472	10,472
116 AVIATION ASSETS	32,804	32,804
121 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	12,435	12,435
131 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	18,800	18,800
133 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	920	920
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	127,035	127,035
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
011G MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	3,400	3,400
011Z BASE SUPPORT	16,600	16,600
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	20,000	20,000
AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
Defense Forces		
Sustainment	2,173,341	2,173,341
Infrastructure	48,262	48,262
Equipment and Transportation	76,216	821,216
Program increase – Afghan aviation		745,000
Training and Operations	220,139	289,139
Program increase – Afghan aviation		69,000

O-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
Interior Forces		
Sustainment	860,441	860,441
Infrastructure	20,837	20,837
Equipment and Transportation	8,153	8,153
Training and Operations	41,326	41,326
TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	3,448,715	4,262,715
<hr/>		
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	1,000,000	0
Program decrease		-250,000
Consolidation of building partner capacity efforts - transfer to title IX		
OM,DW		-750,000
TOTAL, COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	1,000,000	0
<hr/>		
IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	630,000	0
Transfer to Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund		-580,000
Program decrease		-50,000
TOTAL, IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	630,000	0
<hr/>		
SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP	250,000	0
Transfer to Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund		-220,000
Program decrease		-30,000
TOTAL, SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	250,000	0
<hr/>		
COUNTER-ISIL TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND		
COUNTER-ISIL TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	0	980,000
Transfer from Iraq Train and Equip Fund		580,000
Transfer from Syria Train and Equip Fund		220,000
Jordan and Lebanon border security - transfer from title IX OM,DW		180,000
TOTAL, COUNTER-ISIL TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	0	980,000
<hr/>		
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	44,464,924	47,736,507

COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM

The agreement recommends \$5,000,000 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan for fiscal year 2017. As directed in section 9005 of this Act,

not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter, the Army shall submit commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the CERP to the congressional defense committees.

PROCUREMENT

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
6 AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN (OCO/GWOT)	78,040	78,040
15 MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (OCO/GWOT)	21,400	21,400
20 EMARSS SEMA MODS (OCO/GWOT)	42,700	42,700
26 RQ-7 UAV MODS (OCO/GWOT)	1,775	1,775
27 UAS MODS (OCO/GWOT)	4,420	4,420
30 CMWS (OCO/GWOT)	56,115	56,115
31 CIRCM (OCO/GWOT)	108,721	108,721
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	313,171	313,171
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
4 HELLFIRE SYSTEM SUMMARY (OCO/GWOT) Previously funded requirement	455,830	228,330 -227,500
7 JAVELIN SYSTEM SUMMARY (OCO/GWOT)	15,567	15,567
8 TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY (OCO/GWOT)	80,652	80,652
10 GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) (OCO/GWOT)	75,991	75,991
LETHAL MINIATURE AERIAL MISSILE SYSTEM (LMAMS) 12 (OCO/GWOT)	4,777	4,777
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	632,817	405,317
PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY		
6 BRADLEY UPGRADE PROGRAM (OCO/GWOT) Army requested transfer from title IX OM,A lines 111, 113, 115, 121, and 212	0	72,800 72,800
8 PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) (OCO/GWOT) Estimated contract savings	125,184	122,584 -2,600
10 ASSAULT BRIGADE (MOD) (OCO/GWOT)	5,950	5,950
15 M1 ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (OCO/GWOT) Army requested transfer from title IX OM,A lines 111, 113, 115, 121, and 212	0	172,200 172,200
18 MORTAR SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	22,410	22,410
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY	153,544	395,944

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
2 CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	9,642	9,642
4 CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	6,607	6,607
5 CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	1,077	1,077
6 CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	28,534	28,534
7 CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	20,000	20,000
8 CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT) Unit cost growth	7,423	6,923 -500
9 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	10,000	10,000
10 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	2,677	2,677
CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES 12 (OCO/GWOT)	8,999	8,999
14 ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155M, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	30,348	30,348
15 PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982 (OCO/GWOT)	140	140
ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL TYPES 16 (OCO/GWOT)	29,655	29,655
17 MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	16,866	16,866
18 SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT) Army identified excess funds	10,353	0 -10,353
19 SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	63,210	63,210
20 ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	42,851	42,851
22 DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	6,373	6,373
23 GRENADES, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	4,143	4,143
24 SIGNALS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	1,852	1,852
27 NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	773	773
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	301,523	290,670
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
2 SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED (OCO/GWOT)	4,180	4,180
8 FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO/GWOT)	299,476	299,476
10 FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO/GWOT)	6,122	6,122
11 PLS ESP (OCO/GWOT)	106,358	106,358

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
HEAVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV 12 (OCO/GWOT)	203,766	203,766
13 TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	101,154	101,154
14 MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP (OCO/GWOT) Maintain level of effort	155,456	125,456 -30,000
19 WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK (OCO/GWOT)	9,572	9,572
25 SHF TERM (OCO/GWOT)	24,000	24,000
47 CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE (OCO/GWOT)	1,550	1,550
51 COMSEC (OCO/GWOT)	1,928	1,928
INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM 56 (OCO/GWOT)	20,510	20,510
62 DCGS-A (OCO/GWOT)	33,032	33,032
64 TROJAN (OCO/GWOT)	3,305	3,305
CI HUMINT AUTO REPORTING AND COLL (CHARCS) 66 (OCO/GWOT)	7,233	7,233
69 BIOMETRIC TACTICAL COLLECTION DEVICES (OCO/GWOT)	5,670	5,670
70 LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR (OCO/GWOT)	25,892	25,892
FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES 74 (OCO/GWOT)	11,610	11,610
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES 75 (OCO/GWOT)	23,890	23,890
INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS 80 (OCO/GWOT)	4,270	4,270
89 MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM (OCO/GWOT)	2,572	2,572
AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYSTEM 92 (OCO/GWOT)	69,958	69,958
102 AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	9,900	9,900
ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) 108 (OCO/GWOT)	96	96
114 CBRN DEFENSE (OCO/GWOT)	1,841	1,841
115 TACTICAL BRIDGING (OCO/GWOT)	26,000	26,000
124 ROBOTICS AND APPLIQUE SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	268	268
128 FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS (OCO/GWOT)	280	280

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
129 HEATERS AND ECU'S (OCO/GWOT)	894	894
134 FORCE PROVIDER (OCO/GWOT)	53,800	53,800
135 FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	2,665	2,665
CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE		
136 SYSTEM (OCO/GWOT)	2,400	2,400
FAMILY OF ENGINEER COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS		
137 (OCO/GWOT)	9,789	9,789
138 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT) (OCO/GWOT)	300	300
139 QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	4,800	4,800
140 DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER (OCO/GWOT)	78,240	78,240
141 COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL (OCO/GWOT)	5,763	5,763
142 MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	1,609	1,609
143 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (MAINT EQ) (OCO/GWOT)	145	145
144 GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) (OCO/GWOT)	3,047	3,047
148 TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED (OCO/GWOT)	4,426	4,426
151 HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) (OCO/GWOT)	2,900	2,900
155 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (CONST EQUIP) (OCO/GWOT)	96	96
158 GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP (OCO/GWOT)	31,761	31,761
160 FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS (OCO/GWOT)	846	846
168 TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) (OCO/GWOT)	1,140	1,140
RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
170 (OCO/GWOT)	8,500	8,500
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,373,010	1,343,010
<hr/>		
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
<hr/>		
2 F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (OCO/GWOT)	184,912	167,912
Excess cost growth		-17,000
26 STUASL0 UAV (OCO/GWOT)	70,000	61,900
ICS excess growth		-8,100
35 SH-60 SERIES (OCO/GWOT)	3,000	3,000
36 H-1 SERIES (OCO/GWOT)	3,740	3,740
39 EP-3 SERIES (OCO/GWOT)	7,505	7,505
47 SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT (OCO/GWOT)	14,869	14,869

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
51 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	98,240	98,240
59 V-22 OSPREY (OCO/GWOT)	8,740	8,740
63 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (OCO/GWOT)	1,500	1,500
65 AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (OCO/GWOT)	524	524
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	393,030	367,930
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
10 HELLFIRE (OCO/GWOT)	8,600	8,600
TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	8,600	8,600
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		
1 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS (OCO/GWOT)	40,366	40,366
2 AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	8,860	8,860
6 AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES (OCO/GWOT)	7,060	7,060
13 PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION (OCO/GWOT)	1,122	1,122
14 AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (OCO/GWOT)	3,495	3,495
15 SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION (OCO/GWOT)	1,205	1,205
17 40MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT) MK281 unit cost growth	539	481 -58
18 60MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	909	909
20 120MM, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT) Forward financing	530	0 -530
22 ROCKETS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	469	469
23 ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	1,196	1,196
24 DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT) Prior year carryover	261	0 -261
25 FUZE, ALL TYPES (OCO/GWOT)	217	217
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	66,229	65,380
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
81 DCGS-N (OCO/GWOT)	12,000	12,000
116 EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP (OCO/GWOT) Prior year carryover due to contract delay	99,329	74,934 -24,395
124 FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	630	630

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
133 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (OCO/GWOT) Excess to need	25	0 -25
137 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	10,562	10,562
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT)	1,660	1,660
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	124,206	99,786
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION		
6 (OCO/GWOT)	572	572
10 JAVELIN (OCO/GWOT)	1,606	1,606
18 MODIFICATION KITS (OCO/GWOT)	2,600	2,600
19 ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) (OCO/GWOT)	2,200	2,200
26 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	20,981	20,981
29 RQ-11 UAV (OCO/GWOT)	3,817	3,817
35 COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES (OCO/GWOT)	2,600	2,600
37 RADIO SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	9,563	9,563
53 EOD SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	75,000	75,000
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	118,939	118,939
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
4 C-130J (OCO/GWOT)	73,000	73,000
11 CV-22 (OCO/GWOT) Program increase - one aircraft for attrition reserve	0	97,000 97,000
15 MQ-9 (OCO/GWOT) Air Force requested transfer to line 61 for spares Excess initial spares	453,030	366,030 -60,000 -27,000
19 LAIRCM (OCO/GWOT)	135,801	135,801
20 A-10 (OCO/GWOT) Excess funds Program increase - A-10 wing replacements	23,850	43,000 -850 20,000
22 F-16 (OCO/GWOT) Program increase - missile warning system Program increase - anti-jam GPS	0	17,000 12,000 5,000
47 E-3 (OCO/GWOT)	6,600	6,600
56 HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS (OCO/GWOT)	13,550	13,550
57 OTHER AIRCRAFT (OCO/GWOT)	7,500	7,500

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
59 MQ-9 MODS (OCO/GWOT) Early to need	112,068	73,768 -38,300
61 INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS (OCO/GWOT) Air Force requested transfer from line 15 for spares	25,600	85,600 60,000
77 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES (OCO/GWOT)	8,400	8,400
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	859,399	927,249
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
6 PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE (OCO/GWOT) Pricing adjustment	145,125	141,375 -3,750
7 SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (OCO/GWOT) Unit cost growth Previously funded requirement	167,800	67,100 -16,800 -83,900
11 AGM-65 MAVERICK (OCO/GWOT)	26,620	26,620
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	339,545	235,095
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
1 ROCKETS (OCO/GWOT)	60,000	60,000
2 CARTRIDGES (OCO/GWOT)	9,830	9,830
4 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS (OCO/GWOT)	7,921	7,921
6 JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION (OCO/GWOT) Pricing adjustment Previously funded requirement	403,126	189,063 -12,500 -201,563
12 FLARES (OCO/GWOT)	6,531	6,531
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	487,408	273,345
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
1 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES (OCO/GWOT)	2,003	2,003
2 MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE (OCO/GWOT)	9,066	9,066
4 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (CARGO & UTILITY) (OCO/GWOT)	12,264	12,264
6 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SPECIAL PURPOSE) (OCO/GWOT)	16,789	16,789
7 FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES (OCO/GWOT)	48,590	48,590
8 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (MHE) (OCO/GWOT)	2,366	2,366
RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING EQUIPMENT		
9 (OCO/GWOT)	6,468	6,468

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT)		
10 (OCO/GWOT)	9,271	9,271
16 AIR TRAFFIC LANDING & CONTROL SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT) D-ILS schedule slip	42,650	21,325 -21,325
29 AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (OCO/GWOT)	7,500	7,500
33 C3 COUNTERMEASURES (OCO/GWOT)	620	620
52 TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	8,100	8,100
56 COMM ELECT MODS (OCO/GWOT)	3,800	3,800
61 ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT) JCREW - unjustified unit cost increase	53,900	46,400 -7,500
67 DCGS-AF (OCO/GWOT)	800	800
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT) Classified adjustment	3,472,094	3,334,094 -138,000
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,696,281	3,529,456
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
7 TELEPORT PROGRAM (OCO/GWOT)	3,900	3,900
16 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK (OCO/GWOT)	2,000	2,000
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT)	32,482	32,482
41 MC-12 (OCO/GWOT)	5,000	5,000
43 UNMANNED ISR (OCO/GWOT)	11,880	11,880
46 U-28 (OCO/GWOT)	38,283	38,283
48 CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION (OCO/GWOT) Program increase	0	25,000 25,000
57 ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M (OCO/GWOT)	52,504	52,504
58 INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	22,000	22,000
60 OTHER ITEMS <\$5M (OCO/GWOT)	11,580	11,580
62 SPECIAL PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT)	13,549	13,549
63 TACTICAL VEHICLES (OCO/GWOT)	3,200	3,200
69 SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS (OCO/GWOT) Classified adjustment	42,056	22,806 -19,250
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	238,434	244,184

P-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		
RESERVE EQUIPMENT		
ARMY RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	105,000 105,000
NAVY RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	37,500 37,500
MARINE CORPS RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	7,500 7,500
AIR FORCE RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	105,000 105,000
TOTAL, RESERVE EQUIPMENT	0	255,000
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT		
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	247,500 247,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	0	247,500 247,500
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT	0	495,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	0	750,000
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	9,106,136	9,368,076

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

The agreement provides \$750,000,000 for National Guard and Reserve Equipment. Of that amount \$247,500,000 is designated for the Army National Guard, \$247,500,000 for the Air National Guard, \$105,000,000 for the Army Reserve, \$105,000,000 for the Air Force Reserve, \$37,500,000 for the Navy Reserve, and \$7,500,000 for the Marine Corps Reserve.

This funding will allow the reserve components to procure high priority equipment that may be used for combat and domestic response missions. Current reserve component equipping levels are among the highest in recent history and the funding provided by the agreement will help ensure component interoperability and sustained reserve component modernization.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to ensure that the account be executed by the Chiefs of the National Guard and reserve

components with priority consideration given to the following items: acoustic hailing devices including hail and warning escalation of force systems, advanced cargo handling systems for CH-47, air broadband for C-12, airborne sense and avoid systems for remotely piloted aircraft, all-digital radar warning receivers, chemical biological protective shelters, combat uniforms and cold weather protective clothing, common access card for remote access virtual private network with pre-tunnel authentication, computer-assisted language learning software, crashworthy ballistically tolerant auxiliary fuel systems, integrated facial protection components for standard issue helmets, large aircraft infrared countermeasures, advanced targeting pods, electromagnetic in-flight propeller balance systems, electro-optical infrared sensors, frequency hopping multiplexers, handheld and manpack and mid-tier networking vehicular radios, handheld explo-

sives and chemical weapons detection capabilities, HMMWV rollover mitigation and control technologies, lightweight wide-area motion imagery systems, modular small arms and self-contained ranges, joint threat emitters, mandible protection, Marine Corps tactical radio digital communications, the mobile user objective system, modular fuel systems, palletized loading systems, multi-temperature refrigerated container systems, near infrared aiming and illumination systems, out of band infrared pointer and illuminator systems, radiac sets, semi-trailers, unstabilized gunnery crew trainer and small arms simulation trainers, and wireless mobile mesh self-healing network systems.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
 [In thousands of dollars]

R-1	Budget Request	Final Bill
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY		
55 ARMY SPACE SYSTEM INTEGRATION (OCO/GWOT)	9,375	9,375
90 NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV (OCO/GWOT)	33	33
COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) 117 (OCO/GWOT)	10,900	10,900
122 AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	73,110	73,110
208 BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE (OCO/GWOT)	7,104	7,104
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	100,522	100,522
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY		
38 RETRACT LARCH (OCO/GWOT)	3,907	3,907
TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES 78 (TADIRCM) (OCO/GWOT)	37,990	37,990
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT)	36,426	36,426
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	78,323	78,323
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE		
58 COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS (OCO/GWOT)	425	425
131 MQ-9 (OCO/GWOT) Program increase - auto takeoff and landing capability	0	35,000 35,000
SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY 200 DEVELOPMENT (OCO/GWOT)	4,715	4,715
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT)	27,765	27,765
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	32,905	67,905
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE		
999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS (OCO/GWOT) Classified adjustment	162,419	159,919 -2,500
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	162,419	159,919
TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	374,169	406,669

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	46,833	46,833
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	93,800	93,800
TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	140,633	140,633

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
IN-HOUSE CARE	95,366	95,366
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	233,073	233,073
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	3,325	3,325
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ...	331,764	331,764

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

The agreement provides \$215,333,000 for Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense.

JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND

The agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Final bill
RAPID ACQUISITION AND THREAT RESPONSE ...	345,472	339,472
Prior year carryover		-6,000
MISSION ENABLERS	62,800	0
Transfer to title IX OM, DW		-62,800
TOTAL, JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT FUND	408,272	339,472

2016 Appropriations:

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide:

DSCA Coalition Support Fund	\$300,000,000
Counterterrorism Partnership Fund:	
Counterterrorism Partnership Fund	200,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund:	
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	150,000,000
Other Procurement, Air Force:	
Classified adjustment	169,000,000

(RESCISSON)

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the Senate recommending rescis-

JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND

The fiscal year 2017 budget request includes \$408,272,000 in Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund. To preserve the essential joint capabilities of the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization (JIDO) and eliminate any duplication with Service capabilities, the agreement recommends transferring \$62,800,000 to the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account in title IX.

The budget request proposed consolidating the sub-accounts under the appropriation into a single account titled Rapid Acquisition and Threat Response. This flexibility would allow for quick reaction changes in spending; however, it would prevent the congressional defense committees from having any insight into why or when these funding changes occur. Therefore, the agreement provides the following funding levels for JIDO programs: \$101,286,000 for Rapid Capability Delivery; \$200,886,000 for Assist Situational Understanding; and \$37,300,000 for Enable Department of Defense Responsiveness. The Director of the JIDO is directed to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees should funding be shifted between the accounts not later than 15 days after the end of the fiscal quarter.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The agreement provides \$22,062,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

The agreement for title IX incorporates general provisions from the House and Senate versions of the bill which were not amended. Those general provisions that were addressed in the agreement are as follows:

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which provides for special transfer authority within title IX. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which provides funds for logistical support to allied forces supporting military and stability operations in Afghanistan and to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. The House bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides funds for

the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which provides security assistance to the Government of Jordan. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of the Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House related to the replacement of funds for items provided to the Government of Ukraine. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which prohibits the use of assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the House which provides funds to the Department of Defense to improve intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which prohibits the use of funds to transfer additional C-130 aircraft to Afghanistan until the Department of Defense conducts a review of the country's medium airlift requirements. The House bill contained no similar provision.

(RESCISSESSONS)

The agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House recommending rescissions and provides for the rescission of \$819,000,000. The Senate bill contained a similar provision. The rescissions agreed to are:

sions and provides for the rescission of \$11,524,000. The House bill contained no similar provision. The rescission agreed to is:

The agreement adds a provision which terminates the Mine Resistant Ambush Pro-

tected Vehicle Fund. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provisions.

The agreement retains a provision proposed by the Senate which requires the President to designate all Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism funds as such. The House bill contained a similar provision.

2011/XXXX Appropriation:

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide:	
DSCA Coalition Support Fund	\$11,524,000

The agreement adds a provision which terminates the Mine Resistant Ambush Pro-

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army.....	41,045,562	40,028,182	40,042,962	-1,002,600	+14,780
Military Personnel, Navy.....	27,835,183	27,951,605	27,889,405	+54,222	-62,200
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	12,859,152	12,813,412	12,735,182	-123,970	-78,230
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	27,679,066	27,944,615	27,958,795	+279,729	+14,180
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	4,463,164	4,561,703	4,524,863	+61,699	-36,840
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,866,891	1,924,155	1,921,045	+54,154	-3,110
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	702,481	744,995	744,795	+42,314	-200
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,682,942	1,742,906	1,725,526	+42,584	-17,380
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	7,892,327	7,910,694	7,899,423	+7,096	-11,271
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	3,201,890	3,280,065	3,283,982	+82,092	+3,917
Total, Title I, Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,902,332	128,725,978	-502,680	-176,354
<hr/>					

TITLE II**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	32,399,440	33,809,040	32,738,173	+338,733	-1,070,867
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	39,600,172	39,483,581	38,552,017	-1,048,155	-931,564

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	5,718,074	5,954,258	5,676,152	-41,922	-278,106
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	35,727,457	37,518,056	36,247,724	+520,267	-1,270,332
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	32,105,040	32,571,590	32,373,949	+268,909	-197,641
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	2,646,911	2,712,331	2,743,688	+96,777	+31,357
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	998,481	927,656	929,656	-68,825	+2,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	274,526	270,633	271,133	-3,393	+500
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	2,980,768	3,067,929	3,069,229	+88,461	+1,300
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	6,595,483	6,825,370	6,861,478	+265,995	+36,108
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	6,820,569	6,703,578	6,615,095	-205,474	-88,483
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces...	14,078	14,194	~ 14,194	+116	---
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	234,829	170,167	170,167	-64,662	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	300,000	281,762	289,262	-10,738	+7,500
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	368,131	371,521	371,521	+3,390	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	8,232	9,009	9,009	+777	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	231,217	197,084	222,084	-9,133	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	103,266	105,125	123,125	+19,859	+18,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account.....	358,496	325,604	325,604	-32,892	---
 Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance.....	 167,485,170	 171,318,488	 167,603,260	 +118,090	 -3,715,228
 =====	 =====	 =====	 =====	 =====	 =====

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	5,866,367	3,614,787	4,587,598	-1,278,769	+972,811
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,600,957	1,519,966	1,533,804	-67,153	+13,838
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,951,646	2,265,177	2,229,455	+277,809	-35,722
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,245,426	1,513,157	1,483,566	+238,140	-29,591
Other Procurement, Army.....	5,718,811	5,873,949	6,147,328	+428,517	+273,379
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	17,521,209	14,109,148	16,135,335	-1,385,874	+2,026,187
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	3,049,542	3,209,262	3,265,285	+215,743	+56,023
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	651,920	664,368	633,678	-18,242	-30,690
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	18,704,539	18,354,874	21,156,886	+2,452,347	+2,802,012
Other Procurement, Navy.....	6,484,257	6,338,861	6,308,919	-175,338	-29,942
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,186,812	1,362,769	1,307,456	+120,644	-55,313
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	15,756,853	13,922,917	14,253,623	-1,503,230	+330,706
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	2,912,131	2,426,621	2,348,121	-564,010	-78,500
Space Procurement, Air Force.....	2,812,159	3,055,743	2,733,243	-78,916	-322,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	1,744,993	1,677,719	1,589,219	-155,774	-88,500
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	18,311,882	17,438,056	17,768,224	-543,658	+330,168
Procurement, Defense-Wide	5,245,443	4,524,918	4,881,022	-364,421	+356,104
Defense Production Act Purchases	76,680	44,065	64,065	-12,615	+20,000
Total, Title III, Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	108,426,827	-2,414,800	+6,510,470
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	7,565,327	7,515,399	8,332,965	+767,638	+817,566
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	18,117,677	17,276,301	17,214,530	-903,147	-61,771
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.	25,217,148	28,112,251	27,788,548	+2,571,400	-323,703
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	18,695,955	18,308,826	18,778,550	+82,595	+469,724
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	188,558	178,994	186,994	-1,564	+8,000
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	69,784,665	71,391,771	72,301,587	+2,516,922	+909,816
<hr/>					
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,738,768	1,371,613	1,511,613	-227,155	+140,000
National Defense Sealift Fund.....	474,164	---	---	-474,164	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds..	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,511,613	-701,319	+140,000
<hr/>					

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance.....	29,842,167	32,231,390	31,277,002	+1,434,835	-954,388
Procurement.....	365,390	413,219	402,161	+36,771	-11,058
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	2,121,933	822,907	2,102,107	-19,826	+1,279,200
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/.....	32,329,490	33,467,516	33,781,270	+1,451,780	+313,754
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance.....	118,198	147,282	119,985	+1,787	-27,297
Procurement.....	2,281	15,132	15,132	+12,851	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	579,342	388,609	388,609	-190,733	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/.....	699,821	551,023	523,726	-176,095	-27,297
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities,					
Defense1/.....	1,050,598	844,800	998,800	-51,798	+154,000
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.....	---	99,300	---	---	-99,300
Office of the Inspector General 1/.....	312,559	322,035	312,035	-524	-10,000
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,674	35,615,831	+1,223,363	+331,157
<hr/>					

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA).....	505,206	533,596	515,596	+10,390	-18,000
Total, Title VII, Related agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	1,029,596	+10,390	-18,000
<hr/>					
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005).....	(4,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-500,000)
FFRDC (Sec.8025).....	-65,000	---	-60,000	+5,000	-60,000
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec.8030).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8043).....	-1,768,937	---	-2,002,622	-233,685	-2,002,622
National grants (Sec.8051).....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8055).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority) (Sec. 8063)	(1,000)	---	(1,000)	---	(+1,000)
Fisher House Foundation (Sec. 8071).....	5,000	---	5,000	---	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec. 8078).....	-1,500,789	---	-157,000	+1,343,789	-157,000
Defense acquisition workforce development excess cash balances (Sec. 8087).....	---	---	-531,000	-531,000	-531,000
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec. 8093).....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec. 8097).....	(121,000)	(122,375)	(122,375)	(+1,375)	---
Basic allowance for housing.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Working Capital Fund, Army excess cash balances (Sec. 8118).....	-389,000	---	-336,000	+53,000	-336,000
Working Capital Fund, Defense-wide excess cash balances (rescission)	-1,037,000	---	---	+1,037,000	---
Revised fuel costs (Sec. 8119).....	-2,576,000	---	-1,155,000	+1,421,000	-1,155,000
Ship Modernization, Operation, and Sustainment Fund (rescission) (Sec. 8130).....	---	---	-1,391,070	-1,391,070	-1,391,070
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions.....	-6,986,726	---	-5,583,692	+1,403,034	-5,583,692
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
TITLE IX					
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM (GWOT)					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,846,356	2,051,578	1,948,648	+102,292	-102,930
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	251,011	330,557	327,427	+76,416	-3,130
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	171,079	179,733	179,733	+8,654	---
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	726,126	719,896	705,706	-20,420	-14,190
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	24,462	42,506	42,506	+18,044	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	12,693	11,929	11,929	-764	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,393	3,764	3,764	+371	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	18,710	20,535	20,535	+1,825	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	166,015	196,472	196,472	+30,457	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	2,828	5,288	5,288	+2,460	---
Grand Total, Military Personnel (OCO/GWOT)....	3,222,673	3,562,258	3,442,008	+219,335	-120,250
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	14,994,833	15,310,587	15,693,068	+698,235	+382,481
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	7,169,611	6,827,391	7,887,349	+717,738	+1,059,958
(Coast Guard) (by transfer) (GWOT).....	---	(162,692)	---	---	(-162,692)
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,372,534	1,244,359	1,607,259	+234,725	+362,900
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	11,128,813	9,498,830	10,556,598	-572,215	+1,057,768
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	5,665,633	5,982,173	6,476,649	+811,016	+494,476
(Coalition support funds) (GWOT).....	(1,160,000)	(1,100,000)	(920,000)	(-240,000)	(-180,000)
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	99,559	38,679	38,679	-60,880	---
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	31,643	26,265	26,265	-5,378	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,455	3,304	3,304	-151	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	58,106	57,586	57,586	-520	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	135,845	127,035	127,035	-8,810	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	19,900	20,000	20,000	+100	---
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....	40,679,932	39,136,209	42,493,792	+1,813,860	+3,357,583

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT).....	1,100,000	1,000,000	---	-1,100,000	-1,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	3,652,257	3,448,715	4,262,715	+610,458	+814,000
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	715,000	630,000	---	-715,000	-630,000
Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	---	980,000	+980,000	+980,000
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000
Grand Total, Operation and Maintenance (OCO/GWOT).....	46,147,189	44,464,924	47,736,507	+1,589,318	+3,271,583
<hr/>					
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	161,987	313,171	313,171	+151,184	---
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	37,260	632,817	405,317	+368,057	-227,500
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	486,630	153,544	395,944	-90,686	+242,400
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	222,040	301,523	290,670	+68,630	-10,853
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,175,596	1,373,010	1,343,010	+167,414	-30,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT) OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	210,990	393,030	367,930	+156,940	-25,100

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	---	8,600	8,600	+8,600	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	117,966	66,229	65,380	-52,586	-849
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (GWOT)					
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	12,186	124,206	99,786	+87,600	-24,420
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	56,934	118,939	118,939	+62,005	---
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	128,900	859,399	927,249	+798,349	+67,850
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	289,142	339,545	235,095	-54,047	-104,450
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	228,874	487,408	273,345	+44,471	-214,063
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,477,001	3,696,281	3,529,456	+52,455	-166,825
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	173,918	238,434	244,184	+70,266	+5,750
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)	1,000,000	---	750,000	-250,000	+750,000
Grand Total, Procurement (OCO/GWOT).....	7,779,424	9,106,136	9,368,076	+1,588,652	+261,940
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,500	100,522	100,522	+99,022	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	35,747	78,323	78,323	+42,576	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation,					
Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	17,100	32,905	67,905	+50,805	+35,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation,					
Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	177,087	162,419	159,919	-17,168	-2,500
Grand Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (OCO/GWOT).....	231,434	374,169	406,669	+175,235	+32,500
<hr/>					
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT).....	88,850	140,633	140,633	+51,783	---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	272,704	331,764	331,764	+59,060	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT).....	186,000	215,333	215,333	+29,333	---
Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund (GWOT).....	349,464	408,272	339,472	-9,992	-68,800
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT).....	10,262	22,062	22,062	+11,800	---
Grand Total, Other Department of Defense Programs (OCO/GWOT).....	818,430	977,431	908,631	+90,201	-68,800
<hr/>					
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec.9002).....	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative (GWOT) (Sec. 9014).....	250,000	---	150,000	-100,000	+150,000
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec.9018).....	500,000	---	500,000	---	+500,000
Rescissions (GWOT) (Sec.9021).....	-400,000	---	-819,000	-419,000	-819,000
Coalition support funds (rescission) (GWOT) (Sec.9022)	---	---	-11,524	-11,524	-11,524
Total, General Provisions.....	350,000	---	-180,524	-530,524	-180,524
Grand Total, Title IX (OCO/GWOT).....	58,638,000	58,625,551	61,822,000	+3,184,000	+3,196,449
<hr/>					

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Grand Total, Bill.....	566,616,000	569,858,382	571,453,000	+4,837,000	+1,594,618
Appropriations.....	(510,783,937)	(511,232,831)	(513,024,692)	(+2,240,755)	(+1,791,861)
Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	(59,038,000)	(58,625,551)	(62,652,524)	(+3,614,524)	(+4,026,973)
Rescissions.....	(-2,805,937)	---	(-3,393,692)	(-587,755)	(-3,393,692)
Rescissions (GWOT).....	(-400,000)	---	(-830,524)	(-430,524)	(-830,524)
<hr/>					

- 1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
- 2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
- 3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD's pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Final Bill Final Bill	Final Bill vs. FY 2016	Final Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,902,332	128,725,978	-502,680	-176,354
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	167,485,170	171,318,488	167,603,260	+118,090	-3,715,228
Title III - Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	108,426,827	-2,414,800	+6,510,470
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.	69,784,665	71,391,771	72,301,587	+2,516,922	+909,816
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,511,613	-701,319	+140,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,674	35,615,831	+1,223,363	+331,157
Title VII - Related Agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	1,029,596	+10,390	-18,000
Title VIII - General Provisions (net).....	-6,986,726	---	-5,583,692	+1,403,034	-5,583,692
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	58,638,000	58,625,551	61,822,000	+3,184,000	+3,196,449
<hr/>					
Total. Department of Defense.....	566,616,000	569,858,382	571,453,000	+4,837,000	+1,594,618

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN on bringing his first full bill to the House floor as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I have greatly appreciated his friendship and steady leadership of the Defense Subcommittee.

Further, I also thank our new subcommittee chairwoman, KAY GRANGER. She has been a great partner in completing the work on the fiscal year 2017 conference report, and I look forward to working with her as we proceed.

Finally, I thank the members of the subcommittee and our extraordinary staff for their wisdom and for their long hours that they have logged in putting this product together.

The chairman has well described H.R. 1301. I would add that this bill includes strong positions countering Russian aggression, building partnership capacity, and supporting readiness. Because it is a product of bipartisan negotiation, this is a good bill, and I intend to support it.

Despite my support for this legislation, I am extremely troubled that we are still working on the fiscal year 2017 Defense bill 5 months and 8 days into the fiscal year.

For nearly 6 months, the Department of Defense has been operating under two separate continuing resolutions, which wastes the time of people's lives and leads to inefficiencies in spending. I would emphasize this is not the fault of the committee. All that has been absent is the lack of political will on behalf of the majority party.

Even more disconcerting is the fact that the Defense Appropriations Act is just one of 11 fiscal year 2017 appropriations bills that need to be completed by the end of next month. There is no excuse for them remaining unfinished. The investments made through these bills are vital to so many in our country, and they need equal attention from Congress and the administration.

It is imperative that we strive every day to prioritize keeping America safe and supporting our brave servicemembers, but we must also prioritize educating our workforce, making improvements in public health, in science, and in our economic and transportation infrastructure.

If we neglect these investments in our future and in the well-being and success of current families and future generations, then I am deeply concerned that we will not have a country worth defending.

Confounding a confused fiscal situation, there is a \$30 billion supplemental request for fiscal year 2017 recently submitted to the Office of Management and Budget by the Department of Defense, which should make its way to Congress in the next few weeks. Additionally, as the administration modifies its fiscal year 2018 budget request, they are without a predictable base on which to build.

There is very little margin of error, given the few legislative days remaining before the continuing resolution expires on April 28. I, and I believe the chairman, do not view that date as another point for negotiation. It is an absolute deadline, and the value of this bill and every other appropriations bill diminishes the day they are not enacted.

□ 1545

In closing, I again appreciate the leadership and the management of this wonderful work by our chairman, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Going forward, I will work hard with the chairman. I will work hard with Chairwoman GRANGER, with Ranking Member LOWEY, and the other members of our full committee to return the appropriations process to its normal schedule.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), chairwoman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1301, the FY17 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The world is more dangerous and unstable than any time in recent history. The U.S. and our allies face constant threats from countries including Iran, Russia, China, and North Korea. ISIS and other global terrorists threaten our very way of life.

Our number one responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for the defense of this Nation. I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the outstanding job he did drafting the FY17 bill. He deserves our thanks for producing such a significant and meaningful bill.

Since becoming the chairwoman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have spent a lot of time talking to senior defense leaders to find out what they need to combat these threats. They have unanimously stated that the only thing our adversaries respect is strength, and they need this bill passed to ensure our military is as strong and effective as possible.

Sequestration and reduced budget requests have caused the military to be underfunded for too long. This bill begins a process of rebuilding our military and giving our warfighters the resources they need to counter the numerous complex threats around the world. This bill reverses the drawdown of end strength and instead increases it by 36,000 troops above the FY17 budget request. This bill reverses steep cuts to procurement by funding additional ships and aircraft to modernize our weapons systems and address shortfalls. This is important because we have the smallest number of ships in the Navy since 1916, and the average age of an Air Force aircraft is 27 years old. Marine aviation squadrons have

been forced to salvage parts from museums in order to keep our planes flying.

In every meeting I have had with defense leadership, they emphasize the devastating impact both sequestration and operating under a continuing resolution have on our security. When asked about the impact of a full year CR, General Goldfein, chief of staff of the Air Force, said: "There is no enemy on the planet that can do more damage to the United States Air Force than us not getting a budget."

Our military is counting on us to pass this bill now. It is the only way to ensure the United States will be strong and able to lead in this very dangerous world. I strongly urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. VISCLOSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Chairwoman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCLOSEY for their hard work and cooperation. Today's bill is the product of good faith bipartisan and bicameral negotiation.

Each Member of this body will need to determine whether positive aspects of this bill outweigh uncertainty about the prospects of 10 other critical funding bills languishing without a clear path forward. Unlike the Defense Appropriations bill passed by the House last June, this bill keeps faith with existing caps on discretionary spending. It does not use a budget gimmick to create a mid-year shortfall in funding, which would have affected salaries and mission support for men and women serving bravely in harm's way.

I thank the chairman for increasing cybersecurity operations by nearly \$1 billion; fully funding the European Reassurance Initiative in response to Russian aggression; investing in the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance resources combatant commanders clamor for; and assisting men and women in uniform by increasing pay by 2.1 percent, adding \$25 million for sexual assault prevention and response, and providing \$33.8 billion for the Defense Health Program.

Despite these positive attributes, I would be remiss not to remind this body that the 2017 appropriations process can be described as nothing but a failure that continues to this day, more than 5 months into the fiscal year. The Defense bill that we consider today could have and should have been finished in September 2016. The majority chose to punt the deadline for this and 10 other appropriations bills until April for entirely political reasons.

All Americans know we must ensure our Armed Forces are staffed, trained, and equipped to meet the challenges they face. We must fulfill that responsibility without neglecting the critical services and investments funded through the 10 other unfinished appropriations bills.

I am very concerned that the House Republican leadership is proposing to

move one bill forward without any indication that the other 10 will see the light of day.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time and commend him for his continuing leadership on national security. I also thank the chairwoman of this subcommittee, Ms. GRANGER, and the ranking member, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for their continuing work on national security.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we pass this bill now. The Department of Defense is currently operating under a continuing resolution, which means you have got to spend the same money this year that you spent last year, and you have to spend it on the same things. Even if you don't need to spend money on something this year that you spent last year, you have to. So it is wasteful. But you also can't spend money on new things, even though new threats arise. It is not good for any part of government. It is particularly bad for the Department of Defense. It is important to pass this bill now to remove this continuing resolution and have a regular appropriation bill.

Secondly, this bill is consistent with the Defense Authorization Conference Report which passed this House in December. All but four Republicans and all but 30 Democrats in the House voted for that measure in December. This is very consistent with that, and I hope it gets at least as much support as that bill did in December.

There are a few differences. We are further into the fiscal year, so the committee was able to fund some additional priorities that were in the House-passed authorization bill that we were not able to put in the conference report. I just think it is important for all of us to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the only answer to some of the readiness problems we are facing is modernization. We have had testimony that it takes twice as long to maintain an old F-18 aircraft, for example, as it does a new one. Well, this bill has some additional F-18s, and that is good for the pilots, good for the services that receive them. It also frees up maintenance to work on other things.

Finally, it is important also to remember that this bill is just a first step in repairing and rebuilding the military. I am afraid all of us have underestimated the deep damage that has been done through sequestration, budget cuts, and a high tempo of operations. Just yesterday, I was out at Fort Campbell to see some of this and hear about some of this firsthand from the Army.

This is an important essential first step, but shortly we should receive a supplemental appropriation to do more of the work of repair, and then we need to move toward an FY18 bill that real-

ly begins the rebuilding that, I think, on a bipartisan basis, most all of us in this Chamber would support. Remember, Mr. Speaker, the first job of the Federal Government is to defend the country. This is an important first step to help us fulfill that responsibility.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), who is a member of the Subcommittee on Defense.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2017. Last year, I was unable to vote for this legislation, but the bill before us today is improved, and it is one that I can support.

I was unable to vote for the previous bill because it included budget gimmicks that would have jeopardized a full year of funding for our troops and threatened readiness. I am very pleased to see this problem has been resolved. This bill provides the funding for the remainder of the 2017 fiscal year without breaking the budget caps. It also includes a much-needed pay raise for our servicemembers and ensures that they will have the equipment that they need to complete their missions and come home.

What is disappointing is that we are voting on this legislation today, halfway through the fiscal year. This work should have been finished months ago. Instead, a stalled appropriations process has left the Defense Department and our troops operating under a damaging continuing resolution. Right now it doesn't appear that the FY18 process will go any smoother.

President Trump's proposed \$54 billion increase for defense will come at the expense of essential domestic programs that our servicemen and -women and their families depend upon: education for their children, quality healthcare for their families, safe roads to drive on, protection of our clean air and drinking water. The list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill today, but I want to make it clear that I am very concerned about President Trump's proposed cuts that would pit our national security against the domestic needs of all Americans.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), my predecessor. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations and a chairman in his own right.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman on his assumption of the chairmanship of the full committee and for putting this bill together when he chaired the Subcommittee on Defense.

This bill certainly represents the outcome of many hard choices. It prioritizes funding where our troops need it the most. It wisely invests in readiness, training, maintenance, and procurement, and ensures that our

troops are prepared for the tasks before them. This bill also supports our efforts to defeat ISIL alongside our allies in the region as well as our continued focus on deterring Russian aggression.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this bill takes care of the troops and their families, granting them a long-awaited 2.1 percent pay raise. Time and again, our servicemembers put themselves in harm's way and respond to the myriad threats facing the Nation. This pay raise is one small way for us to honor their dedication and willingness to serve.

As the threats we face continue to become more unpredictable, we must provide our troops with the tools that they need to win in uncertain times. This bill goes a long way toward restoring the shortfalls in manpower and readiness that our military has endured in recent years.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me call attention again to Will Smith, who has been a clerk of this committee for 6 years and served as my chief of staff in my private office for many years before. This is likely his last appropriations bill on the floor to help manage and put together, and so I want to say to Will and all of you in behalf of saying something good about Will, what a great amount of service he rendered the Nation with a true Kentucky attitude, which he has.

Will, we owe you a lot. Thank you for your service. You have been great. We wish you Godspeed.

□ 1600

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply follow up on the chairman's remarks, and I also want to congratulate Mr. Smith on his life of service to his country. Mr. Pomerantz on our side was also mentioned. Again, both gentlemen and their service to this country are a reflection on public service, and I appreciate it very much on behalf of all of us in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), who is also a member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

I thank Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for bringing this bill to the floor.

This bill helps to close gaps in readiness while making investments in research and development. These investments are critically important because I guarantee our adversaries know where we have work to do.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a congressional district home to two Army bases, the NSA, several National Guard facilities, and dozens of our private sector partners. I serve on the board of the United States Naval Academy, and I co-chair the Army Caucus.

My experience tells me we are living in a world that has changed since our Armed Forces entered the Middle East 16 years ago. While our men and women

in uniform fought asymmetric foes, our near-peer adversaries such as Russia and China made advancements in technology that threaten to degrade our military qualitative advantage.

This appropriations bill ensures our troops are ready and that we have enough of them to get the job done. It fully funds the new end strength number and allows for a 2.1 percent pay raise for our troops. This is the least we can do for the brave men and women who sacrifice for our country.

This bill also deters Russian aggression by fully funding the European Reassurance Initiative, and makes critical investments in missile defense technology.

This bill is a solid start, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it, but there is still work to be done. Our troops should trust that elected officials will support them and do their job to fund the government, just as we trust them to accomplish the mission assigned to them. Band-Aid budgets are bad for everyone—our partners in industry, the American taxpayers, and especially our Armed Forces.

Now is not the time to argue over partisan issues. Congress should create a frontline of support for our Armed Forces that is just as strong as the frontline our soldiers have created to protect us.

I call on all of my colleagues to work in a bipartisan fashion to pass this and the other FY17 appropriation bills as quickly as possible.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that we are here hoping to end the continuing resolution on the Department of Defense, and I rise in support of the bill we are debating today.

We all know too well that continuing resolutions are unacceptable burdens on the least and the greatest of our DOD assets, our Members, and civilians at a time of unprecedented threats to our Nation. I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Chairwoman GRANGER for bringing this bill to the floor and for their unwavering commitment to the men and women in uniform, which will continue under their leadership in the future.

I also thank this committee for fully funding an increase of Active, Guard, and Reserve soldiers. I am also co-chair of the Army Caucus, and providing them with the modern equipment and training necessary to keep them alive and the greatest fighting force on Earth is very important to the defense of our Nation.

We have more that we need to consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Army Vice Chief of Staff Daniel Allyn recently

told the House Armed Services Committee that our Army requires modernization equipment to win decisively, but today we are outraged, outgunned, and outdated. At the present time, he says that only three of the Army's 58 brigade combat teams are ready to fight. It is crucial, and I urge my colleagues to support this appropriations bill and fully fund our armed services.

Mr. VISCHOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a member of the full Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Mr. VISCHOSKY for yielding. I also thank him for his tremendous leadership as our ranking member, and giving us all an opportunity to really voice our opinions and put our points of view forward in a very fair way.

I rise in opposition to this bill, however.

I offered two amendments to this bill, the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, and I am really disappointed to once again see that my amendments were not made in order. I want to explain these two amendments because this is the only chance that we will have to talk about this.

The first amendment, which I have offered several times on a bipartisan basis, would prohibit the funding for the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, the AUMF, beginning on September 30, 2017. And mind you, that 6-month window provides Congress ample opportunity to draft and debate a new AUMF and to vote it up or down.

Clearly, Congress is required to act. This amendment would require Congress to finally debate and vote on nearly a 3-year-long war that is raging in the Middle East, a war that has already claimed the lives of several brave servicemembers. The House simply cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility to give the American people a voice in matters of war and peace.

I offered another amendment, which would prohibit funding for United States combat troops in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was really simple, but, once again, I am sad to say that it was not made in order. This amendment would use the power of the purse to prevent funding for combat operations in Syria, unless the purpose is to rescue or protect members of the Armed Forces from danger.

We can all agree that ISIL must be degraded and dismantled, but Congress continues to be missing in action from this debate.

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

Mr. VISCHOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. We know that the 2001 authorization was specific to 9/11. And I voted against it because I knew it would be broadly interpreted, which it has been. Sadly, it is a blank check for war. Actually, the Congressional Re-

search Service provided us a declassified report saying—and this was last year—it had been used over 35 times. Nothing related to 9/11. So this blank check needs to be repealed.

We also know that ISIL didn't even exist in 2001. Every day, more bombs fall and the battlefield expands. We have already spent billions of dollars against this unauthorized war.

Congress needs to show up for work, muster its courage, exercise its constitutional responsibility for debate, and vote on the ongoing war in Iraq and Syria. We owe nothing less to our brave men and women who are in harm's way. It is past time to force a debate and vote on this issue. Hopefully, one day we will make these amendments in order and, hopefully, we will have bipartisan support to just move forward and do our job as Members of Congress, which is what the Constitution requires.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), and thank him for his service on the Defense Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to first start by commanding the chairman of the full committee and the former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for his unwavering commitment to the men and women in uniform, and also for bringing this great bill forward.

I also want to recognize the good work and leadership of the new subcommittee chairwoman, that titanium Texan, Ms. GRANGER.

Mr. Speaker, I have to also mention the ranking members, Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. VISCHOSKY, because this, frankly, is a partnership in allowing this bill to come forward.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, Congress fulfills what I believe is an essential part of what we are here to do and what government's essential role is—to provide for the common defense.

This bill is essential for the men and women who serve our Nation with distinction in the military.

This bill funds a 2.1 percent pay raise for the military, something that they so deserve.

It also targets resources for the health care for our servicemembers and their family members.

Throughout the year—and you have already heard it—we have heard testimony time and time again from our service chiefs about the necessity to address our military's alarming readiness shortfalls. This bill, Mr. Speaker, addresses the readiness problems that are making it more and more difficult for our troops. We devote resources to prepare our troops both for combat and peacetime missions, including flight time and training, to ensure that we maintain our military superiority.

Lastly, this bill provides the necessary essential equipment, weapon systems, and platforms needed to

maintain and sustain our essential military superiority, whether it is in the air, in the sea, or on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I would just end with what I mentioned before: I believe the principal job of the Federal Government is to defend and protect our country. The Defense Appropriations bill before us does just that, and it deserves all of our support.

Mr. VISCLOSESKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member VISCLOSESKY very much.

Mr. Speaker, every year, our top responsibility as appropriators is to finish the 12 spending bills that keep our government running by October 1 of the year before that fiscal year is supposed to start. But here we are today, March 8, halfway into fiscal year 2017, finally voting on a compromise bill that closely reflects the request the last administration delivered to us 1 year ago February.

Our service chiefs and Secretaries present a consistent, clear message to Congress. They have pleaded for stability and predictability in the budget so they could ensure complete readiness of America's forces. Force readiness remains the defense community's top priority. Funding the capabilities to provide this responsibility must remain our top priority. We must approach Congress' appropriations responsibility from the historic bipartisan process that has broken down once too many times in recent years.

This political infighting harms the stability and predictability necessary for our Armed Forces to properly plan. It left both our adversaries and allies questioning our ability to defend or support the multiple conflicts we are currently engaged with abroad.

This compromise worked out by our responsible colleagues, Chairwoman GRANGER, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member VISCLOSESKY, Ranking Member LOWEY; and their Senate counterparts are strong glimmers of hope that we might actually finish the 2017 appropriations responsibilities. But we have ten additional subcommittee bills that are equally important and account for nearly half of our budget.

When will we vote on those compromised bills?

I could think of little that would be more irresponsible than to only move this defense bill and leave the remaining departments and agencies operating under a continuing resolution.

I have always supported our troops and our national defense. However, we know the safety and well-being of the American people does not merely rely on defense funding. It is rooted in the stability of the Republic they are sworn to protect and defend. We have a responsibility there, equally important.

Our financial commitments to energy independence, critical infrastructure,

homeland security, funding for first responders, teachers, and healthcare programs are equally necessary to increase America's security at home and abroad. I hope my colleagues alleviate this concern and quickly package the remaining bills for a vote, as the American people so richly deserve.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), and I thank him for his great contributions to the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

□ 1615

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I consider it one of the great honors in Congress to serve on the Defense Appropriations Committee with some real champions for national security: guys like RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, the overall chairman; Chairwoman KAY GRANGER from the Defense Subcommittee; my friend PETE VISCLOSESKY, the ranking member. These are all people that have a heart and a soul for what we are trying to do here today, and that is to provide for the common defense. It is our constitutional duty. And guys like MAC THORNBERRY, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. A lot of champions here that believe in a strong national defense.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this bill rebuild readiness by giving our troops the equipment they need, but it also reverses Obama-era cuts to the developing defense platforms, stops troop drawdowns, and perhaps most importantly, gives our warfighters a much-deserved pay raise.

As a 30-year veteran of the Arkansas Army National Guard, I am particularly pleased that this bill provides the funding necessary to ensure the National Guard remains a fully operational force.

It is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and with a willing partner in the White House and a pledge to rebuild our military, it marks the first step, an important first step our Congress has to take to complete our business from last year; and it gives our defenders what they need and deserve, and that is certainly.

Threats are growing. America must project strength. That starts with creating a military so strong that we never send our men and women downrange in a fair fight.

I call on my colleagues to stand strong against our enemies. Take this first step today in projecting power with our financial commitment.

I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a new member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN at the full committee

and Chairwoman GRANGER at the Defense Subcommittee on this bill.

Providing for the common defense of our Nation is one of the most fundamental duties of Congress under the Constitution.

Last week I appreciated the message that President Trump delivered in his joint session address, and I was particularly encouraged by his call to properly fund our military. For the last 6 years, we have been in almost constant tension with an administration whose sequestration policy threatened to hollow out our military.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I stand ready to work with the President and Secretary Mattis to make sure our military is properly funded, well equipped, and ready for the fight. That is why I am so proud to support this Defense Appropriations bill.

Our bill rejects the Obama administration's proposed troop level reductions that would have amounted to as many as 36,000 servicemen and -women cut from the ranks. Instead, our bill provides funding for an additional 1,000 Active-Duty Army soldiers, 1,000 Army National Guard soldiers, 1,000 Army Reserve soldiers, and 1,000 Active-Duty marines. The bill also fully funds a much-deserved 2.1 percent pay raise for military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a district that is home to both Fort Rucker, the home of Army aviation, and Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base, the intellectual center of the Air Force.

I am pleased to report that this bill contains a strong budget for Army aviation, including \$187 million for the 28 Lakota helicopters, which are the primary aircraft used for training at Fort Rucker.

It also contains an increase of almost \$450 million for the Air Force's cybersecurity efforts. Maxwell's Air Force Cyber College at Air University plays a key part in cybersecurity, serving as an intellectual hub for the Air Force in the emerging battlefield for cyber warfare.

This appropriations bill also contains funding for the procurement of 74 F-35 Joint Strike Fighters. The Montgomery-based 187th Fighter Wing is on the short list for being assigned this next generation fighter jet, and our Alabama congressional delegation is working together to make the case to the Air Force why this special unit is an ideal fit.

Mr. Speaker, I take our responsibility to craft sound military spending plans very seriously. I am pleased the House is moving the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill this week, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS). He is a great member of the full committee.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for the outstanding work and effort that he has put into this critically important piece of legislation, and I thank Chairwoman GRANGER for her strong support in advancing this much-needed legislation.

The people before me have talked so eloquently about our responsibility as Members of Congress to defend and protect our Nation. We have talked about national security. We have talked about troops. We have talked about battling terrorism. And that is what this bill does.

I want to take a slightly different approach and say something about what this bill does in all of our communities, not just distant lands around the world, but in our home communities. I want to highlight one area that will make a real difference in all of our communities, and that is the National Guard's Counterdrug Program.

This program is essential in detecting, disrupting, and curtailing drug trafficking. It provides resources to almost every State and territory to help train personnel and run counterdrug missions. The National Guard supports almost 60,000 requests a year for assistance from local law enforcement agencies.

In fiscal year 2014, National Guard counterdrug programs took almost \$12 billion in illegal drugs off the street. This minor investment is paying major dividends. During NDAA consideration, I helped secure an amendment to increase funding for this account by \$30 million because this program works.

This legislation under consideration today also increases funding for this vital program by \$135 million more than the amount requested by then-President Obama. This is a critical moment in combating the drug crisis, and we must fully fund every program that will help us solve it.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), a great member of the full committee.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for the time.

I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill. I have long said that the number one constitutional responsibility of this body is the common defense of this Nation, and today, the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, has once again shown the importance that we place on this most sacred duty.

After years of weak budget requests from our prior administration, this bill contains over \$5.2 billion over the 2016 level and \$1.5 billion more than the Obama administration's request.

Included in this appropriations bill is the funding of 10 new ships for our Navy, including an LPD, essential to our Marine Corps mission, as well as 3 destroyers, 2 Virginia class submarines, 3 LCSs, and an LHA, all ships

desperately needed by our Navy and Marine Corps.

Funding these ships steadily is not only a key to keeping our military strong, but also keeps our industrial base healthy and keeps these ships affordable in the long run.

Finally, this appropriations bill takes the first steps toward rebuilding our military, showing our allies that they can trust us, and showing our enemies they should fear us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work and his staff's work on this fine bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will end where I began, and that is because I think this will be the last time that the chair and I manage a Defense Appropriations bill together on the floor. It has been a delightful relationship, and I look forward to it continuing as you are chairman of the full committee.

Again, I thank the staff and look forward to working with Chairwoman GRANGER, and I also ask my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the FY2017 Defense Appropriations bill. I commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member LOWEY, our new Chairwoman GRANGER and Ranking Member VISCOSKY for their leadership on this bill. I would also like to thank our dedicated professional staff who have tirelessly worked on this agreement.

I have served on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for many years and providing for our men and women in uniform is a privilege and an honor. This bill provides vital funding for our Armed Services, including a 2.1 percent pay raise and additional funding for increased end strength.

As many of us have noted, our military is in a precarious position, and this bill is an important first step to rebuild and restore our military strength. It provides funding for necessary shipbuilding; aircraft and vehicle procurement; and important research and development to maintain our technological superiority. The bill also provides vital Operations and Maintenance funding for facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization programs.

I look forward to working with the new Administration and providing the resources our military needs to maintain our position in the world as well as continue to invest in our most important asset—the men and women our United States Armed Forces.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, can the Chair tell me when the Congressional Budget Office will score the Republican ACA replacement bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Members are reminded to refrain from wearing communicative badges while under recognition.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. TAKANO. 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 California (Mr. TAKANO).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 290, not voting 25, as follows:

	[Roll No. 135]	AYES—114
Adams	Demings	Krishnamoorthi
Amodei	Dingell	Kuster (NH)
Barragán	Doggett	Langevin
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence
Beyer	F.	Lee
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Blunt Rochester	Engel	Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lowenthal
C. F.	Espallat	Lowey
Brady (PA)	Evans	Luján, Ben Ray
Brownley (CA)	Foster	McEachin
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Butterfield	Fudge	McNerney
Cárdenas	Gallego	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Meng
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Hanabusa	Neal
Cicilline	Hastings	Norcross
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Payne
Clay	Hoyer	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Cohen	Jayapal	Pingree
Conyers	Jeffries	Raskin
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez
Cummings	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Kennedy	Schiff
Delaney	Khanna	Scott, David
DeLauro	Kihuen	

Lewis (GA)	Panetta	Speier
Lofgren	Pocan	Takano
Maloney,	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B.	Raskin	Velázquez
Massie	Rohrabacher	Waters, Maxine
McGovern	Rush	Watson Coleman
Moore	Schakowsky	Welch
Napolitano	Schrader	
Pallone	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Kaptur	Titus
Cleaver	Khanna	Vela
Deutch	Lynch	
Jenkins (KS)	Richmond	

□ 1719

Messrs. RUSH and DANNY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. COFFMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Nay” on Roll Call No. 134, “Nay” on Roll Call No. 135, and “Yea” on Roll Call No. 136.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 720, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 985, FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-29) on the resolution (H. Res. 180) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 985) to amend the procedures used in Federal court class actions and multidistrict litigation proceedings to assure fairer, more efficient outcomes for claimants and defendants, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ARBUCKLE PROJECT MAINTENANCE COMPLEX AND DISTRICT OFFICE CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 132) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and appurtenances of the Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma, to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 132

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 “Arbuckle Project Maintenance Complex and District Office Conveyance Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF MAINTENANCE COMPLEX AND DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as practicable, convey to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, located in Murray County, Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Maintenance Complex and District Office, Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement between the United States and the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term “Agreement” means the Agreement between the United States and the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District for Transferring Title to the Federally Owned Maintenance Complex and District Office to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District (Agreement No. 14AG640141).

(2) DISTRICT OFFICE.—The term “District Office” means the headquarters building located at 2440 East Main, Davis, Oklahoma, and the approximately 0.83 acres described in the Agreement.

(3) MAINTENANCE COMPLEX.—The term “Maintenance Complex” means the caretakers residence, shop buildings, and any appurtenances located on the lands described in the Agreement, to include approximately 2.00 acres, more or less.

(c) LIABILITY.—Effective upon the date of conveyance of the Maintenance Complex and District Office under this section, the United States shall not be held liable by any court for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the Maintenance Complex and District Office, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees or agents prior to the date of conveyance. Nothing in this section increases the liability of the United States beyond that provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (popularly known as the “Federal Tort Claims Act”), on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) BENEFITS.—After conveyance of the Maintenance Complex and District Office to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District—

(1) the Maintenance Complex and District Office shall not be considered to be a part of a Federal reclamation project; and

(2) such water district shall not be eligible to receive any benefits with respect to any facility comprising that Maintenance Complex and District Office, except benefits that would be available to a similarly situated person with respect to such a facility that is not part of a Federal reclamation project.

(e) COMMUNICATION.—If the Secretary of the Interior has not completed the conveyance required under subsection (a) within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a letter with sufficient detail that explains the reasons the conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 132, sponsored by Congressman TOM COLE of Oklahoma, conveys two buildings and two acres of land of the Federal Arbuckle Project to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, Oklahoma. The district has operated and maintained the project for decades, and completed repayment of its capital costs for the project in 2012.

While noncontroversial, legislation is necessary in order to facilitate this and other Bureau of Reclamation title transfers. Under current law, these buildings and land remain in Federal ownership until legislation is enacted to transfer the title to the district. Mr. COLE’s bill achieves this objective.

This title transfer is a win-win for the district and for the Federal Government. The district will no longer be subject to certain Federal paperwork requirements, and the Federal Government will be relieved of all future liability and financial responsibilities associated with these facilities and land.

I urge the adoption of this measure, which overwhelmingly passed the House on a bipartisan basis in the last Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 132, as the gentleman from Florida just mentioned, would allow a title transfer of two Federal buildings to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District in south-central Oklahoma. These are buildings that were part of the Arbuckle Project, which is a water project authorized by Congress back in 1962 to provide flood control, recreational opportunities, and municipal water supply.

Nearly all the facilities within this project were already transferred to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District in 2012, after the district finished repaying what it owed to the Federal Government for construction. However, due to some overly narrow language in the legislation authorizing this project, two buildings have yet to be transferred.

Transferring them will save taxpayers money that would otherwise be

needed to operate and maintain these buildings. It will also relieve the Federal Government of any potential future liability associated with these buildings. It is a straightforward bill that should be quickly passed.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for yielding.

Before I begin my prepared remarks, I had no idea there was such interest in the Arbuckle watershed, but I am flattered and pleased that all of you are here for this important legislation.

I rise in support H.R. 132, the Arbuckle Project Maintenance Complex and District Office Conveyance Act. This bill is straightforward. As has been mentioned, it is a land conveyance which has both Federal and local support.

I would like to remind my colleagues this legislation was passed in the 114th Congress on December 7, 2016, by a vote of 412–1. Clearly, it was so good, everybody wanted it back again.

H.R. 132 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and buildings of the Arbuckle Project in Murray County, Oklahoma, to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District.

In 1962, Congress authorized the payment of reimbursable costs for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bureau of Reclamation's Arbuckle Master Conservancy District in south-central Oklahoma. The district completed repayment of the capital costs of the project in September of 2012.

In accordance with the Bureau of Reclamation's policy framework for title transfer, in December 2014, the Bureau of Reclamation and the district executed an agreement to transfer, in fee title, certain facilities that could be more effectively and efficiently managed at the local level.

The title transfer involves approximately 2.83 acres of land. On this land is a small house, associated structures, and the conservancy district's headquarters office building. The house and property are used to accommodate a district employee who maintains and inspects the dam and the pumping facilities. The headquarters office building is the base of operation for the district.

This bill also divests the Federal Government of its responsibility and liability associated with the district's facilities. Reclamation and the district have worked cooperatively and successfully to address all of the elements necessary to bring this legislation forward and make this transfer proceed as smoothly as possible.

I am pleased this bill is an agreement in which both the Federal and local interests are satisfied. I want to urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation once again.

I want to again thank the chairman for his help in expediting this matter.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, is it consistent with the rules of the House of Representatives for the Committee on Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committee to be considering the American Health Care Act without a CBO score that would permit us to know how much this legislation will cost?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is asking the Chair a hypothetical question that is not pertinent to the business currently before the House.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I didn't think it was hypothetical. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman first yield back the time he was yielded for debate?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, I will.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RASKIN. 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 Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 314, nays 98, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—314

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)	
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Cramer	King (NY)
Aderholt	Brown (MD)	Crawford	Kinzinger
Amodei	Brownley (CA)	Crist	Knight
Arrington	Buchanan	Crowley	Krishnamoorthi
Babin	Buck	Culberson	Kuster (NH)
Bacon	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)	Kustoff (TN)
Banks (IN)	Budd	Davidson	Labrador
Barletta	Burgess	Davis (CA)	
Barr	Bustos	Davis, Rodney	Aguilar
Barragán	Cárdenas	DeFazio	Reichert
Barton	Carter (GA)	DeGette	Allen
Beatty	Carter (TX)	Delaney	Amash
Bergman	Castro (TX)	Demings	Bera
Beyer	Chabot	Denham	Bishop (GA)
Biggs	Chaffetz	Dent	Blumenauer
Bilirakis	Cheney	DeSantis	Bonamici
Bishop (MI)	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier	Butterfield
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	DesJarlais	Espy
Black	Clark (MA)	Diaz-Balart	Frank (AZ)
Blackburn	Clarke (NY)	Dingell	Fudge
Blum	Coffman	Doggett	Gabbard
Blunt Rochester	Collins (GA)	Donovan	Carson (IN)
Bost	Collins (NY)	Doyle, Michael	Cartwright
Boyle, Brendan F.	Comer	F.	Clay
Brady (PA)	Comstock	Duncan (SC)	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Brat	Cook	Dunn	Cohen
Bridenstine	Cooper	Emmer	Huffman
	Costa	Engel	Jordan

Eshoo	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Espaillet	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Farenthold	Lance	Rooney, Francis
Faso	Langevin	Rooney, Thomas J.
Ferguson	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Roskam
Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Rothfus
Flores	Lee	Rouzer
Fortenberry	Levin	Royce (CA)
Foster	Lewis (GA)	Ruppersberger
Fox	Lewis (MN)	Rush
Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Rutherford
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Sánchez
Gaetz	Long	Sanford
Gallagher	Loudermilk	Scalise
Gallego	Love	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Lowenthal	Shweikert
Garrett	Lowey	Scott, Austin
Gibbs	Lucas	Scott, David
Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	Lujan, Ben Ray	Serrano
Gosar	MacArthur	Shuler
Gowdy	Marchant	Sowell (AL)
Granger	Marino	Smith (MO)
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Smith (NE)
Graves (LA)	Massie	Smucker
Graves (MO)	Mast	Soto
Griffith	Matsui	Speier
Grijalva	McCarthy	Tiberti
Grothman	McCauley	Tipton
Guthrie	McClintock	Tonko
Gutiérrez	McEachin	Trott
Hanabusa	McGovern	Turner
Harper	McHenry	Upton
Harris	McKinley	Valadao
Hartzler	McMorris	Vargas
Hastings	Rodgers	Vela
Heck	McNerney	Walberg
Hensarling	Meadows	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Walker
Hice, Jody B.	Meeks	Walorski
Higgins (LA)	Meng	Walters, Mimi
Higgins (NY)	Mitchell	Wasserman
Hill	Moolenaar	Schultz
Hollingsworth	Moore	Waterson
Hoyer	Mullin	Watson Coleman
Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Welch
Huizinga	Nadler	Wenstrup
Hultgren	Neal	Westerman
Hunter	Newhouse	Williams
Hurd	Norcross	Witter
Issa	Nunes	Young (IA)
Jackson Lee	Olson	Zeldin
Jayapal	Palazzo	
Jeffries	Pallone	
Johnson (GA)	Palmer	
Johnson (LA)	Pascarella	
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	
Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	
Johnson, Sam	Perry	
Jones	Peterson	
Joyce (OH)	Pingree	
Katko	Pittenger	
Kelly (IL)	Pocan	
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	
Kelly (PA)	Posey	
Kennedy	Quigley	
Khanna	Raskin	
Kihuen	Reed	
Kirkendoll	Reichert	
Kinzinger	Renacci	
Knight	Rice (NY)	
Krishnamoorthi	Rice (SC)	
Kuster (NH)	Richmond	
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	
Labrador	Roe (TN)	
		NAYS—98
		Kilmer
		Kind
		King (IA)
		Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Lipinski
		Lofgren
		Lujan Grisham, M.
		Lynch
		Maloney, Carolyn B.
		Maloney, Sean
		McCullom
		McSally
		Messer
		Mooney (WV)
		Moulton
		Murphy (FL)
		Napolitano

Noem	Royal-Allard	Taylor	NOT VOTING—17		
Nolan	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Bass	Green, Gene	Sessions
O'Halleran	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)	Calvert	Himes	Smith (TX)
O'Rourke	Schneider	Torres	Castor (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Titus
Panetta	Schrader	Tsongas	Cleaver	Jenkins (WV)	Wagner
Payne	Scott (VA)	Veasey	Conyers	Loebssack	Young (AK)
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Velázquez	Duffy	Pelosi	
Peters	Sherman	Visclosky			
Poe (TX)	Simpson	Walz			
Polis	Sinema	Weber (TX)			
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)			
Ratcliffe	Smith (WA)	Woodall			
Rokita	Stivers				
Rosen	Swalwell (CA)				

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and fourth quarters of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, BRIAN P. MONAHAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 17 AND DEC. 23, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	
Brian P. Monahan	12/17	12/23	South Korea		703.04	(³)	703.04
			Japan		926.06	(³)	926.06
Committee total		1,629.10	1,629.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³Military air transportation.

³Military air transportation.

BRIAN P. MONAHAN, Feb. 14, 2017.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30,
2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to South Korea, Japan, June 4–9, 2016:											
David Giachetti	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation							14,401.95				14,401.95
Craig Greene	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation						14,401.95					14,401.95
Alison Lynn	6/5	6/6	South Korea		366.00						366.00
	6/8	6/9	Japan		398.58						398.58
Commercial transportation						14,401.95					14,401.95
Delegation expenses			South Korea				653.03				653.03
Committee total					2,293.74		43,858.88		0.00		46,152.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAC THORNBERRY, Chairman, _____

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	
Travel to Colombia, October 1–3, 2016:										
Hon. Ruben Gallego	10/1	10/3	Colombia		764.00					764.00
Commercial transportation							1,515.56			1,515.56
Travel to Argentina, Columbia, October 2–8, 2016:										
Catherine Sendak	10/3	10/4	Argentina		568.61					568.61
Commercial transportation	10/4	10/7	Colombia		884.00					884.00
Mark Morehouse	10/3	10/4	Argentina		568.61			7,458.36		7,458.36
Commercial transportation	10/4	10/7	Colombia		884.00					884.00
Katherine Quinn	10/3	10/4	Argentina		568.61			7,458.36		7,458.36
Commercial transportation	10/4	10/7	Colombia		884.00					884.00
Delegation expenses			Colombia		463.00					463.00
Travel to Italy, Poland, Germany, Latvia, October 9–14, 2016:										
Jeanette James	10/9	10/12	Italy		828.00					828.00
Commercial transportation	10/13	10/14	Latvia		129.00					129.00
Daniel Sennott	10/14	10/14	Germany				13,694.06			13,694.06
Commercial transportation										828.00
Alison Lynn	10/9	10/12	Italy		828.00			11,582.76		11,582.76
Commercial transportation										828.00
Craig Greene	10/9	10/12	Italy		828.00			11,582.76		11,582.76
Commercial transportation										828.00
Travel to Canada, October 11–12, 2016:										
Margaret Dean	10/11	10/12	Canada		312.84					312.84
Commercial transportation					1,864.09					1,864.09
Andrew Warren	10/11	10/12	Canada		312.84					312.84

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial transportation					1,712.32						1,712.32
Vickie Plunkett	10/11	10/12	Canada		312.84						312.84
Commercial transportation					1,715.74						1,715.74
Travel to United Kingdom, October 11–14, 2016:											
Catherine Sendak	10/12	10/14	United Kingdom		829.50						829.50
Commercial transportation							910.86				910.86
Mark Morehouse	10/12	10/14	United Kingdom		829.50						829.50
Commercial transportation							910.86				910.86
Claude Chafin	10/12	10/14	United Kingdom		829.50						829.50
Commercial transportation							910.86				910.86
Jack Schuler	10/12	10/14	United Kingdom		829.50						829.50
Commercial transportation							910.86				910.86
Delegation expenses	10/12	10/14	United Kingdom				44.03				44.03
Travel to Egypt, Iraq, Israel, October 15–23, 2016, With CODEL Conway:											
Hon. Gwen Graham	10/16	10/18	Egypt		568.98						568.98
Commercial transportation			Kuwait		787.09						787.09
10/18	10/19	10/23	Israel		1,934.00						1,934.00
Daniel Sennott	10/16	10/18	Egypt		568.98						14,344.49
Commercial transportation			Kuwait		787.09						787.09
10/18	10/19	10/23	Israel		1,934.00						1,934.00
Commercial transportation							14,344.49				14,344.49
Travel to the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, October 19–28, 2016:											
Alexander Gallo	10/20	10/23	Vietnam		748.08						748.08
Commercial transportation			The Philippines		833.17						833.17
Craig Greene	10/20	10/23	Vietnam		748.08						16,595.56
Commercial transportation			The Philippines		833.17						833.17
Brian Garrett	10/20	10/23	Vietnam		748.08						13,146.06
Commercial transportation			The Philippines		833.17						748.08
Katherine Quinn	10/20	10/23	Vietnam		748.08						13,146.06
Commercial transportation			The Philippines		833.17						748.08
Travel to Germany, Slovakia, Slovenia, Hungary, Croatia, October 21–30, 2016, With STAFFDEL Goffus:											
Catherine Sendak	10/22	10/22	Germany								293.87
Commercial transportation			Slovakia		293.87						234.41
10/22	10/24	10/25	Hungary		234.41						637.36
10/24	10/25	10/26	Croatia		637.36						304.00
10/25	10/26	10/27	Slovenia		304.00						
William Spencer Johnson	10/22	10/22	Germany				11,575.66				11,575.66
Commercial transportation			Slovakia		293.87						293.87
10/22	10/24	10/25	Hungary		234.41						234.41
10/24	10/25	10/26	Croatia		637.36						637.36
10/25	10/26	10/27	Slovenia		304.00						304.00
Commercial transportation							11,575.66				11,575.66
Travel to Belgium, Germany, October 24–28, 2016:											
Andrew Walter	10/25	10/25	Belgium		207.00						207.00
Commercial transportation			Germany				1,744.16				1,744.16
Leonor Tómoro	10/25	10/25	Belgium		207.00						207.00
Commercial transportation			Germany				1,744.16				1,744.16
Travel to Republic of Korea, October 23–29, 2016:											
Kevin Gates	10/24	10/29	Republic of Korea		1,470.00						1,470.00
Commercial transportation							15,034.56				15,034.56
Lindsay Kavanagh	10/24	10/29	Republic of Korea		1,770.00						1,770.00
Commercial transportation							14,114.56				14,114.56
Delegation expenses			Republic of Korea				488.10				665.85
Travel to Japan, October 30–31, 2016:											
Hon. Mac Thornberry	10/30	10/31	Japan		480.00						480.00
Robert L. Simmons, II	10/30	10/31	Japan		480.00						480.00
Travel to Australia, Indonesia, the Philippines, November 1–11, 2016:											
Kari Bingen Tyler	11/3	11/5	Australia		287.00						287.00
Commercial transportation			Indonesia		104.00						104.00
11/3	11/5	11/6	The Philippines		348.00						348.00
11/5	11/6	11/9									
Andrew Peterson	11/3	11/5	Australia		287.00						287.00
Commercial transportation			Indonesia		104.00						104.00
11/3	11/5	11/6	The Philippines		348.00						348.00
11/5	11/6	11/9									
William Spencer Johnson	11/3	11/5	Australia		287.00						287.00
Commercial transportation			Indonesia		104.00						104.00
11/3	11/5	11/6	The Philippines		348.00						348.00
11/5	11/6	11/9									
Alexander Gallo	11/7	11/9	The Philippines		232.00						36,398.79
Commercial transportation											36,398.79
Travel to Rwanda, Kenya, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Somalia, Uganda, November 1–11, 2016:											
Mark Morehouse	11/2	11/4	Rwanda		588.00						588.00
Commercial transportation			Kenya		360.00						360.00
11/2	11/4	11/5	Ethiopia		784.26						784.26
11/2	11/4	11/7	Kenya		700.00						700.00
11/2	11/4	11/9	Uganda		430.00						430.00
Commercial transportation											
Paul Arcangeli	11/2	11/4	Rwanda		588.00						14,708.56
Commercial transportation			Kenya		360.00						360.00
11/2	11/4	11/5	Ethiopia		784.26						784.26
11/2	11/4	11/7	Kenya		700.00						700.00
11/2	11/4	11/9	Uganda		430.00						430.00
Commercial transportation											
Katherine Quinn	11/2	11/4	Rwanda		588.00						14,708.56
Commercial transportation			Kenya		360.00						360.00
11/2	11/4	11/5	Ethiopia		784.26						784.26
11/2	11/4	11/7	Kenya		700.00						700.00
11/2	11/4	11/9	Uganda		430.00						430.00
Commercial transportation											
Hon. Michael R. Turner	11/22	11/23	Turkey		265.00						265.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency
Commercial transportation										
Hon. Rob Bishop	11/22	11/23	Turkey		265.00		8,302.66			8,302.66
Commercial transportation										265.00
Hon. Paul Cook	11/22	11/23	Turkey		265.00		8,302.66			8,302.66
Commercial transportation							8,302.66			265.00
Travel to Italy, Romania, December 11–16, 2016:										
Mark Morehouse	12/12	12/14	Italy		658.36					658.36
	12/14	12/16	Romania		1,046.17					1,046.17
Commercial transportation							6,055.56			6,055.56
Catherine Sendak	12/12	12/14	Italy		658.36					658.36
	12/14	12/16	Romania		1,046.17					1,046.17
Commercial transportation							5,987.86			5,987.86
Andrew Warren	12/12	12/14	Italy		658.36					658.36
	12/14	12/16	Romania		1,046.17					1,046.17
Commercial transportation							6,055.56			6,055.56
Katherine Quinn	12/12	12/14	Italy		658.36					658.36
	12/14	12/16	Romania		1,046.17					1,046.17
Commercial transportation							6,055.56			6,055.56
Travel to the Netherlands, Belgium, December 18–21, 2016:										
Andrew Walter	12/19	12/19	The Netherlands		262.00					262.00
	12/19	12/21	Belgium		262.00					262.00
Commercial transportation							1,483.56			1,483.56
Catherine Sendak	12/19	12/19	The Netherlands		262.00					262.00
	12/19	12/21	Belgium		262.00					262.00
Commercial transportation							1,483.56			1,483.56
William Spenser Johnson	12/19	12/19	The Netherlands		262.00					262.00
	12/19	12/21	Belgium		262.00					262.00
Commercial transportation							1,483.56			1,483.56
Leonor Tomero	12/19	12/19	The Netherlands		262.00					262.00
	12/19	12/21	Belgium		262.00					262.00
Commercial transportation							1,483.56			1,483.56
Brian Greer	12/19	12/19	The Netherlands		262.00					262.00
	12/19	12/21	Belgium		262.00					262.00
Commercial transportation							1,483.56			1,483.56
Travel to Afghanistan, Qatar, December 25–31, 2016:										
Hon. Mike Coffman	12/26	12/28	Afghanistan		33.00					33.00
	12/28	12/29	Qatar		322.80					322.80
Commercial transportation							8,968.86			8,968.86
Daniel Sennott	12/26	12/28	Afghanistan		33.00					33.00
	12/28	12/29	Qatar		388.65					388.65
Commercial transportation							9,025.96			9,025.96
Andrew Schulman	12/26	12/28	Afghanistan		33.00					33.00
	12/28	12/29	Qatar		388.65					388.65
Commercial transportation							9,054.96			9,054.96
Delegation expenses									21.06	
Committee total					61,500.92		453,976.68		198.81	515,655.35

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL: COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve King	9/30	10/6	France, Austria, & Finland	683.00	16,063.25	1,408.68	18,154.93
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Hon. Blake Farenthold	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Hon. Doug Collins	10/1	10/8	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	654.00	8,829.66	1,452.00	10,935.66
Shelley Husband	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Andrea Loving	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
David Greengrass	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Kathryn Rexrode	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
John Manning	10/1	10/10	Italy, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, & Senegal.	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Charlie Keller	10/1	10/10	857.00	(³)	1,779.00	2,636.00
Committee total					8,193.00		24,892.91		17,092.68		50,178.59

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Feb. 13, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Russell	10/3	10/6	Georgia		1,023.00						1,023.00
	10/6	10/7	Bulgaria		271.00						271.00
	10/7	10/9	Lithuania		638.00						638.00
Commercial airfare							15,115.00				15,115.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses											
Michael Howell	10/3 10/6 10/7	10/6 10/7 10/9	Georgia Bulgaria Lithuania	1,023.00 271.00 638.00		15,213.00				2,673.00	2,673.00
Commercial airfare											
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	11/20 11/23	11/23 11/24	Oman Bahrain	179.00 408.00		17,091.00					15,213.00
Commercial airfare											
Delegation expenses											
Hon. Steve Russell	12/15 12/17 12/18 12/19	12/17 12/18 12/19 12/20	South Korea Kosovo Turkey Germany	1,038.00 252.00 520.00 389.00						1,616.00	1,616.00
Commercial airfare											
Committee total					6,650.00		6,351.00				64,709.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ, Chairman, Feb. 15, 2017.

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. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 111. Resolution of inquiry directing the Attorney General to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the financial practices of the President; with an amendment; adversely (Rept. 115–28). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 180. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 985) to amend the procedures used in Federal court class actions and multidistrict litigation proceedings to assure fairer, more efficient outcomes for claimants and defendants, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–29). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require an air carrier to provide information to the public regarding its policies for imposing baggage fees and assisting passengers during a widespread disruption of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUR, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. SENSENBRANNER):

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital stay requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. ROSS (for himself and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1423. A bill to reauthorize and improve the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRANNER (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1424. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 1425. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a lower rate of tax on a portion of pass-through business income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 1427. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 1428. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESSEY (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 1429. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of

higher education to provide students with annual estimates of student loan borrowing costs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1430. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1432. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to repeal the suspension of eligibility for grants, loans, and work assistance for drug-related offenses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1433. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand preventive health care services under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 1434. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 1435. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to remove citizenship and immigration barriers to access the Exchanges under such Act; 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. JORDAN (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 1436. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1437. A bill to discourage the use of payment of money as a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 1438. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SAR-BANES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr.

POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NOR-CROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 1439. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to revise its sponsorship identification rules so as to require the disclosure of the names of significant donors to persons paying for or furnishing broadcast matter or origination cablecasting matter that is political matter or matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SAR-BANES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NOR-CROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1440. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations requiring material in the online public inspection file of a covered entity to be made available in a format that is machine-readable; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1441. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the sequestration for the revised security category under section 251 and to eliminate the section 251A reduction in discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts within function 050 (defense); to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LONG, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H. Res. 178. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that before any bill or joint resolution repealing or amending the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 in the House it should be made available on a public website of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WELCH):

H. Res. 179. A resolution to uphold the protections of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 181. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 182. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 183. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the text of any legislation that will be marked up at a meeting for the markup of legislation by a committee to be publicly available in electronic form at least 72 hours prior to the commencement of the meeting; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1420. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1421. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1422. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1423. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1424. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 1425. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, 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.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 1426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States “[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 1427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. 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. HURD:

H.R. 1428.

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. MESSEY:

H.R. 1429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing—“All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 1433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws

necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.”

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 14 and Clause 18

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 1435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 1436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the Constitution of the United States; and Amendment X to the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.J. Res. 86.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—“necessary and proper” clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BACON and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 37: Mr. BACON and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 38: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. ROYCE of California.

H.R. 60: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BARR, Mr. KIND, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HECK, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 82: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 112: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 115: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 173: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 179: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 350: Mr. BARR and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 367: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 371: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 377: Mr. YOHO and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 380: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 390: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 411: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HECK, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 429: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 508: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 510: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 520: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 530: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 544: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 553: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 611: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 613: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. COLE, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 632: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 640: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 664: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 667: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 672: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 674: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 676: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 696: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 721: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KATKO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 722: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 723: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 747: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 772: Mr. POSEY and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 790: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 795: Ms. ROSEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 799: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 820: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 824: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 850: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 861: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WIILIAMS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 877: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 898: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 910: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 959: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 960: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 963: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 972: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 997: Mr. McCaul, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1017: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1031: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1036: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1057: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1078: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1090: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1091: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1092: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1094: Mr. McGOVERN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

- H.R. 1098: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1107: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 1108: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1116: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROSS, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1120: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1127: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1133: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1136: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 1148: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1155: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1158: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1164: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1181: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 1205: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1206: Mr. VEASEY and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1216: Mr. EMMER and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1219: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.R. 1223: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1235: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1236: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1239: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1257: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.R. 1261: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1276: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1284: Ms. DELAUBRO.
H.R. 1304: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1311: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1312: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.R. 1326: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1346: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1356: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1363: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1366: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 1368: Mr. NADLER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1370: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1391: Mr. MESSEY, Mr. BUDD, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1413: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. COLE.
H.J. Res. 17: Mr. POSEY.
H.J. Res. 26: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 27: Mr. ROKITA.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.J. Res. 71: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. EMMER.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H. Res. 28: Mr. VISCHOSKY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 31: Mr. CORREA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VISCHOSKY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BERA.
H. Res. 136: Mr. HUFFMAN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2017

No. 40

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Eternal God, who rules the raging of the sea, You are our guardian and friend. Place Your arms of protection and wisdom around our lawmakers, shielding them from life's pitfalls and using them for Your glory. Lord, be their refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. May they rejoice because of Your mercies, serving You with grateful hearts. Turn the night of their distress into the morning of Your hope, causing them to wait patiently for the unfolding of Your loving providence. May they feel Your everlasting arms beneath them and find peace in Your presence.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING THE NKU NORSE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to start by taking a moment to congratulate the men's basketball team of Northern Kentucky University for an impressive accomplishment.

My home State of Kentucky is without a doubt known for college basket-

ball, and now we have another reason to be proud. With last night's win, the NKU Norse secured the Horizon League championship and earned a ticket to the NCAA Tournament. With their recent entrance into Division I play, this is the first year the Norse have been eligible for a spot in the tournament, and their season of hard work has paid off.

I would like to congratulate the team, Head Coach John Brannen, and the entire program, and I look forward to watching them continue their incredible season.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act was one of the great triumphs of the last Congress. It represented the most significant education reform in over a decade. It heralded "the largest devolution of federal control to the states in a quarter-century," as the Wall Street Journal put it, empowering parents, teachers, and schools at the expense of Washington bureaucrats. It passed the Senate with wide bipartisan support, 85 to 12; President Obama signed it into law.

Yet just a few months later, his administration set to shift power back from parents and schools to the Washington bureaucracy by regulation. The Obama administration's so-called accountability regulation was written in direct—direct—contradiction to the law that passed Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support and is a prime example of the Executive overreach we in Congress are working to overturn.

Today, however, thanks to the Congressional Review Act, we have the opportunity to move past this overreaching regulation and empower those closest to our kids once again to ensure our schools are held to the highest standards.

We will also have the opportunity to move past another Obama-era regula-

tion that hurts students and those seeking to go into the teaching profession. I am talking about a regulation that allows the Federal Government to insert itself into the way States choose to prepare their teachers for the classroom. States are supposed to be the leaders on core curriculum and decisions on how to prepare teachers to best meet the needs of their students—not Washington bureaucrats. By repealing this regulation, we could help restore that process. Further, this regulation increases administrative burdens that only divert much needed resources and focus away from students.

As the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education put it, voting to remove the harmful teacher preparation regulation "will allow Kentucky universities and colleges to continue developing and supporting outstanding teachers who positively impact P-12 children."

"Teacher preparation programs have limited and shrinking resources," the letter said. "[Our] members want to spend those resources on developing exemplary teachers rather than working on compliance regulations that have not been shown to result in better prepared and higher quality teachers."

That is from the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Groups like this know firsthand that more flexibility is the key to improving our schools. They know that those closest to students are best positioned to help our children succeed. They know that the one-size-fits-all education policies of the past are unsustainable for the future. So it is time to move past both of these harmful education regulations.

In particular, I want to recognize Senator SASSE and Senator ALEXANDER, the HELP Committee chairman, for their leadership on these issues. They introduced legislation similar to the House-passed proposals that we will vote on this week to overturn these unfair regulations.

- This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

I encourage colleagues to support both CRA resolutions so that we can continue building upon educational policies that put America's students and educators first.

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just before the election, CNN ran an article with the following headline. This is CNN: "Is ObamaCare really affordable?" Answer: "Not for the middle class." It was true then, it is true now, and it will continue to get worse unless ObamaCare is repealed and replaced.

In places like my home State of Kentucky, relief cannot come soon enough. Because of ObamaCare, premiums in Kentucky shot up by as much as 47 percent this year. Almost half of the counties in Kentucky have only one option for insurance providers on the ObamaCare exchange. Families are losing their doctors and are being forced into junk plans. The list of broken promises goes on and on.

I have said it before; I will say it again: The status quo is unsustainable. We cannot sit on our hands and do nothing. We must act before the market collapses.

Americans have repeatedly demanded the repeal of ObamaCare, and Republicans are fulfilling our promise to do just that. The bill unveiled in the House this week represents an important step toward that pledge. It will bring much needed relief to families and small businesses. It will give Americans more control over their own healthcare choices. It will help stabilize the marketplace. And just yesterday, Health and Human Services Secretary Dr. Tom Price sent a letter expressing the administration's support for it. Here is what he said: "These proposals offer patient-centered solutions that will provide all Americans with access to affordable, quality, healthcare," he wrote. They will also "promote innovation, and offer peace of mind for those with pre-existing conditions," he said.

In the coming weeks, committees in the House will publicly debate this bill. I hope Members will take the time to consider the bill and continue to ask questions.

Once we receive the bill from the House, the Senate will act because here is what we know: ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class. It will continue to get worse unless we act to repeal and replace it, and we are determined to keep our promise to the American people to do just that.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the House Republicans have finally unveiled their healthcare plan after nearly 8 years without a plan of their own.

TrumpCare is finally public, and each hour that goes by brings a new set of concerns and new groups that oppose the bill, from all places along the ideological spectrum. Even a growing number of conservatives are expressing their distaste for the legislation.

The fact of the matter is that TrumpCare is a mess. It will mean higher costs and less care for most Americans. When you look at the details, you can see that TrumpCare amounts to two separate systems of healthcare in America: cheaper healthcare for the rich, more expensive healthcare for everybody else.

Under TrumpCare, if you make more than \$250,000 a year, you will get a huge tax break. The average is \$200,000 a year, because most people are way above that \$250,000. If you are in the middle class, the cost will increase by \$1,500 annually, and by 2020, over \$2,000 a year.

Let me repeat that. If you make over \$250,000, your average tax break is \$200,000. If you are in the middle class, your average increase in costs is \$1,500 up. What kind of plan is that?

Donald Trump has talked about helping working America. The plan he has embraced, TrumpCare, helps the rich and hurts the average American. That is not surprising given all the other things they are doing the same way. This administration continues—and healthcare is part of that—to talk like populists but act like those helping the wealthy special interests time after time.

Let me repeat that. Under TrumpCare, if you make more than \$250,000, you will get a tax break on average of \$200,000 a year. If you are in the middle class, the cost will increase by about \$1,500 annually, and after 2020, by \$2,000 a year.

TrumpCare is a healthcare handout for the wealthiest Americans and fake healthcare for everybody else. Under TrumpCare, if you are a member of the Trump Cabinet—stocked with billionaires—you are going to get a tax break, but if you are 60 years old, on the cusp of retirement but still waiting because you are not yet eligible for Medicare, TrumpCare would allow insurers to charge you more simply because of your age—discrimination against the elderly, against those 50 to 65, who have worked so hard but don't yet have Medicare. That is wrong.

If you are between 55 and 64, the total cost for you will increase \$5,269 a year. Let me repeat that. If you are between 55 and 64, the total cost would increase

by \$5,269 a year. That is only the next 2 years. By 2020, it goes up to \$6,000 a year.

For a working family, they can't afford that. What is this all about? They said it would be better care and cost less. It is worse care and it costs more.

How about this? Under TrumpCare, a wealthy insurance executive making over \$500,000 a year is allowed a tax break. If you are struggling to make it into the middle class with an income of 250 percent below the poverty line, your costs are going to go up by nearly \$3,000 a year, and by 2020, \$4,000 a year—once again, helping the wealthy special interests, in this case insurance executives, and hurting those struggling, climbing the ladder to get into the middle class.

If you are a working mother and you get healthcare from Planned Parenthood, too bad, TrumpCare cuts all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood for a year.

I am wearing my red tie today to honor the Day Without Women. Unfortunately, TrumpCare is the healthcare bill that forgot about women. Women are an essential part of our workforce in America. They ought to be able to go to the doctor or provider of their choice, even if that is Planned Parenthood.

When you look at the fine print of this bill, it has jagged edges. TrumpCare shifts the costs and burdens from the wealthy to the poor, from the insurance executive to the middle-class family.

The more Americans hear about this plan, the less they are going to like it. They were already against repeal before this plan came out. Can you imagine what is going to happen now as they read the details? I believe the Congressional Budget Office, when they score it, will ultimately show America everything America needs to know—how this bill would likely hurt overall coverage numbers and affordability and, at the same time, explode the deficit.

You are getting worse healthcare and increasing the deficit. What kind of combination is that? No wonder the Republican leadership in the House is trying to rush through the bill even without a score. They don't want the American people to see it. I don't think they even want their own Members to have a chance to study it because it is a near certainty that this bill will cause millions to lose insurance as well as blow a gigantic hole in the Federal budget.

In conclusion, it is reckless for Republicans to make Congress vote on this mess of a plan before we have those answers from CBO. Simply put, TrumpCare is a mess for the American people. We Democrats will fight it tooth and nail.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 58, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues.

CALLING FOR AN INDEPENDENT, BIPARTISAN COMMISSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in recent weeks, we have seen an astonishing series of revelations about Russia's efforts to influence the 2016 election in support of the Donald Trump campaign. Last week, the Washington Post reported that Attorney General Jeff Sessions met with the Russian Ambassador in July and September during the campaign. Yet, during his confirmation hearing, the Attorney General said under oath: "I did not have communications with the Russians."

Last Thursday, the Attorney General announced he would partially recuse himself from any investigation into the Presidential campaign. I note that this was a partial recusal when it comes to investigations into Russia's influence on President Trump and his circle of advisers and associates. The scope of the recusal is still unclear. For example, Attorney General Sessions does not even appear to believe that his own meeting with the Russian Ambassador on September 8, 2016, was related to the campaign. The scope of his recusal will need to be clarified.

We also continue to learn of previously undisclosed communications between the Russians and President Trump's inner circle. For example, we learned last week that Jared Kushner, President Trump's son-in-law and senior adviser, had met in December with the Russian Ambassador in Trump Tower, along with the President's National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, who resigned on February 13. People across America are wondering when the next shoe will drop.

It is becoming clear that the President is desperate to change the head-

lines from these Russian revelations—so desperate, in fact, that in a series of tweets on Saturday morning, President Trump claimed that President Obama had wiretapped Trump Tower in an act President Trump described as "McCarthyism" and "Nixon/Watergate." Well, President Trump's tweets again made news but not in the way he had hoped. It quickly became clear that President Trump has no evidence to back up his claims. In fact, it appeared he got his information not from America's law enforcement or intelligence agencies but from rightwing talk radio.

On Sunday, the former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, denied the President's claims, and the Director of the FBI, James Comey, took an extraordinary step of calling on the Justice Department to publicly deny the President's claims. Even Republicans like House Oversight Committee chairman JASON CHAFFETZ and TREY GOWDY, chairman of the Select Committee on Benghazi, said they had not seen any evidence that would support what President Trump tweeted. Nonetheless, the President's spokespersons doubled down, saying that the President does not accept the contention of the FBI Director and he stands by his tweets.

Let's be clear. President Trump is playing games with the credibility of his Presidency. Donald Trump is destroying the credibility of the Office of the President 140 characters at a time. If President Trump had consulted with his adviser—any credible adviser—prior to his tweets, he would have learned something that is crucial, and it is as follows: The President of the United States does not have the authority to order a wiretap. Instead, such a wiretap can be granted upon a finding by a court that there is probable cause to believe the target has committed a crime or is an agent of a foreign power.

Clearly, there are more revelations to come. The only question: How long is it going to take? How much damage will be done to the credibility of the Office of the President and America in the process?

These recent events confirm yet again the need for an independent, transparent, bipartisan commission led by Americans of unimpeachable integrity to get to the bottom of this Russian attack on the United States. Russia attacked our democracy. We need to fully understand what happened. We certainly need to prevent it from happening in the next election or ever again.

This week, a USA TODAY/Suffolk University poll found that Americans, by a margin of 58 percent to 35 percent, believe an outside independent investigation is needed into Russian involvement in our election. It is worthy of note that just a few weeks ago, only 30-something percent of the American people were aware of this controversy with Russia. Now over 55 percent of people want an independent investigation. America is listening.

We also need the Justice Department and the FBI to proceed with a credible, impartial investigation to determine if there may have been any criminal conduct involved.

Yesterday, the President's nominee for Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee. If confirmed, Mr. Rosenstein would oversee any Justice Department investigation into the Trump administration's Russian connections after Attorney General Sessions has partially recused himself. So I pressed Mr. Rosenstein to clarify the scope of Attorney General Sessions' recusal commitment. I also asked, as did Senator FEINSTEIN, whether Mr. Rosenstein had read the January 6 Intelligence Community assessment into Russian election interference. I cannot explain it, but in 2 months Mr. Rosenstein had not read this 15-page, unclassified report that is available on the internet. It focuses on the major issue he will face initially as Deputy Attorney General, and he told us he had not read it.

Let me add that I respect Rod Rosenstein. He served as U.S. attorney in Maryland, appointed first under a Republican President and held over under a Democratic President, and that says a lot about his professionalism as a prosecutor, his reputation, and his integrity. It is hard for me to believe that he could come before a hearing, which he knew would focus on the need for a special prosecutor to look into this Russian interference, and not have been briefed to read the 15-page public report that summarizes the conclusions of all of America's intelligence agencies when it comes to this Russian interference.

I am sure he is an excellent lawyer who wouldn't enter a courtroom or stand before a judge or jury without complete preparation to the best of his ability, but yesterday, time and again, he told us he didn't take the time to read this report. I urge him to do so as quickly as possible, and when he reads it, he will see that our intelligence agencies are unequivocal in their statement that Vladimir Putin was setting out to elect Donald Trump and to defeat Hillary Clinton. This is not a report from the Democratic National Committee; it is a report from our intelligence agencies. And whomever Putin was trying to help, that is secondary to the fact that he was hacking into the internet, disclosing materials, and trying to become a material player in our Presidential election.

Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, I went to visit Poland, Lithuania, and Ukraine. They are watching this carefully because they have been the victims of Vladimir Putin and Russia's attempts to interfere in their elections, and now they hear the United States has been victimized by Putin, as well.

One of the scholars in Poland asked me what I thought was a very clear question, and I can't answer. He said: If

the United States will not take the interference of Putin in your election seriously, how can the people of Poland believe you will take your NATO commitment to protect us from Putin seriously? Important question. Valid question.

There are exceptions on the Republican side of the aisle, and I would like to point out one of them. My friend, my colleague, and the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations, LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, made an extraordinarily forthright statement yesterday about the need for an investigation into this Russian interference. Thank goodness he is stepping away from party loyalty and stepping up when it comes to defending this Nation. I salute my Republican colleague for his leadership on this issue.

It is important to step back from the daily dysfunction we have when it comes to the Russian investigation and the White House and lack of governing and remember what is really at stake.

Five months ago, our intelligence services disclosed evidence that a foreign adversary—one ruled by a dictatorial former Communist KGB agent—was trying to help its preferred candidate in the U.S. Presidential election. Think about that for a moment. An adversary of the United States—a country which has imprisoned millions of Europeans in the Communist system for almost half a century and which today rigs elections and silences or murders members of the media and opposition—committed what I believe is akin to a cyber act of war against America in trying to elect someone they saw as more sympathetic to their interests.

Since those early reports, we have been provided with damning evidence by our intelligence agencies on the depth and sophistication of this operation—so favorable to its nefarious goal that it had Russian intelligence operatives boastfully celebrating after the outcome of the election.

We also know that members of President Trump's campaign met with those thought to be Russian intelligence; had suspiciously timed communications with the Russian Government just after the Obama administration placed sanctions on Russia; and in the case of top Trump advisers Michael Flynn and Jeff Sessions, refused to disclose those meetings, both in public and in one case to the Vice President and in another case to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

No candidate would or at least should want help from a foreign dictator to help win political office in the United States. So in a situation like this, the response is obvious: Help in any way possible to clear suspicions and concerns. Go forward and serve the American people with an investigation. It seems so obvious.

Leon Panetta was on one of the Sunday morning talk shows. Leon Panetta is a friend. I served with him in the

House of Representatives. He was the Chief of Staff to the President of the United States, President Clinton. He served as Secretary of Defense. He headed up the Central Intelligence Agency. He is an extraordinarily gifted and well-thought-of person who has a record of public service that is enviable. He was asked about what the Trump White House should do about this allegation of Russian interference in the election and the suggestion that they might have been complicit.

He said: Get out in front.

The President of the United States should say: I have nothing to hide, and we will fully cooperate with an independent commission to get to the bottom of what happened in that election. But instead, what do we have? Fanatical—in fact, patently false—tweets by the President, alleging a wiretap by the former President. President Trump, if he has nothing to hide, should help us clear this up once and for all.

To my Republican colleagues, so many patriots and champions of American national security, it is time for more to join Senator GRAHAM and others to step up and speak out even on the floor of the Senate about this situation.

Each one of us in the Senate swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against enemies foreign and domestic. Clearly, the Russian attack is a call for all of us—of both political parties—to step up. This issue is not going to go away. We are going to continue to pursue the truth.

NOMINATION OF SEEMA VERMA AND THE REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the recently released Republican healthcare repeal bill and to speak on the nomination of Seema Verma to serve as Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

CMS is an agency touching the lives of 125 million people, and 34 percent of Americans receive their health insurance under one of the three Federal programs run by that agency—Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program. These programs are vital to the health and well-being of seniors, children, persons with disabilities, and low-income families. Yet, with those vows to repeal the Affordable Care Act, President Trump, Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price, and congressional Republicans are sadly attempting to gut the Medicaid program and to jeopardize the future of Medicare.

The head of CMS should be someone who believes in these core programs and is willing to fight to preserve them. Instead, Ms. Seema Verma's record—as well as comments she made during her confirmation hearing—indicates she is more than willing to take dramatic steps to force people to lose their health insurance or dramatically increase out-of-pocket costs.

From her refusal to disavow efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act to

her willingness to cut the Medicaid Program, I do not believe Ms. Verma is the right person for this job.

When it comes to the Affordable Care Act, our constituents—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—are angry and frightened about what the Trump administration and congressional Republicans might do to healthcare. Based on what has finally been released, they have good reason.

In over 2 months, Republican leaders in Washington have taken numerous steps to change and even sabotage our healthcare system, jeopardizing patient access to care and throwing the system into chaos.

Before President Trump took office, congressional Republicans rammed through a budget bill, laying the groundwork for a quick, silent repeal of the Affordable Care Act, despite the fact that they had no replacement. Then, on his first day in office, the President signed an Executive order to weaken the Affordable Care Act, instructing Federal agencies to stop doing their job under the law. The President then acted hastily to stop Federal outreach efforts—TV ads, radio spots, and emails intended to encourage more Americans to sign up for health insurance.

I watched yesterday as the Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN, said that the Affordable Care Act is collapsing. Well, I can tell you, it needs help and it should be bipartisan. Instead, the Republicans are doing everything they can to jeopardize it.

Last week, the President met with big insurance companies to discuss what they want for healthcare. But where were the patients, the hospitals, the doctors, the nurses, the community health centers in these conversations?

It is clear that congressional Republicans want to move full steam ahead on repealing our healthcare law. The problem has always been and still is that they can't agree on how to move forward. They don't have a plan to protect people. Some Republicans just want to repeal. Others want to repair. Others want to rebuild. They can throw out all the "R" words they can find in the dictionary, but at the end of the day, they don't know what they want to do. These disagreements are becoming even more obvious in the last week.

For the past few months, House Republican leaders have been meeting secretly to craft a repeal bill. Well, they finally unveiled it. No wonder they wanted to keep it secret.

Incidentally, this bill, which has been authored by the Republicans—a party that claims a commitment to fiscal soundness—has not been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. We don't know, even as it is being considered by committees in the House of Representatives, whether it is going to add to the deficit or not. You would think that the party of fiscal integrity—the Republican Party—would ask that question early on. As yet, they have no answer, and they are proceeding full steam ahead.

The bill, first, would end Medicaid as we know it, cutting \$370 billion from the program and limiting care. Who are the beneficiaries of Medicaid? The largest group of beneficiaries are kids and mothers. The second most expensive group are seniors, many of them in nursing homes who, without Medicaid and Medicare, could not even continue in a good nursing home environment.

Keep in mind that one in five Americans currently depend on Medicaid for their health insurance—65 million people nationwide. That includes 35 million children, 7 million seniors, 11 million people with disabilities.

We used to say: Well, Medicaid is for poor people. Well, it certainly is for lower income Americans, but many of them are working low-income Americans who still qualify for Medicaid.

My friend, who has worked in the motel-hospitality industry all of her life, in her sixties, sadly, is a part-time employee, despite her hard work. She can't afford health insurance, but she qualifies for Medicaid. She is part of the working poor, and she is one who needs this benefit. If the Republicans have their way and reduce Medicaid coverage, she could certainly lose it.

In my home State of Illinois, 650,000 people have gained healthcare coverage under Medicaid, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. For her and others I have met, it is the first time in their life that these men and women—often in their sixties—for the first time in their life have health insurance.

Of Illinois' 18 congressional districts, not a single one has less than 71,000 Medicaid enrollees. Nearly half of all the kids in Illinois, 1.5 million children, get their healthcare through Medicaid, and the Republican repeal bill is going to endanger that.

That is so obvious that yesterday the Republican Governor of Illinois, who was careful in his words and seldom reacts, came out publicly and said that the Republican repeal bill would significantly hurt our State of Illinois. That is from a Republican Governor.

Medicaid is the largest payer of long-term care for seniors in the Nation and in Illinois. It is one of our best tools, incidentally, for addressing the opioid epidemic, ensuring that those facing addiction have access to treatment. And the Republicans want to cut that.

Medicaid has been a lifesaver to Illinois hospitals, especially in my part of the State, downstate Illinois.

Repeal of the Medicaid expansion, as the House bill proposes, could result in the loss of up to 90,000 jobs in Illinois.

The Republican repeal bill on healthcare is a jobs killer in Illinois and across this Nation. We will see hospitals cutting back on personnel in an attempt to adjust to the cutbacks in coverage and the increases in cost brought on by the Republican repeal bill.

But the bill goes even further. It dramatically restructures the entire Medicaid Program. When talking about the plan for Medicaid, congressional Re-

publicans throw around innocuous terms: per capita caps, block grants, more flexibility, modernizing. Don't be lulled in a false sense of security by these words. This Republican healthcare repeal bill would significantly cut back on Federal spending on Medicaid, shifting the cost to States, families, and individuals who are currently struggling to get by today.

With less funding, States would be forced to throw people off of Medicaid, limit the types of healthcare services offered, create waiting lists, and much more. In the name of State flexibility and modernizing, it would mean that more and more people would be showing up in emergency rooms in Illinois and across the Nation with no health insurance coverage under the Republican approach.

Oh, they will get care, and it will cost. They can't pay for it, and that cost will be shifted to others with health insurance.

Unfortunately, Ms. Verma has significant experience in this exact type of healthcare rationing. In her role as a private healthcare consultant, she championed radical Medicaid overhauls. She supports making low-income Medicaid beneficiaries pay more money. She believes that Medicaid beneficiaries need "more skin in the game." I wonder how many Medicaid recipients Ms. Verma has actually sat down and met with.

The Illinois folks whom I know are the mom working two jobs, struggling to take time off from work to take her kid to the doctor, or the senior who has literally spent down all of her life savings on nursing home care and has no place else to turn.

Devising plans that restrict access to care for the most vulnerable among us are not the qualifications I am looking for in the person who wants to run the agency responsible for Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP.

Finally, on the House Republican repeal bill, in addition to gutting Medicaid, the bill eliminates the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which currently provides the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention \$900 million, or 12 percent of their annual budget. The bill defunds Planned Parenthood. The bill allows insurers to charge older people significantly more in premiums than allowed under current law. The bill, incidentally, dramatically cuts taxes for the wealthiest people in America and increases costs for middle-income families. What is most telling, as I mentioned earlier, is that the House Republicans won't even send this bill or wait for a report from the Congressional Budget Office before proceeding.

How many people will lose their health insurance under the Republican repeal plan? How will out-of-pocket expenses go up for families under the Republican repeal plan? How much responsibility and burden will be shifted to the States under the Republican repeal plan?

For now, Republicans can claim ignorance because they have decided to move forward before there was a report from the Congressional Budget Office.

Thank goodness some Republicans are speaking out against this terrible plan—maybe not for the same reasons I oppose it. But conservatives say it doesn't rip health insurance away from more people more quickly, and moderates worry about Medicaid—demonstrating, again, the lack of a consensus on the Republican side when it comes to the future of healthcare.

We have big challenges ahead—challenges that will determine whether we have as many people in America with health insurance tomorrow as we have today and how much it will cost.

I don't believe the Republican repeal bill is the right path forward, and I don't believe Seema Verma is the right person to stand up and fight for our Nation's seniors, children, and low-income families. For that reason, I will be voting against her nomination to serve as Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the American Health Care Act. This bill will destroy the Affordable Care Act, even though the Affordable Care Act has given more Americans access to quality, affordable healthcare than ever before in our history. It would force middle-class families to pay more money for less care. It would leave more people uninsured by a lot. It would allow insurance companies to charge older Americans with what is essentially an age tax, as if our parents and grandparents don't already pay insurance companies enough for their care.

It would cause many working families to lose coverage from their employers because, under this new bill, companies would no longer have to provide their workers with healthcare, and without a mandate to do so, we know many of them will not.

It would drastically cut Medicaid funding, which would cripple our State budgets and would leave many seniors in nursing homes and lower income New Yorkers stuck without a way to pay for the medical care they actually need to survive. This bill would also take away healthcare for millions of women, including lifesaving healthcare services like breast exams and pap smears.

On top of all of this, as if to add insult to injury, this so-called healthcare plan would give tax breaks to health insurance CEOs who make more than

\$500,000 a year. How is any of this going to make people in my State or in my colleagues' States healthier?

I am struggling to understand, amid all of the problems we seem to have and all of the problems we need to solve in this Chamber, why this Congress seems to have a singular fixation on taking away access to healthcare from some of the most vulnerable people in our communities. I continue to be amazed by how little empathy there seems to be in this Chamber for the millions of women, older Americans, and lower income Americans who do not have the incredible resources that we have here in Congress and who desperately need the Federal programs this bill will cut.

The legislation is completely out of touch with the actual needs of the people in my State. It is driven by ideology, as if it is somehow the wrong thing to do to help people in our States live healthy and fulfilling lives.

If someone is diagnosed with cancer and the only way he can afford to see an oncologist and have surgery is through an Affordable Care Act health plan, do you think he cares whether his insurance coverage was made possible by ObamaCare? If your parents or grandparents suffer from dementia and the only way they can afford the constant care and medical attention is if they sign up for Medicaid, do you think they care that Medicaid is a program that is actually run by the Federal Government?

I don't think families care about that. I think they are much more concerned about whether they have access to the insurance plans that actually cover their needs, that actually treat their illnesses, that actually give them the medicines they need, and that allow them to heal and get back to full strength.

That is why the Affordable Care Act has done so many good things for people in our States—because access to healthcare is a human right. Now that millions more Americans finally have it, it is wrong to take it away from them.

I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to think much more about the women in their lives who need access to these preventive healthcare services, to think about all of the hard-working Americans who do not earn a lot, though they work full-time jobs and cannot afford it, and to think about all of the older Americans who are really being disadvantaged through this bill so they will not be able to afford that 24/7 or nursing care they need. This bill harms all of them, and it makes their lives much harder, not easier.

I implore all of my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time spent in quorum calls on H.J. Res. 58 be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. KAYNE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act that is being considered by the House.

In December, I was informed that I was going to get one of my dreams to come true in the Senate. I had asked to be on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee when I came in, in January of 2013, and I was not on the committee. I had no complaints because I had other good committees, but I was told in December that, for this Congress, I would be added to the committee, and I am thrilled to serve on it.

When I found that I was going to be added to the committee, I knew one of the first issues we would be tackling is what to do about the Affordable Care Act. So I have started to pay visits around the State to as many stakeholders as I can, including patients, doctors, medical students, hospitals, behavioral health facilities, allied health training programs in regions all across the State, military families in Hampton Roads just last Friday, as well as patients and their families in Chesterfield County last Friday. In all of these visits, my question has been: We are going to be tackling the Affordable Care Act; tell me what works, what doesn't work, and what we can do better. That has been the goal.

Today's committees in the House, two committees, are considering a plan that House Republicans have put on the table and are touting as a replacement of the Affordable Care Act. I just want to talk about what it would mean, if passed, to Virginians and Americans.

This plan will reduce the number of Americans with insurance. We dropped the uninsurance rate to a historic low, but the gains that we made would be reversed and the numbers of Americans with insurance would go down.

It would raise healthcare costs, particularly on seniors, which I will discuss in a minute.

It would dismantle the Medicaid Program at the service of tax cuts for the wealthiest.

It is not an adequate replacement; in fact, it would be a dramatic retreat, and it would be a retreat that would violate promises that had been made by the President and other leaders.

Republicans—and I will get into this—have made a number of promises about what a replacement would look like, but this plan falls far short of that. That is why, within 36 hours of it being put on the table, stakeholders across the spectrum, including the American Hospital Association, AARP,

the American Medical Association, nurses, nursing homes, and Republican Governors have come out to either dramatically and flatly oppose this plan or suggest significant concerns with it.

The bill has yet to be scored by the Congressional Budget Office, but the House is trying to push it through committee, and even through the floor, if they can, before the CBO tells the American public what this plan would cost and, every bit as importantly, what it would cost Americans in terms of the number of people who would lose their health insurance.

A very poignant comment about the plan that was in the paper this morning was from the Republican Governor of Nevada, Brian Sandoval, who said: We Republican Governors have talked to Congress and said please pay attention to what we have to say. States bear a huge burden on these programs, especially Medicaid. He said: We gave ideas to the leadership, to the majority about the replacement, but none of our ideas are in this plan.

Without a CBO score, the American public and this body are completely in the dark about how many people will lose coverage and about how this will affect the American economy. Why would we move forward? Why would we try to push a vote even in a committee, much less on the House floor, before the CBO has given us this score? We don't serve the American public well by doing that.

What does the replacement bill do? One, it ends the expansion of Medicaid that was a core component of the Affordable Care Act—the expansion that has been embraced by more than 30 States. Then, it takes the traditional Medicaid Program and really dismantles it, instituting a per capita fee for enrollees, and moving it more towards a block grant program. That is the first thing it does.

Second, with respect to seniors, this plan would repeal a provision in the Affordable Care Act that says seniors cannot be charged more than three times the premium of a young person; it would repeal that, and it will allow insurers to charge older customers five times as much as younger customers. It would also give States the ability to set even more unfavorable ratios for seniors. This will have a significant impact on the premium of older Americans.

Third, the plan repeals the income-based subsidies, premium assistance, and cost-sharing reductions in the current Affordable Care Act and substitutes less generous tax credits that will not be adjusted to average costs of plans in particular markets. So if you are a middle-income individual in a high-cost market, you are really out of luck with this plan.

Let me give an example of how insurance would be affected in particular communities all over Virginia if the House plan were adopted. If you are 60 years old and you make \$30,000 per year, under the House plan, here is

what happens. First, the cost of your insurance can be dramatically raised because you are not, at age 60 now, limited to three-to-one over a young person's premium; they can charge you five-to-one over a young person's premium. So the premium cost, if you are a 60-year-old making 30,000 bucks, goes up significantly.

Now, you get a tax credit, just as right now you get a subsidy, but the tax credit is much less generous. So the cost of your policy goes up, but here is what happens in communities all over Virginia—tax credit compared to the subsidy they currently get.

In 2020, in Augusta County, VA, in the Shenandoah Valley, the tax credit you get is worth only about half of the subsidy you would get if we continued the Affordable Care Act. So the price is up, but your tax credit is less generous by half of the current subsidy.

In Fairfax, your tax credit is 41 percent less than the subsidy; in Bedford, 51 percent less than the subsidy; in the city of Norfolk, 51 percent less; in Rockingham, 50 percent less; Pittsylvania, 49 percent less, and Pulaski County in far Southwest Virginia, 54 percent less.

So if you are a senior, your costs go up, but the assistance you get in the tax credit is dramatically less generous than the assistance you currently get with the premium subsidy.

The bill establishes a penalty if you don't have continuous insurance. An insurer can charge you 30 percent more in premiums if you go 2 months or more without insurance. So if you are unemployed, you lose your insurance. If you forget to pay a premium for two months, you lose your insurance. If you have any gap of 2 months, that is an opportunity for insurers to come in and sock you with a massive penalty.

The bill repeals funding to a healthcare provider of choice for millions of American women: Planned Parenthood. It is really important to be specific about this. There is not in the Federal budget a line item that says Planned Parenthood gets axed. What Federal funds go to Planned Parenthood? Well, first, the Hyde amendment says no Federal funds can go to any organization for the provision of abortions—Planned Parenthood or anybody else. Planned Parenthood receives Federal funds because it provides healthcare to women who are eligible for Medicaid. So when Planned Parenthood treats a woman who is Medicaid-eligible for a medical service that is eligible for a Medicaid reimbursement, then Planned Parenthood is able to bill Medicaid just like a doctor's office is. And Planned Parenthood is the healthcare provider of choice for millions of American women to do annual checkups, pap smears, cervical cancer tests, and all kinds of basic healthcare provisions. But under this bill, Planned Parenthood will be disbarred from the Medicaid Program, even when they are providing services to Medicaid-eligible women—services that are covered by Medicaid.

The one thing about this bill that I would say—if you were going to say: Well, who is a guaranteed winner in this bill because there are a lot of losers, and I have tried to summarize them—the guaranteed winner is that this bill overwhelmingly repeals the provisions that raise revenue. This bill is a big tax cut bill.

The biggest revenue raisers in the Affordable Care Act were tax cuts on the wealthiest citizens. There is a tax increase for nonwage income by the top earners in the United States and an additional hospital insurance tax that also affected individuals of high income.

What this bill does is cut taxes that almost exclusively benefit the wealthy, while the bill is taking away these coverages and provisions that protect middle and lower income Americans. The tax cuts in this bill would save the top 0.1 percent of earners in the United States about an average of \$195,000 a year. So if you are in the top 0.1 percent and this bill passes, you are going to get an average of a \$195,000 tax break.

Millionaires get 80 percent of the value of the high income tax cuts in the House bill, with the elimination of the hospital insurance tax on high earners and the Medicare tax on investment income. In fact, a family who is going to do incredibly well under this bill is the family of our President, Donald Trump. As high earners, they are going to get a huge tax cut with this bill.

I have to ask: Is this bill a healthcare bill or is it basically a tax cut bill? You could look at this bill as basically being that the driver of it is who benefits from it. It is a tax cut on the wealthy, paid for by slashing Medicaid, slashing healthcare coverage, slashing Medicare's trust fund, slashing Planned Parenthood, taking protections like preexisting conditions that really matter to people and reducing them. So I have a real question about whether this bill is a healthcare bill at all or whether, under the guise of a repeal and replace of ACA, it is a tax cut for the wealthiest, financed by slashing the healthcare safety net.

Let me read to my colleagues what certain Republican leaders have said about this bill in the past. The deputy leader here in the Senate—a friend—from Texas, Senator CORNYN, said to Republican Governors—Governors have a lot at stake in this. I was a Governor. I know how much Governors depend on Medicaid and healthcare programs. Here is what he said on January 19, 2017: "Nobody is going to lose coverage."

No exception, no qualification. "Nobody is going to lose coverage." That is what he said to the Republican Governors.

We were awaiting the CBO score suggesting potentially how many millions will lose coverage. Many people will lose coverage. That is not what was promised.

But, more importantly, probably, what did the President say? When the President was campaigning as a candidate, this is what he promised the American people: "I am going to take care of everybody. I don't care if it costs me votes or not. Everybody's going to be taken care of much better than they're taken care of now."

That was the test that he set for himself about an ObamaCare replacement—that no one would be worse off and that many would be better off. This does not meet that promise. It fails that promise.

At a December press conference the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL said: "Surely, we can do better for the American people," and "we will work expeditiously to come up with a better proposal than current law."

Again, the promise was, we will take where we are right now and we will make it better. Nobody will lose coverage; everybody will be taken care of better. We will come up with a better proposal than the current law.

This is not that proposal. Turning Medicaid from a Federal guarantee to a per capita cap on spending doesn't mean everyone is covered; it means cuts to the States that would force States to cut eligibility, reduce benefits or provider payments. That is why providers, like the hospital associations and nursing homes, and the Republican Governors, like Governor Sandoval, are deeply opposed to this particular version. It is not better for the American people.

Protecting people with preexisting conditions, which the current bill does, but only if they have continuous coverage—that is not better for the American people because what if you lose your job or you can't afford benefits or you have a break in coverage for two months, and then you suddenly find that you are not protected, and your preexisting condition can be used against you to bar you from insurance for the rest of your life.

If you are unemployed and have a break in coverage, how do you afford a 30-percent surcharge on health insurance premiums like this plan proposes that insurance companies can sock you with? That is not better for the American people.

In closing, I will repeat something that 13 Democrats put into a letter to the Republican leadership in January: We want to work together to try to make healthcare better. We are willing to sit down at a table. We have ideas for how to improve not just the Affordable Care Act but prescription drug prices under Medicare Part D, something our citizens are deeply concerned about. We need to work together on affordability. We need to work together to make sure small businesses are able to afford coverage. We have to bring prescription drug pricing down. I know Republicans have ideas about how to do that and Democrats do too. The time is now to sit down and try to figure that out.

Passing a precipitous repeal, trying to rush it through before the CBO scores it—a precipitous repeal that would take health insurance away from many, that would jack costs up on seniors, that would punish so many Virginians by reducing the subsidies they get now and replacing them with a less-generous subsidy—that will break a promise the President made. That will break a promise other leaders have made.

We had a HELP Committee hearing recently where we had witnesses who had been called by Democrats and Republicans before us, talking about things we need to do to fix and improve the Affordable Care Act. They all agreed we needed to find improvements and fix it—all of them. Democrats, Republicans, Independents, they all agreed we need to find improvements. They all agreed a repeal of the Affordable Care Act would be a catastrophe.

There were four witnesses. I asked them this question: If we need to make improvements, what is the best way to do it? Should we do it fast, carelessly, and secretly or should we do it slowly, deliberately, and publicly transparently?

They all said: Of course, there is only one answer to that question. We are talking about people's health. We should do it deliberately, carefully, and transparently, rather than fast, carelessly, and secretly.

We are proceeding right now in the fast, careless, and secret mode. This particular plan comically was locked in a room and nobody was able to see it last week. One of our Senate colleagues went over and tried to get in to see what was in the plan—a Republican colleague, the Senator from Kentucky. Now that the plan is out in the light of day, I think we can see why they were hiding it—because it has so many elements that are frightening so many people.

We can get this right. We can get this right by sitting down and having a discussion about what I have been talking to my constituents about: in the healthcare system right now, what works, what doesn't work, and what we should change. If we bring constituents around the table—individuals, hospitals, insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, businesses that are trying to buy insurance, doctors and nurses—if we get people around the table, they will break us out of the “them versus us” thing. We listen to them. We ask them those questions—what works, what doesn't, what can be fixed. We will find a path to meet the promise the President made, to meet the promise Senator CORNYN made, which is not make anything worse but taking the system as it is right now and making it better. We will only do that if we engage in a dialogue rather than trying to rush. That is what I encourage my colleagues to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

EARMARKS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, within a matter of days, our national debt will top \$20 trillion, notching another ominous milestone in our Nation's long-running addiction to spending. How did we get here?

A decade ago, taxpayers learned that many of their elected representatives were complicit in an insidious practice that rotted the legislative branch to its core, and that is congressional earmarking. Called a “gateway drug” by our distinguished former colleague from Oklahoma, Senator Tom Coburn, earmarks have long exacerbated the Federal Government's spending addiction.

As old as the Republic, earmarks have always been used by generations of politicians as currency to curry favor with well-connected special interests. After public outrage reached a critical mass, both the House and the Senate instituted bans on earmarking, ending what had been a corrupt pay-to-play culture in Congress.

In order to preserve this important check against the corrupting influence of earmarks, I recently sent a letter to President Donald Trump respectfully urging him to veto any legislation containing earmarks that reaches his desk. I thank my colleagues, Senators JOHN McCAIN, MIKE LEE, RAND PAUL, TED CRUZ, and BEN SASSE, for co-signing this letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following letter.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2017.
President DONALD J. TRUMP,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMP: With our national debt set to top \$20 trillion within days and growing at a rate of over half-a-trillion dollars a year, bringing fiscal sanity to the federal budget requires immediate attention and action. We write today to urge opposition to any efforts by Congress to return to earmarking.

While cutting unnecessary and wasteful spending may be commonsense to most taxpayers, behind every dollar spent is a boisterous special interest group with the loudest being Congress itself. Even with a full agenda that includes repealing Obamacare, reforming the tax code, easing the regulatory burden, and strengthening our nation's security, some lawmakers are focused on reviving the corrupt practice of earmarking that was ended in 2011 after what seemed like an endless series of corruption scandals.

Fondly described as a “favor factory” by a lobbyist convicted of exchanging gifts for government grants, earmarks represent the pay-to-play culture you have pledged to end. It is unfathomable to those of us who fought

to end earmarks and witnessed our colleagues go to jail for corruption that pork barrel politics would return, especially at this time when Americans are clearly fed up with business-as-usual. However, despite the success of the current moratorium enacted in both chamber of Congress, there are efforts underway seeking to revive the disdainful practice.

President Reagan vetoed a highway bill in 1987 because it was larded up with 152 earmarks. Escalating exponentially, the over-budget transportation bill signed into law in 2005 contained more than 6,300 earmarks. Earmark proponents are trying to reassure that this time will be different, promising fewer projects and even rebranding them as “congressionally-directed spending.” With the serious fiscal problems facing our nation, processing thousands or even hundreds of pork requests will only distract and delay addressing pressing national needs and push spending decisions once again into the murky shadows.

We respectfully urge you to make it clear that you will veto any bill Congress sends to you containing earmarks within the legislative text or the accompanying report. We look forward to working with you to make Washington more accountable and stop wasteful spending where it starts, which is often right here in Congress.

Sincerely,

JEFF FLAKE.
MIKE LEE.
JOHN McCAIN.
RAND PAUL.
TED CRUZ.
BEN SASSE.

Mr. FLAKE. To explain the urgency behind my letter to the President, I wish to remind my colleagues in this body, many of whom were not in the Congress before enactment of the moratorium, just how bad the earmarking epidemic became.

For the uninitiated, the term “earmark” is a euphemism for when lawmakers work to circumvent the regular, normal appropriations process in order to secure special funding for projects in their home districts or their States. This resulted in Federal tax dollars being doled out to Members of Congress on a whim, bypassing normal rigorous Federal and public vetting.

Instead of focusing on oversight responsibilities or devising legislative solutions for the Nation's most pressing challenges, lawmakers and staffers devoted thousands of man-hours toward filling earmark requests. Congressional appropriators and appropriations committees transformed into what were termed “favor factories,” abandoning oversight responsibilities to focus on rationing out pork. To me, that was one of the most insidious parts of the whole earmarking era.

We have oversight responsibilities in Congress. There is a huge Federal budget on which we should be providing oversight, but instead of poring over agency spending and searching for waste in our trillion-dollar discretionary budget, Members and staff devoted countless hours to roughly 2 or 3 percent of the Federal budget. There was so much focus on just doling out what represented 1 or 2 or 3 percent of the Federal budget that we basically neglected the rest of the Federal budget in terms of oversight.

In less than 20 years, the number of earmarks in the Transportation bill alone grew from 152 to 6,300. President Reagan, I believe, in 1988 famously said that he vetoed the highway bill because he hadn't seen that much pork since he handed out ribbons at the county fair. There were 152 earmarks in the Transportation bill that year, and by 2005 it was 6,300. That is an increase of more than 4,000 percent.

Examples of earmarks range from a quarter billion dollars for a bridge to nowhere in Alaska—everybody became familiar with that one; \$50 million for an indoor rainforest in Iowa, paid for by taxpayers across the country; and half a million dollars for a teapot museum in North Carolina. All of these earmarks added up, eventually totaling about \$29 billion a year.

It was in this environment that, along with a small group of like-minded colleagues, I set out to put an end to this form of transactional politics that had infected the Halls of Congress. Our mission was to place a permanent moratorium on congressional earmarks.

It took unprecedented revelations of widespread corruption and illegality and ultimately the jailing of lawmakers, staffers, and lobbyists before the public's outrage forced Congress to clean up its act. But even brazen instances of public corruption didn't stop Congress from dragging its feet on reforms, and the majority party, my party, paid the price at the polls in 2006.

The dominant mood of the electorate at that time—that of mistrust in government institutions—is strikingly reminiscent of the drain-the-swamp mentality that permeated last November's election. But despite this surging anti-insider sentiment across the ideological spectrum, there is now a chorus of lawmakers from both sides of the aisle working behind the scenes to lift the congressional earmark moratorium. These earmark defenders will trot out arguments ranging from constitutional prerogative to the insignificance of earmarks relative to the entire Federal budget. They will say: It is OK to earmark. We are only earmarking 1 percent of the Federal budget.

But all of these defenses ring hollow. The constitutional power of the purse is not a blanket mandate for Congress to spend freely; rather, it is a fundamental duty to prevent the executive branch from wasting taxpayer dollars. By using earmarks to funnel billions of dollars to special interests, Congress ceases to be a check on the executive branch. We have become no better than the free-spending bureaucrats whom we rail against.

While we were ultimately successful in securing earmark bans in both the House and the Senate, today we are seeing far too many cracks in those foundations. With so many in Congress now willing to sacrifice fiscal discipline, we have to remain vigilant against the return to business as usual.

We can't afford to forfeit the hard-fought progress we have made.

The Senate Republican conference's vote earlier this year to preserve the earmark ban was an important step in the right direction, but we need to do more. That is why I sent the letter to President Trump, and it is why, should earmarks return, I intend to challenge each one of them on the Senate floor. Just as I did in my time in the House, I will file amendments to force debate and force votes on these earmarks. That way, Members can publicly defend their earmarks to the hard-working taxpayers they represent.

As we look forward to the future, I have been encouraged by the President's recognition of Washington's addiction to spending and his administration's commitment to finally doing something about it. I look forward to working with the administration to make the Federal Government leaner, more transparent, and more accountable to the taxpayers it serves.

BORDER ADJUSTMENT TAX

Mr. President, I take the floor today to express my concern with the border adjustment tax. The border adjustment tax is quickly becoming the centerpiece of a planned overhaul of our tax and trade policies. I am certain that I am not the only one hearing that this approach could make everyday consumer products more expensive at the very places middle-class families shop the most. From the aisles at big-box stores to the checkout lines in grocery stores, household staples could be pushed out of reach for those who can least afford it.

In addition, there are concerns that this new policy could disrupt global supply chains and make it harder for our country's largest private sector employers to grow and to do business.

There are those who suggest that the known downsides to the new tax will be a wash because the U.S. dollar will be stronger; however, others are not so comfortable gambling the purchasing power of the average consumer on the unpredictability of international currency markets.

At first glance, the plan seems simple enough: Tax companies in the United States less and tax goods made overseas more. That seems simple. According to supporters, this would boost our exports, incentivize companies to locate operations here in the United States, and it would reduce our trade deficit. Unfortunately, it turns out that is not so easy. Looking inward, we simply do not produce everything we need here in the United States. That is why we trade with other countries in the first place. And for the things we do make here, those products often require inputs from all over the world. In fact, whether it is raw material or specialty parts, roughly 50 percent of our Nation's imports consist of inputs for U.S. production and manufacturing. Let me say that again. Roughly 50 percent of our Nation's imports consist of inputs for U.S. production and manu-

facturing, many times for products that are then shipped overseas.

Because of our trade deals with other nations, these inputs are cheaper than they would be otherwise. Cheaper inputs mean lower production costs for U.S.-based businesses, which in turn allows these companies to expand production and to reduce prices.

What will happen if we place a 20-percent tax on all imports? Looking beyond our borders, we should also consider the reaction such a tax is sure to trigger amongst our trading partners. If the protectionist trade policies of the past have taught us anything, it is that countries tend to retaliate when they believe trade obligations have been violated. When we increase barriers to trade, nobody wins.

Do I agree that we should work to make U.S. businesses more competitive? Absolutely. Do I agree that we need to reform our Tax Code? You bet. Tax reform and pro-growth trade policies have been at the top of my list of priorities throughout my tenure in Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to lower corporate and individual tax rates, eliminate costly tax earmarks, and make our Tax Code flatter, simpler, and more conducive to growth. There will always be winners and losers in a robust debate on reforming the Tax Code. We ought to make sure the middle class isn't in the losing column.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

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

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week our colleagues in the House released a plan to clean up the mess left in the wake of the ObamaCare's failed promises. The bill known as the American Health Care Act represents the next step forward in keeping our promise to repeal and replace ObamaCare, which continues to fail Texans and folks all across the country.

Instead of helping more Americans and more Texans by providing more healthcare choices, ObamaCare has actually led to dwindling insurance options in a lot of counties across the country. In fact, it is estimated that almost 40 percent of counties in Texas have just one option on the exchange this year. It is hard to shop, it is hard to compare, and it is hard to get the benefits of competition when there is only one option because of ObamaCare.

So that is actually the opposite of what the President and the advocates for the Affordable Care Act promised. That is what happens when government interferes with the market and

takes a one-size-fits-all approach to our Nation's healthcare. The fact of the matter is that the path that President Obama put us on is not sustainable. It is hurting families and burdening job creators and is taking a tremendous toll, and Americans are paying the price.

I know some of our colleagues across the aisle are relishing the fact that Republicans, the majority, are now taking this step to keep our commitment to repeal and replace ObamaCare. They are sitting back and hoping that we fail. But the fact of the matter is that we would be having this debate no matter who won the Presidency last November 8, because ObamaCare is in a meltdown mode. It is unsustainable, and we would be dealing with our broken healthcare system no matter who won the White House on November 8 of last year.

One of my constituents wrote me earlier this year about her daughter. She said that before ObamaCare, back when she could choose the policy that she wanted, she was paying about \$190 a month for health insurance, and she had a \$500 deductible. Well, that sounds pretty reasonable—not great, but not terrible either. Then came ObamaCare. Now her daughter, who unfortunately lost her job in the interim, must pay almost \$400 a month with a deductible that is more than \$6,000. I don't know many people who can write a check for \$6,000 when they have an unexpected healthcare crisis. So in essence, she is being forced to self-insure and has been denied the benefit of even the insurance that she has, even though her premium has gone up more than double, and, of course, her deductible is now \$6,000.

So to our friends across the aisle who seem to be relishing this moment where we are actually undertaking the hard work of working through a repeal and replacement program, I would say to them that ObamaCare is certainly no gold standard. It is the opposite of what we need to help our Nation's healthcare woes. There is no doubt that it is a failed piece of legislation, full of empty promises, and one we have to scrap.

So with the American Health Care Act, starting today in the House of Representatives, we will repeal ObamaCare and deliver better, more affordable healthcare choices to the American people.

This bill actually also improves Medicaid. That is another big part of what ObamaCare did. It forced more people onto Medicaid, which is frankly not the best quality healthcare insurance or coverage that exists.

I remember back during the ObamaCare debate, I actually introduced an amendment in the Finance Committee saying that if Congress passed ObamaCare, Members of Congress needed to be put on Medicaid—my theory being, not that it was such great coverage, but that if Members of Congress were on Medicaid, we sure

would take every step necessary to actually improve it and make sure it works.

But this legislation actually does improve Medicaid and puts it on a sustainable path for the future by working with the Governors, because Medicaid is a shared Federal-State responsibility. But right now, it is growing by leaps and bounds. It is at the consumer medical inflation rate plus two, which means it is growing much faster than the economy and, unfortunately, putting unprecedented burdens on our State governments. For example, I know, talking to some Texas legislators, they said it is easily the second—and, if they weren't careful, the largest—expense item in the Texas State budget—Medicaid, or the State share of Medicaid.

Of course, Medicaid was designed to help the most vulnerable in our communities and enjoyed broad bipartisan support. Along the way, it became less about serving those who needed it and more about unchecked government spending, as I mentioned a moment ago. So what the American Health Care Act does is it actually puts Medicaid on a budget. It doesn't cut current spending in Medicaid; it just says that it will grow at a slower rate, and it sends much of the authority to work out the best healthcare delivery systems to our State Governors and legislators. It gives States more flexibility along the way so they can use resources to serve the specific needs of their citizens. I know in my State we frequently will come to Washington and ask the Health and Human Services Department and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, for a waiver so we can actually use the Medicaid money and to spend it most effectively—to build either a medical home or to deal with chronic diseases, or some other flexibility we need in order to deliver quality healthcare to our constituents. But the gall of having to come to Washington, DC, and asking permission on how to spend your own money is just too much.

I believe, actually, the American Health Care Act is the most significant entitlement reform in decades. That is something we should all applaud—putting Medicare and Medicaid on a more sustainable path, not continuing to spend money that we don't have, and racking up annual deficits and adding to our national debt, which now is in the \$20 trillion range, with no end in sight.

Both Federal and State governments spend a significant amount of money on Medicaid every year. As I indicated, last year nearly one-third of the Texas budget was dedicated to Medicaid. The fact of the matter is that when the States have to spend so much of the money they tax and collect on Medicaid, then, it is unavailable for other important purposes—law enforcement, education, and the like. There is a crowding-out effect. By responsibly re-

forming Medicaid, the States and the Federal Government will benefit, all while helping Medicaid work for the most vulnerable in our country and putting us on a path to fiscal sustainability.

In addition to entitlement reform, this bill will also get rid of the ObamaCare taxes that have led to hikes in premium costs, fewer options for patients, and more redtape for job creators. I know, being in Tyler, TX, for example, back after ObamaCare passed, and meeting with a woman who said she was forced, actually, to work two jobs because her employer laid her off of her full-time job, so as to come under the cap necessary for the ObamaCare employer mandate. So, literally, this single mother had lost her full-time job because of ObamaCare and was forced to work two part-time jobs just to make up the difference in income.

We will also, in this American Health Care Act, eliminate the individual mandate. President Obama said when he ran for office back in 2008 that he was opposed to penalizing the American people if they did not buy government-approved insurance, but of course he changed his tune once he was sworn into office.

We will eliminate the individual mandate so people who don't want to purchase a government-approved plan are not forced to buy a plan they don't want and that they can't afford or else suffer a penalty. This bill will also help families spend money on healthcare decisions that make the most sense to them by giving them tools so they can manage their healthcare expenses like health savings accounts.

The American Health Care Act is an answer to a promise we made and we have made repetitively in the last three elections since ObamaCare became the law of the land. I believe it is imperative we keep our promise.

Some have said: Well, this is a difficult process. I agree. There are a lot of different ideas that people have. I agree. That is a good thing, but in the end, we have a binary choice. We can either keep the status quo, which is in meltdown—which is ObamaCare—or we can pass legislation which offers more choices at affordable prices to the American people.

I believe the choice is very clear. It is a great opportunity to reform our healthcare system and Medicaid and move healthcare decisions away from Washington and back to the families, back in the States where we all live, and back in the hands of patients and their doctors. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the Trump administration to make this a reality.

Again, the choice is between the status quo, which is unacceptable, which is not working, or a better way. I, for one, choose a better way: more choices at a price consumers can afford.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Maine.

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to address the bill that has been recently—and I emphasize the word “recently”—introduced in the House of Representatives. I believe it was introduced Monday. It is having not a hearing but a markup today, and may be on the House floor as soon as tomorrow or early next week.

As the President said recently, healthcare is complicated. To me, to introduce a bill that was not available to any Members of Congress before Monday, mark it up in committee 2 days later, attempt to pass it on the floor of the House, and then I understand it may come directly to the floor of the Senate without any committee consideration, it just seems to me is a disservice to the process and a disservice to the traditions and practices of this institution.

This is complicated. It is difficult. The ramifications and implications of this bill, just as any other major change in our healthcare system, are incredibly important. This is not about ideology. This is about people. This is about the impact on people. I want to talk about the impact of this bill, as we have thus far been able to assess it, on the people of Maine. When I look at a piece of legislation down here, I start with Maine. How will it affect the people who live along our coast or inland, in the small towns, and particularly people who are above the age of 50?

Maine happens to be the oldest State in the country. Therefore, anything which negatively impacts seniors doubly negatively impacts the people of my State. I feel this bill is a disaster for seniors. I define seniors in this case as anybody over 50 because it does several things. One of the things it does, and there should be a great deal of discussion about this, under the Affordable Care Act, which recognizes the fact that seniors and people who are older tend to have more medical needs than those who are younger, it caps differential at three times. In other words, a senior can only pay three times what a younger person pays, and even that is burdensome in many cases.

This bill changes three to five. It will be a very substantial increase in the payments and the costs of insurance and healthcare to senior citizens. Now, the Kaiser Family Foundation, which is, I find, the most nonpartisan and informative source of information on all of these issues, has created a handy tool on their website, where you can put in information, such as family income and age, and determine what you would have paid under the Affordable Care Act and what you would pay under this new bill.

What they found was—I wanted to look and see what somebody in my State will pay. If you are a 60-year-old in Aroostook County Maine with an income of \$30,000, the subsidy—the support for the premium for individual insurance—would fall by 70 percent. The support for your insurance policy

under the Affordable Care Act would fall by 70 percent.

Throughout our State, the average decrease would be 48 percent—almost half. So we are talking not about some theoretical, ideological, political thing here, we are talking about people's ability to afford health insurance. It is about as clear as it could be. That is why it is frustrating to me that we collectively—the Congress—are going to be asked to consider this bill with literally no hearings, no input from the public, no discussion of how all the pieces fit together or don't fit together. Yet we are going to be asked—I believe, my understanding is, we are going to be asked to vote on this bill sometime on the floor of the Senate, without any committee consideration, in the next week or so.

This is too important to people's lives to give it such short shrift. It is just not right to make changes of this magnitude that are so vital to people's well-being and literally their health and their survival in some cases. It is unthinkable to me that we would do this without a round of hearings and discussions and the regular order that we supposedly honor around here as to how major legislation is to come to the floor.

I received a letter just recently: “Hi, Angus.”

I like it when my correspondents say “Hi, Angus” instead of “Senator.”

Hi, Angus [he says]. I have worked in the pulp and paper industry for close to 30 years. It was a good industry up here, supported middle-class families in northern Maine. But we have had layoffs and closures of our mills. After every closure, I had to obtain health insurance for my family on my own. Before ObamaCare, this was a disaster. I could only obtain catastrophic insurance from one of two providers. There was no way I could pay \$1,500 a month for a decent plan. After ObamaCare, I could obtain decent insurance at a decent price. While there may have been problems for some, it was a godsend for my family. Please help ensure we don't go back to the old days. We are self-employed by our small business and would not be able to pay more for less.

That is what the bill that is in the House would do, pay more for less. By the way, how does the money work in this bill? Well, one of the things the bill does is, my understanding, and, again, I am only operating on what we have seen in the last 24 hours because of no hearings, but one of the things it does is eliminate a tax on people who make over \$250,000 a year in order to cut coverage for people who are not making that kind of money.

It is a tax cut, and shifting the cost to our citizens, particularly our seniors. The pattern is, shift and shaft. Shift the cost, and shaft the people who need the coverage. This is supposed to be a substitute. It is supposed to be coverage for everyone. You have to be careful. When people talk about access, they are talking about: Yes, you can buy it, but if you can't afford it, that is not really access. This bill dramatically decreases the support for health insurance premiums through the Affordable Care Act.

The reality is, and I hear a lot of talk about how ObamaCare is collapsing. It isn't. More people signed up this year than last year. Yes, it is true the rates went up, but that was because younger people were not signing up in significant numbers. We need to deal with that issue because that makes the risk pool older and sicker and therefore more expensive.

I have been told by insurance officials that if something like this bill that is in the House passes and the subsidies disappear and the Affordable Care Act goes away, the private health insurance market for individuals, the so-called individual market, will essentially collapse. The reality is, the uninsured population of this country has fallen virtually in half since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Twenty-two million people have coverage now who did not before and we can take it away.

The other piece I don't like about this bill is it phases things out so the impact will not be felt until after the next election or sometime in the future. Well, the future comes. In this case, the future is going to be pretty desolate for people who have health insurance now and are not going to have it 2, 4, or 6 years from now. It is just not right.

I am one who has been saying, since I entered this body now 4-plus years ago, that there are problems with the Affordable Care Act. We should be working on those problems. We should be working on repairing it, not destroying it. We should not be talking about taking healthcare coverage away from people in this country.

I am sure I and many others will be addressing more comprehensively the provisions of this bill as it becomes more clear, even though we are going to have to ferret those provisions out because we are not going to have the benefit of expert testimony and views from a variety of points of view of how this is actually going to work.

The reality is, I don't think there is much question that this proposal will hammer Maine and my people. I can't stand for that. I hope the House will have a more vigorous process, they will understand what the implications are, and take a more judicious approach so we are not tearing insurance out from under people, we are not going to make the cost be driven up, we are not giving a tax break to people who make over \$250,000 a year, and at the same time taking coverage away from people who make \$30,000 a year.

That is wrong. We should be repairing, not repealing. I think this bill is not the right place to start. I stand for the people of Maine. I stand for the people who are going to be harmed by this, whether they are seniors or working people or self-employed people or people who have been able to start businesses because they could get, for the first time, insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

I believe that is our obligation. We have an opportunity to work together.

I am willing to work with anyone who wants to work on improving and dealing with some of the issues that have been raised by the Affordable Care Act.

Let's stop talking about repealing. Let's talk about fixing, strengthening, and meeting our commitment to our fellow citizens in Maine and across our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

(The remarks of Mrs. SHAHEEN are printed in today's RECORD during consideration of S. Res. 84.)

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I join literally millions of Ohioans and tens of millions of Americans in my concern about what the House of Representatives is trying to do to our healthcare laws and our healthcare system.

I leave just one statistic with my colleagues in the Senate, and that is that in my State alone, there are 200,000 people who are now under treatment for opioid addiction, and they are able to get this comprehensive treatment because they have insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

The legislation apparently coming out of the House of Representatives, even though we do not know how much it costs, is a big tax cut for the wealthy. We do not know how much it costs because they are moving so quickly. It was under wraps, and now they are moving it so quickly that the Congressional Budget Office has not even had time to look at it and understand what it costs, nor has it been able to tell us how many of the 22 million Americans who have insurance under the Affordable Care Act will lose their insurance. They want to move so fast that they are not even answering the basic questions of how much it costs—a lot; how much it is going to add to the deficit—a whole lot, but they will not be specific; and how many people will lose their insurance.

As I said, today 200,000 Ohioans are getting treatment for opioid addiction under the Affordable Care Act. Most of them—we think at least half, but tens of thousands of them will lose their treatment just like that, right in the middle of their addiction treatment. What does society gain by that, other than some Republican talking points, when people chanted for 6 years “repeal and replace ObamaCare,” never having any idea how they were going to replace it—still don’t—to do it right and continue that effort.

Finally, there is the hypocrisy of this, where Members of Congress in the

House and in the Senate enjoy taxpayer-financed health insurance. People in this body—most of the 100 Senators and most of the 435 Congressmen and Congresswomen—have health insurance provided by taxpayers, yet they want to take insurance away from millions of Americans. These are people who have jobs. They are millions of Americans who have jobs, who are making relatively low wages. Some of them may be holding two or three part-time jobs. They make low wages. They have no health insurance provided at their job. People in Congress who have taxpayer-funded health insurance are taking their insurance away, stripping them of that insurance. How morally repugnant that is. How hypocritical that is. Yet they move along their merry way.

We should defeat these efforts. We should continue to make improvements in the Affordable Care Act, but not wholesale destruction that will throw hundreds of thousands of Ohioans off of the insurance they have.

I will close with this. My Republican Governor has admonished his Republican colleagues around the country and in Congress not to repeal the Affordable Care Act and throw 900,000 people in Ohio off of their insurance without a replacement to take care of it. This bill coming out of the House is far from an adequate replacement.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CALLING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, even in its early days, this administration has embarked on a course of foreign private interest entanglements and conflicts of interest that are truly staggering.

Just this morning, the Associated Press reported that China has granted preliminary approval for 38 new trademarks. They are Trump trademarks, paving the way for the President, Donald Trump, and his family to “potentially develop a host of branded businesses from hotels to golf clubs to bodyguard and concierge services.”

These reports are contained in public documents. All but three are in the President’s own name. The AP report also quotes an official as saying that “for all these marks to sail through so quickly and cleanly, with no similar marks . . . no issues with specification, boy, it’s weird.”

Now, the speculation is that these trademarks could not have been issued without approval by the ruling Communist Party, that hierarchy had to be involved, and that awareness had to involve their approval for these intellectual property interests. The benefit is

to the President through his private interests. The fact is, the President of the United States should be beholden only to the American people, not to personal profit, but in fact these trademarks raise the specter that the President possibly is beholden to the approving officials in China even more than to the American people. That is an issue that merits investigation. Like so many issues arising in this young administration, the question is, Who will do that investigation?

The lawyers in China representing Donald Trump applied for these trademarks in April of 2016, even as then-Candidate Donald Trump railed against China at his campaign rallies, criticizing Chinese currency manipulation, its intellectual property theft, its attraction of jobs from this country to theirs. The question arises, What has he done about those issues? In fact, China continues to manipulate its currency, continues to attract jobs from this country, and continues its aggressive policies in the area around that country.

The question is whether an inquiry is appropriate—which certainly it seems to be—and who will supervise it. It is the same question that arises with respect to Russian interference in our electoral system and the potential ties between Trump team officials and the Russians who committed those acts. Those ties have been established by evidence that is now incontrovertible because it is admitted by the officials themselves, now Attorney General Jeff Sessions and former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn.

It is now a matter of factual record that Russia engaged in a series of deliberate cyber attacks in order to carry out an unprecedented plot to undermine the 2016 elections with the goal of assisting Donald Trump. The growing body of evidence clearly and unmistakably indicates that Trump campaign officials were in contact with Russia during the election. These deeply troubling claims of coordination with a foreign government to influence an American election certainly deserve exacting scrutiny and investigation, and the more we learn, the more troubled we become. In fact, we are rapidly careening toward a constitutional crisis. These recent revelations about Vladimir Putin’s government and former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn resulted in his resignation. There have also been details about contact between Attorney General Sessions, our former colleague, and the Russian Ambassador that have caused his recusal from all inquiries of that subject matter.

I believe a special prosecutor must be appointed to investigate the Russian interference and meddling in our election, the massive cyber attack misinformation, and propaganda campaign conducted to subvert that election. The potential for cooperation, condoning,

connecting between the Trump officials and Russia certainly merits investigation as well. Without reaching conclusions, the special prosecutor ought to investigate and then reach a conclusion. His conclusion should be based on fact, not surmise or speculation.

For weeks, I have called for a special prosecutor to investigate possible ties between members of the Trump campaign, the Trump transition, and the Trump White House to Russian officials who sought to interfere with our election. I support the Intelligence Committee in conducting its investigation. I would favor the appointment of a special commission or a select committee of the Congress to do fact-finding, make reports and recommendations in a fully transparent way, but only a special prosecutor can take action based on criminal intent. Only a special prosecutor can pursue violations of criminal law, to not only investigate but also bring charges and seek appropriate punishment and remedy. Only the Deputy Attorney General of the United States can appoint a special prosecutor because the Attorney General has recused himself—in other words, taken himself out of all of the areas of this subject matter. That is why I asked yesterday that the nominee for Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, commit to appoint a special prosecutor.

His answer to me was that he wishes to wait until he is approved by the Senate—assuming his confirmation occurs—to decide whether to appoint a special prosecutor. He claims he needs to familiarize himself with the facts and circumstances of any ongoing investigation before he can make a decision. With all due respect, the facts he needs to know are already established. They are already a matter of public record. They are already known to the American public. There is an investigation ongoing by the FBI—and with good reason—into Russian meddling in our elections, this massive campaign of misinformation and cyber attack that they purposefully conducted to influence the outcome of our election.

We know the Justice Department must investigate and pursue the ongoing investigation, wherever the evidence leads. Part of that evidence inevitably will be meetings that were conducted by his boss, the Attorney General of United States, Jeff Sessions, which is why the Attorney General has recused himself—because he could be involved in that investigation as a witness, as a subject, even possibly as a target, as could the President himself.

To close that investigation, the Deputy Attorney General, or whoever is conducting it, needs to question the Attorney General of the United States. To conduct that investigation, that questioning must occur. So the Deputy Attorney General would be expected to be investigating his boss. If he decides to conduct that investigation himself, he must appoint a special prosecutor to establish the independence of that in-

quiry, to assure that in reality and in appearance the American public is assured that the investigation is independent, objective, impartial, vigorous, and fair.

The facts that warrant a special prosecutor are already known and they are already a matter of public record. That is why I believe he must commit himself now, before his confirmation—in fact, as a condition of his confirmation—to take that action, which preserves the credibility and public confidence in the Department of Justice that he observed very eloquently in his confirmation hearing as one of his central objectives.

There is a lot of precedent for this step. The most prominent one perhaps is Elliot Richardson, when he was the Attorney General designee. He was requested by the Judiciary Committee, at that time, to make the same kind of commitment—and he did. He kept his promise. He appointed Archibald Cox to be special prosecutor, and the Watergate scandal was appropriately investigated and pursued. That example—when Elliot Richardson had enough facts, just as Rod Rosenstein does now—ought to be the lodestar here. It ought to be the model for his commitment to appointing a special prosecutor.

The simple fact is, Rod Rosenstein, like Elliot Richardson, knows everything he needs to know to be sure a special prosecutor is necessary, and especially because he is a career prosecutor with a distinguished record, and because he has that intellect and integrity that would qualify him probably to be confirmed, he should know it is the right thing to do. Maybe he will do it if he is confirmed, but it would serve the interests of justice, and it would help to sustain and enhance the trust and public confidence in the Department of Justice if he were to do it now, as Elliot Richardson did many years ago.

We live in an extraordinary time. The conflicts of interest and foreign entanglements that threaten our Nation, beginning at the very top of this administration, impose a unique mandate on the Department of Justice. The recusal of the Attorney General from this investigation indicates that leadership and integrity are necessary at every level as never before. That is why, in this extraordinary time, I urge the Deputy Attorney General nominee, Rod Rosenstein, to do the right thing and make sure there is an investigation that is independent and vigorous, as well as fair and full; that we know all of the facts eventually and that action is taken appropriately to deal with the Russian interference in our election, the potential ties between the Trump administration—before and after the election—in those improper interferences by the Russians in our election, and that the danger of cover-up, indicated by the potential false statements made by Jeff Sessions before the Judiciary Committee and Mi-

chael Flynn elsewhere, be stopped before it starts. Only a special prosecutor can provide the unbiased and fair answers that are so urgently needed.

The American people deserve an explanation. They deserve an explanation for the trademarks that have been issued to Donald Trump in China. They deserve an explanation by a special prosecutor on Russian meddling and Trump ties to that meddling. Whether the independent and special prosecutor broadens the scope of that investigation to include the entanglements or conflicts of interest involving China is a question that will have to be addressed by that official, but this much we know now. We are rapidly careening toward a constitutional crisis, a crisis of credibility as well as legal challenges. The historic opportunity and obligation this nominee owes the country cannot be avoided.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Apparently there is another speaker. I withdraw that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

NOMINATION OF NEIL GORSUCH

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, looking at today's headlines and listening to the news, it may seem as if colleagues from across the country—Democrat, Republican—don't always agree on some things, let alone anything. I think we are starting to see a consensus emerge—a very good, genuine agreement emerge between liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans on at least one matter in Washington, DC, in the Senate: Neil Gorsuch. That agreement is on Neil Gorsuch.

Neil Gorsuch is an exceptional nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court. In fact, Judge Gorsuch is, by many extents and by many commentators, arguably one of the most talented jurists we have nominated to the Court in a very long time, at least in modern history.

As the Denver Post in Colorado said: "Gorsuch is a brilliant legal mind" who has a reputation for "[applying] the law fairly and consistently."

You can't ask for much more than that—somebody who will apply the law fairly and consistently. However, this shouldn't surprise anyone who knows Judge Gorsuch. Judge Gorsuch has always enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support. All we need to do to see that is to look back to 2006 when we could see that most clearly in the U.S. Senate.

In 2006, when Judge Gorsuch was unanimously confirmed to the Tenth Circuit Court, 12 current Democratic Senators, including the minority leader and Senators LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, and DURBIN, all were in office. It was a nomination in 2006 that was unanimous, a nomination that went by voice vote.

He was so universally appealing to the Tenth Circuit Court that he had an introduction at the Judiciary Committee by both a Democratic Senator

from Colorado and a Republican Senator from Colorado, joined by every single person on the floor to vote yes unanimously.

They approved his nomination. And to give you even greater context about this vote, the people who made this vote, the approval of Judge Gorsuch in 2006 to the Tenth Circuit Court came in addition to the 12 people I just mentioned who are here today and who were here then. It also came with the support of then-Senator Obama, Senator Biden, Senator Clinton, and Senator Kerry.

Approximately 11 years later, now that Judge Gorsuch has proved himself to be a mainstream jurist, a consensus builder, a profound legal mind with an even temperament and affable nature, we have a chance again to put this incredibly brilliant mind on the Nation's highest Court.

Judge Gorsuch is a faithful adherent to the Constitution and the organizing principles of this great democracy. I have no doubt that Judge Gorsuch will—and should—enjoy similar levels of approval among my distinguished colleagues across the aisle.

I also wish for people to learn more about Judge Gorsuch personally and to tell some stories about growing up in Colorado. It is a story about how a young man from Denver, CO, through his own hard work and academic excellence, rose to the highest echelons of the legal profession and to the nearly universal acclaim of Democrats and Republicans.

A fourth-generation Coloradan, Neil Gorsuch learned the value of hard work at a young age from his grandfathers. His maternal grandfather, Dr. Joseph McGill, began his adult life by working in Union Station, the main railway terminal in Denver. From there, Dr. McGill put himself through medical school and became a prominent surgeon. With his wife, Dorothy Jean, Dr. McGill raised seven children, all of whom he gave a better life to and put through college.

Neil's paternal grandfather, John Gorsuch, was his legal inspiration. After serving in World War I, John Gorsuch put himself through undergraduate and law school at the University of Denver by driving a trolley car. Upon graduation, John built a law practice focusing on real estate law. He also made time to help Denver's welfare department and participate in the Kiwanis Club and numerous other civic organizations. Later, John started what was at one time one of the largest law firms in Denver, Gorsuch Kirgis, where he practiced well into his eighties.

It was this family work ethic that drove Neil to get his hands dirty and pursue blue collar jobs at a young age. In Colorado, he moved furniture, he shoveled snow, he mowed lawns, and he even shoveled some more snow in the great State of Colorado. It was this work ethic—and a lot of shoveling of snow—combined with his family's ap-

preciation of higher education that helped Neil consistently realize academic excellence.

By now, I think this Chamber is well familiar with Judge Gorsuch's sterling academic credentials, receiving his undergraduate degree at Columbia, law school at Harvard, Ph.D. at Oxford. I don't think any of us can forget, nor should we, the fact that he spent a summer at the University of Colorado.

Intellect alone doesn't get you through the halls of these storied academic institutions. It requires hard work, independence—two values of the West; two values in addition to many other western values that Judge Gorsuch holds.

It is these values, these western perspectives that the Supreme Court desperately needs to grow. Judge Gorsuch is a lifelong outdoorsman. He enjoys fly fishing and skiing. In fact, I have been told that he is a double black diamond skier. His wife, Louise, cares for animals in a small barn on his land.

In addition to his love of the outdoors and his appreciation of nature's beauty, Judge Gorsuch understands the complex legal issues facing westerners and our Western States.

Since 2006, Judge Gorsuch served on the Federal court that covers the Tenth Circuit Court based out of Denver that covers six other Western States—Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah. Those States represent nearly 20 percent of the land of the continental United States.

His service on this court has provided him with a unique understanding of public lands, water, and Tribal issues that many of the other Western States in the region face. Some of the most complex legal challenges in water law and others come before his court as a result. That experience would serve all of our Western States well when utilized from the U.S. Supreme Court.

Over the coming days, I plan, along with many of my other colleagues, to elaborate on why Gorsuch's western values and perspective make him an outstanding choice for the U.S. Supreme Court. I look forward to working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure he gets a timely up-or-down vote. From the highest echelons of the legal field to the Tenth Circuit Court, to the U.S. Supreme Court, Judge Gorsuch would make us proud, and he would serve this country well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. MANCHIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 581 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MANCHIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

TRUMPCARE AND THE NOMINATION OF SEEMA VERMA

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, it seems appropriate that we are debating the

nomination of Seema Verma to head the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services the same week Republicans in Congress introduce a plan to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

Over the past 8 years, President Obama and the Democratic Party have been fighting to make sure that everyone in this country has access to affordable, quality health insurance. President Trump and his allies in Congress do not share this commitment. Instead of debating how best to expand access, they are fighting with each other to see just how many people they can kick off insurance rolls—all in a crusade, apparently, to save some people money.

This is not a crusade to improve the lives of as many Americans as possible. It is a crusade to serve their radical antigovernment ideology. In fact, "ideology over people" is a useful shorthand to describe the first 2 months of the Trump administration.

The problem with their ideological debates is that people are left out of the debate. Do we really know what it is like to be without health insurance? Under the plan to repeal the ACA, 20 million people in our country will be without health insurance, without healthcare. What if you were one of those people?

This question is not an academic one for me. I know what it is like to live without health insurance. When my mom brought my brothers and me to this country—I am an immigrant—her job did not provide health benefits. My greatest fear growing up as a little girl in this country was that my mom would not be able to go to work if she got sick. If she wasn't able to go to work, where would money for food and rent come from?

That is not the kind of fear we want to impose on millions of children in our country, but we will be doing just that to the 20 million people and their families who gained health insurance under the Affordable Care Act—many, for the first time in their lives. They did not have to be worried every single day that their child or their parents would be sick and would not be able to afford the care that they needed. This is not an academic exercise for any of them. They will be hurt by what we are being asked to do. It is not an academic exercise for the millions more who will lose their insurance coverage under TrumpCare.

But no one should be surprised. This administration and their allies in Congress continue to demonstrate a commitment to alternative facts. If you believe their alternative facts, TrumpCare would improve healthcare access for working families, seniors and women, and Americans would have, as the President said, "much better healthcare for much less money."

But in reality, TrumpCare will do the opposite. TrumpCare would end by 2020 the ACA's Medicaid expansion that millions of people in our country depend on every day. The expansion not

only provided health coverage to millions of people for the first time, but it also helped to keep hospitals in rural and underserved communities from closing down. These rural hospitals exist all across the country. In its place, TrumpCare would change how States receive Medicaid funding, and it would do so in a way that ensures that these programs cannot keep pace with the rising cost of health insurance in their counties and in our country.

Under this new system, States would have less money to spend on Medicaid recipients and face the prospect of tightening eligibility and slashing benefits. This would be particularly devastating in Hawaii, where we saw the number of people enrolled in Medicaid grow by nearly 20 percent under the ACA. Medicaid has had a transformative impact on tens of thousands of lives in Hawaii and millions of others across the country.

Anne from Oahu walked into the Kokua Kalihi Valley Clinic 3 years ago. She had no health insurance, and she was pregnant at the age of 15. The doctors at the clinic helped Anne apply for Medicaid, which helped her afford prenatal care, gave her support to stay healthy and, very importantly, to stay in school.

Medicaid helped Anne and her husband Dan, age 17, welcome a healthy baby boy named Joseph. Today, Anne is a graduate of Farrington High School, works part time, and has plans to become a pediatric nurse practitioner. Anne, Dan, and Joseph now have insurance through Dan's employer.

Reducing access to this critical program is wrong. Trying to convince the American people they would be better off with the results of these kinds of drastic negative changes to Medicare and Medicaid is yet another alternative fact.

I am encouraged that four of my Republican colleagues spoke out forcefully against any bill that would eliminate the ACA's Medicaid expansion. We need more Republicans of conscience to make their voices heard on this important issue.

TrumpCare would also be devastating for seniors in Hawaii and across the country. Under TrumpCare, insurance companies would be able to charge older Americans up to five times more for an equivalent health plan than they would be able to charge a younger person. For a President and a party that professes to hate taxes so much, they don't seem to have a problem with what amounts to an age tax.

TrumpCare's changes to Medicaid would also have devastating consequences for States like Hawaii, where our rapidly aging population depends on Medicaid to pay for nursing home and other care. The President made the American people a promise—that his healthcare plan would not touch Medicare. But the cumulative effect of TrumpCare's assault on our seniors—our kupuna—would force the Medicare

trust fund to go broke 4 years sooner than expected. For reference, the ACA extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by 10 years.

This would have a devastating impact for seniors like Anne and Lanny Bruder from Kauai. Lanny is 80 years old and working three jobs to make ends meet. He has had two knee replacements and a heart attack. Anne has glaucoma and pays a lot of money out of pocket for her prescription eye drops. They can't afford to pay more for their health insurance, which is exactly what is going to happen under TrumpCare.

TrumpCare would also have a profoundly negative impact on women across the country. The President's plan would completely zero out funding for Planned Parenthood. This life-giving, life-saving organization would no longer be eligible for Medicaid reimbursements or Federal family planning, which would leave a \$500 million hole in their budget.

Republicans continue to claim falsely that community health centers would fill the gap in service left by the demise of support for Planned Parenthood—not true. Most of these community centers, whose resources are already stretched thin, do not provide women's healthcare or family planning services. In other words, they would not be able to replicate the services that Planned Parenthood provides all across the country to millions of women and families.

Planned Parenthood operates two clinics in Hawaii, one on Oahu and one on Maui. They are the forefront of innovation in increasing access to family planning services across the State. They launched an innovative new mobile application that would allow doctors to provide digital consultations to women on neighbor islands for the purpose of prescribing birth control. Recently, Planned Parenthood made their first delivery to the island of Molokai, a largely rural island with little permanent medical infrastructure. This is the kind of innovation we should be encouraging, and it is precisely the type of program that could get cut if Planned Parenthood loses its Federal funding.

I often say that there are people in this country getting screwed every second, minute, and hour of the day. Instead of reducing that number, which should be our goal, TrumpCare would increase the number of people who get hurt in our country. The wealthiest of the wealthy in our country would benefit because—not only would all these things happen under TrumpCare that would be devastating to families, to women, to our seniors—TrumpCare would also give a big tax break, a big tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country. They don't need that kind of tax cut. Do people making over \$2 million a year really deserve another \$150,000 a year in tax cuts? I don't think so.

TrumpCare would be a disaster for the middle class, I am going to do ev-

erything in my power to stop it from being the law of the land. We have come too far in the past 8 years to go backward. The first way we can fight back against this plan is by rejecting the nomination of Seema Verma, who would be in charge of implementing TrumpCare as the head of CMS.

Ms. Verma is unqualified for the job she has been nominated to do. She has absolutely no experience running a major Federal department and has virtually no budgeting experience. This is deeply disconcerting because as the Administrator of CMS, she would oversee a \$1 trillion budget, which is twice as large as that of the Pentagon.

Ms. Verma would also continue the President's assault on women's healthcare. During her confirmation hearing, Ms. Verma said she opposed the ACA's requirement that all health plans cover pregnancy care. It is because of this attitude that millions of women across the country are participating in a Day Without Women today. In solidarity with them, I will fight tooth and nail against TrumpCare and encourage my colleagues to oppose Seema Verma's nomination to serve as the Administrator of the very agency that is supposed to be protecting healthcare for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose H.J. Res. 58, another Congressional Review Act resolution that would roll back an agency's efforts to implement a law and prevent it from doing its job in the future.

In this case, we are considering eliminating Department of Education regulations on teacher preparation programs. In the 2008 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Congress required States to assess and identify low-performing teacher preparation programs to ensure that every teacher graduates ready for the classroom. Following a process that began in 2011, the Department of Education released a draft rule in 2014. That draft wasn't perfect and needed more flexibility for States and institutions of higher education. After an extended comment period, the Department revised the rule 2 years later. Though it may not satisfy everyone, the final rule provides clarity in line with Congress's direction.

Congress has the opportunity, with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, to improve upon these provisions. We can build on the State-driven assessment that this rule provides and further refine the system to make sure that data is being used to better prepare a more diverse class of teachers for our schools.

If the Trump administration does not want to wait for further legislation, it can engage in a new rulemaking, but as with all Congressional Review Act resolutions, this resolution is a meat ax rather than a scalpel. It repeals the rule and prevents the Department from carrying out its responsibility to ensure high-quality teacher preparation programs. This is simply the wrong approach, and I urge a no vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to once again urge my fellow Senators to vote against the pending resolution and support strong and accountable teacher preparation programs in America today.

There are so many great teacher prep programs across the country that are supplying our teaching students with the tools they need to succeed in the classroom, but there are also teacher prep programs that are struggling and need support to make sure they are producing great teachers for our schools.

This rule ensures that students can make informed decisions about teacher preparation programs and that they have access to this information before they take out massive amounts of student debt. It gives States information about the schools that are struggling so States can provide those schools the tools and resources they need to improve their teaching preparation programs.

Finally, eliminating this rule will give Secretary DeVos more power over our higher education programs—a risk we should not be willing to take without learning more about Secretary DeVos's vision for our higher education system.

Every student deserves to have an amazing teacher in the classroom. This rule helps ensure that is possible. So I urge Senators to think of the future teachers and students who will be impacted if this resolution passes.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SASSE. 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. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. today, all remaining time on H.J. Res. 58 be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I rise to restate my support for H.J. Res. 58, a resolution to overturn the Obama administration Department of Education's rule regulating future teacher preparation programs from Washington, DC.

This teacher preparation mandate actually assumes that Washington bureaucrats are competent to micro-manage teacher training programs across America. There are 27,000 such programs, by the way, and this micro-management is absurd. We all agree that education matters, that teachers matter, that teacher training programs matter, and that kids are the future of our country, but I ask my colleagues to

acknowledge the expertise and to respect the reforms already begun at the district and State levels and to reverse this misguided Federal regulation of teacher preparation programs.

I would like to close by reading several quotations from those who would have been affected by this regulation had it gone into effect.

This first quotation comes from the American Federation of Teachers. Their public statement on the final rule, on October 12, 2016, reads as follows:

It is, quite simply, ludicrous to propose evaluating teacher preparation programs based on the performance of the students taught by those program's graduates. Frankly, the only conceivable reason the department would release regulations so out of sync with the Every Student Succeeds Act and President Obama's own call to reduce high-stakes testing is they are simply checking off their bucket list of outstanding issues before the end of their term.

The final regulations could harm students who benefit the most from consistent, high-quality standards for teacher preparation programs. The regulations will create enormous difficulty for teacher prep programs and place an unnecessary burden on institutions and states, which are also in the process of implementing ESSA.

My second quotation comes from the comments of the provost and the chair of the Department of Education at Creighton University in Omaha, NE, dated February 2, 2015, of the comment period:

As stated earlier, the regulations represent a significant financial burden to institutions, local school systems, and states. In the state of Nebraska, there are over 500 individual teacher preparation "programs" subject to the complexities of these regulations.

Again, these regulations are 700 pages.

Even as a system is developed, issues regarding privacy, low numbers, and student demographics would impact results unfairly and result in decisions unlikely to improve teacher preparation programs and student learning at PK-12 schools [in Nebraska].

My third and final quotation comes from the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Nebraska, and they wrote the Department of Education about this rule as follows:

[T]he budgetary impact of this regulation is significantly understated, if not laughable. No financial support for states, school systems, or institutions of higher education to implement the requirements is proposed. The regulations create new requirements for colleges, schools, and states to track and report on candidates and teachers for many years. Those systems are not in place. The cost estimates make inaccurate assumptions that colleges and states already have the systems in place for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and utilizing data (federally-mandated data which may or may not be valid or reliable for the purposes for which it is intended to be used). It also provides a timeline that is unworkable for most states and institutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following statements and letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From www.aft.org, Oct. 12, 2016]

AFT'S WEINGARTEN ON TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS REGULATIONS

WASHINGTON—Statement from American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten on the Department of Education's final regulations for teacher preparation programs.

"It is, quite simply, ludicrous to propose evaluating teacher preparation programs based on the performance of the students taught by a program's graduates. Frankly, the only conceivable reason the department would release regulations so out of sync with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and President Obama's own call to reduce high-stakes testing is they are simply checking off their bucket list of outstanding issues before the end of their term.

"The final regulations could harm students who would benefit the most from consistent, high-quality standards for teacher preparation programs. The regulations will create enormous difficulty for teacher prep programs and place an unnecessary burden on institutions and states, which are also in the process of implementing ESSA.

"Instead of designing a system to support and improve teacher prep programs, the regulations build on the now-rejected high-stakes testing system established under NCLB and greatly expanded under this administration's Race to the Top and waiver programs. It's stunning that the department would evaluate teaching colleges based on the academic performance of the students of their graduates when ESSA—enacted by large bipartisan majorities in both the House and Senate last December—prohibited the department from requiring school districts to do that kind of teacher evaluation.

"Teacher prep programs need to help ensure that teachers are ready to engage their students in powerful learning and creating an environment that is conducive to learning. These regulations will not help achieve that goal. These regulations do not address ways to help the current status of the teaching profession: the shortages, the lack of diversity or the high turnover.

"While the department has made minor tweaks, the flawed framework remains the same. The regulations will punish teacher prep programs whose graduates go on to teach in our highest-needs schools, most often those with high concentrations of students who live in poverty and English language learners—the exact opposite strategy of what we need. As we brought up in January 2015—in our comments to the department's proposal—if programs are rated as the department proposes, teacher prep schools will have incentive to steer graduates away from assignments in our toughest schools, and that will only make matters worse.

"If we want to get it right, we should look to countries like Finland, where prospective teachers receive extensive training in their subject matter and teaching strategies combined with clinical training. Finland has no alternative prep programs. Programs are highly selective and free of cost; their graduates go on to work in supportive, professional environments with strong unions, fair pay and benefits, and without high-stakes testing."

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST,
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
Omaha, NE, February 2, 2015.

Re Docket ID ED-2014-OPE-0057.

Hon. ARNE DUNCAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Education,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY DUNCAN: We would like to introduce ourselves. Our names are Edward

O'Connor, Provost, and Debra L. Ponec, Professor and Chair in the Education Department at Creighton University, which is located in Omaha, Nebraska. We are responding to the U.S. Department of Education's proposed regulations for teacher preparation programs released in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) on December 3, 2014.

Like other teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education throughout the nation, the Education Department at Creighton University embraces accountability for our work. The faculty are eager to learn more about the effectiveness of our graduates and seek continual program improvement to ensure their profession-readiness in the classroom. Our preparation programs currently employ accountability mechanisms such as these:

National and state accreditation

Praxis II testing

Survey data from graduates and employers
Feedback from PK-12 school partners and
Advisory Boards

Continuous Review of Programs

The institution's teacher preparation programs also undergo continual reform influenced by the effective practice, feedback from our K-12 partners, local and national workforce demands, new requirements from our legislature and state, new professional standards for preparation, and funding to support new initiatives. The Education Department at Creighton University has developed partnerships with public and private schools where instruction and clinical practice are on-site; integrated "best practices" into evidence-based teacher preparation; placed students in high need, diverse settings for clinical practice throughout the program; and provided data on the impact of our programs on our website. Our programs have a documented high placement and retention rate for our graduates. Our teacher preparation program actively supports accountability mechanisms that are fair, transparent, valid, reliable, feasible, and useful for program improvement. The proposed regulations initiated by the U. S. Department of Education do not meet these criteria.

Overall, if these proposed regulations were adopted, they would draw energy, funding, and attention away from innovative reforms, proven accountability initiatives, and overall program improvement currently under way in teacher preparation programs across the country. Some of the specific areas of concern are as follows:

The specific requirements outlined in the proposal usurp the rights of the state and higher education institutions to determine what indicators identify proficiency of teacher education graduates and their preparation programs. This unfunded mandate represents a significant financial burden to institutions, local school systems, and states. The costs of implementing these regulations have been woefully underestimated with the understanding that no federal funding would be available to move the proposed regulations forward. The proposed regulations require data systems to track and report on teacher education candidate effectiveness for multiple years. Many states do not possess the technology capacity to develop highly sophisticated data collection systems which will collect, analyze, report, and utilize this data in a meaningful manner.

The proposed regulations have generally not been tested for validity and reliability, and attaching high-stakes consequences at this point is of significant concern. For example, using PK-12 student academic achievement and growth to evaluate teacher performance is questioned by leading research organizations and education scholars as having questionable validity and reli-

ability for making teacher effectiveness decisions. Utilizing this approach of evaluating teacher performance to his/her teacher preparation institution is an even weaker link given the largely unknown impacts such as implications of time and place of employment and teacher preparation influence. The lack of a scientifically acceptable basis for using student achievement as a rating for program performance, even if the cost and burden were low, makes this indicator unreasonable. In addition, evidence that ACT/SAT/GPA scores are a reliable indicator of teacher effectiveness is equally questionable. Capstone assessments, which are being implemented in very limited ways are still inconclusive in their outcomes as measuring teacher quality.

As stated earlier, the regulations represent a significant financial burden to institutions, local school systems, and states. In the state of Nebraska, there are over 500 individual teacher preparation "programs" subject to the complexities of these regulations. Even as a system is developed issues regarding privacy, low numbers, and student demographics would impact results unfairly and result in decisions unlikely to improve teacher preparation programs and student learning at PK-12 schools.

The regulations focus on placement, retention, and performance with PK-12 students has significant potential to become a disincentive to encourage candidates to seek placements in areas of high-need. This ideal conflicts with our mission statement and preparation which seeks to lead students to work with the underrepresented, disenfranchised, and poor. Our teacher preparation candidates are well-prepared, however, the potential of a teacher preparation program being rated on test scores of high-needs students will cause any institution pause. With lack of control of the experience of the teachers once employed and no assurance of resources to provide the supports for candidates in high-need schools, it is unreasonable to compare these candidates with candidates in non high-need situations.

The proposed timeline is unreasonable and unrealistic. Those states piloting connecting teacher effectiveness to student achievement are still under development and are experiencing many ethical and legal challenges as they seek to implement the requirements. Attaching outcomes to national accreditation is also problematic in that the new CAEP accreditation standards are not fully implemented and accreditation processes using the new standards will not officially be required until the Fall of 2016. The timeline presented in the proposed regulations would include piloting additional reporting requirements for the 2016-17 academic year which is unrealistic to meet significantly increased reporting elements, creation of new data systems, delivery of in-service and technical assistance systems for institutions and schools, and lack of new resources with which to accomplish the unfunded mandates.

The proposed regulations do not consider or support the philosophy that quality education requires a systemic approach. Factors such as student demographics, preschool learning opportunities, poverty and other social factors are not controlled by PK-12 schools or teacher preparation experiences. Other quality indicators such as equitable funding, strong curriculum standards, focus on providing opportunity—access—success for all students, and quality assessment which all contribute to PK-12 student learning are not controlled by teacher preparation programs. Therefore equating PK-12 student performance to the quality of a teacher preparation program is unfair and unreasonable. However, dedication to strong commitments and collaborative partnerships by educator

preparation programs and school systems impact the development of exemplary educators for the future.

Thank you for allowing us to address our concerns. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. O'CONNOR,
PhD, FACHE,
Provost.

DEBRA L. PONEC,
EdD, NCC, Professor and Chair,
Education Department.

ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN, NE, JANUARY 29, 2015.

Re Comments Regarding Proposed Regulations, 34 CFR Parts 612 and 686; Teacher Preparation Issues.

SOPHIA MCARDLE,
U.S. Department of Education,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MCARDLE: I am writing as the representative of the private, non-profit, regionally accredited colleges and universities in Nebraska with teacher education programs. While we laud the US Department of Education in its efforts to improve the quality of K-12 and higher education in the United States, we believe there are portions of the proposed regulation that are troubling to our institutions.

First, Nebraska is a state that prides itself on local control in education matters. Despite the rhetoric about allowing states to use their own measures of student growth, this proposed regulation mandates states that do not already use value-added measures of student learning in their teacher assessments to do so. It provides for federally-mandated state indicators of quality for teacher preparation program assessments. This is a significant expansion of the federal role in its oversight of the states' responsibility for the education of its young people, and is inappropriate.

Second, the budgetary impact of this regulation is significantly understated, if not laughable. No financial support for states, school systems, or institutions of higher education to implement the requirements is proposed. The regulations create requirements for colleges, schools, and states to track and report on candidates and teachers for many years. Those systems are not in place. The cost estimates make inaccurate assumptions that colleges and states already have the systems in place for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and utilizing data (federally-mandated data which may or may not be valid or reliable for the purposes for which it is intended to be used). It also provides a timeline that is unworkable for most states and institutions.

The January 2, 2015 letter from the American Council of Education and twenty-three other association signatories to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs points out the significant understatement of OMB's estimate of the costs of implementing the proposed regulation by states and IHE's. Most of the teacher preparation programs that I represent are very small, and the impact on them will be disproportionately large from a cost standpoint. The Department cannot talk about tuition containment from one side of its mouth and take actions that will exacerbate tuition hikes out of the other side.

Third, while teacher preparation is one factor in secondary student performance, it is not the only factor. Demographics, family income, school facilities, parental support, and other non-preparation issues have impacts on student performance. This proposed

regulation may have unintended consequences that the USDOE should consider. Why would an IHE place a first-year student in a “troubled” school district or building, where he or she might be less likely to continue in a teaching career, when a “safer” placement would make that continuance more likely? Ergo, a higher rating for the IHE, the students in the program would not be at risk to lose Title IV funds or Teach Grants, and other positives for the college. On the other hand, a school district or building might lose the services of an outstanding first-year teacher which it really needs.

Finally, attributing financial aid-eligibility on institutional ratings based on research that may or may not be valid is irresponsible and bad public policy. It will hinder enrollment to students who could become outstanding teachers, but may have to overcome hurdles in order to do so. This regulation will give IHE’s less incentive to enroll those types of students.

For these reasons, we believe the proposed regulations should be reconsidered and a new negotiated rulemaking convened, with proposed regulations that take into account the myriad of comments received by the USDOE from states, institutions of higher education, and associations relating to these proposed regulations. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

THOMAS O’NEILL, JR.,
President.

Comments submitted by Nebraskans:

—Malinda Eccarius, University of Nebraska, Lincoln on Apr. 27, 2016: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-4855>

—Debra Ponec, Creighton University on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-4364>

—Lixin Ren, Doctoral Student, University of Nebraska-Lincoln on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-4246>

—Don Jackson, President of Hasting College on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-4231>

—Thomas O’Neill, President of Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Nebraska on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-4541>

—Sharon Katt, Matthew L. Blomstedt, and Scott Swisher of Nebraska Department of Education on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-3887>

—Marjorie Kostelnik, University of Nebraska, Lincoln on Feb. 4, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-3511>

—Ronald Bork, Associate Dean, Head of Teacher Education at Concordia University, Nebraska on Jan. 26, 2015: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=ED-2014-OPE-0057-1997>

Mr. SASSÉ. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time on the joint resolution has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SASSÉ. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Johnson	Scott
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cortez Masto	King	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Donnelly	McCaskill	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Udall
Carper	Leahy	Van Hollen
Casey	Markley	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Peters	

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 57, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to address the resolution the Senate is now considering.

In 2015, 85 U.S. Senators voted for the law fixing No Child Left Behind, which reversed the trend to a national school board and restored decisions to classroom teachers, local school boards, and States. The Wall Street Journal said it was the “largest devolution of federal control to the states in a quarter of a century.”

The Department of Education regulation this resolution seeks to overturn does exactly the reverse. It begins to restore the national school board, and it takes away responsibilities from classroom teachers, local school boards, and States. It does this in direct violation of the law that 85 Senators voted for just 15 months ago. So the question before us, today, is not only whether we believe in a national school board or local school boards. More important, perhaps, the question is: who writes the law? Does the U.S. Congress write the law, or does the U.S. Department of Education write the law? Article I of the U.S. Constitution says that the Congress, elected by the people, writes the law.

The purpose of this resolution is to overturn a regulation of the Department of Education that in 7 cases directly violates the Every Student Succeeds Act, passed just 15 months ago, and in 16 other cases exceeds the authority allowed by that law.

This regulation would say to States: Ignore the law 85 Senators passed 15 months ago. Ignore the law that President Obama called a Christmas miracle. Ignore the law that Governors, teachers, school boards, and superintendents all supported, and even ignore why they supported it. Instead, listen to the unelected bureaucrats at the U.S. Department of Education.

This regulation issued by the Department of Education specifically does things or requires States to do things that Congress said, in our law fixing No Child Left Behind, that the Department of Education cannot do. Therefore, it violates the law.

In this law, Congress said to the Department: You cannot tell States exactly what to do about fixing low-performing schools; that is a State decision. But this regulation does that anyway.

Congress said to the Department: You cannot tell States exactly how to rate the public schools in your State. But this regulation does that anyway.

This is not a minor matter.

The remarkable consensus that developed in the 2015 bill in support of fixing No Child Left Behind was to reverse the trend toward a national school board and restore to States, classroom teachers, and school boards decisions about what to do about their children in 100,000 public schools. Teachers, Governors, and school board members were fed up with Washington telling them so much about what to do about the children in their schools. So this regulation, which contravenes the law specifically, goes to the heart of the bill fixing No Child Left Behind.

It is very unusual in Federal law to specifically prohibit a department from regulating on an issue, but that is exactly what Congress did in 2015. Here are seven specific examples of how the regulation which we seek to overturn violates prohibitions that Congress explicitly wrote into the law:

No. 1, the regulation prescribes the long-term goals and measurements of progress that States establish for student subgroups.

The law says, for example, that the Secretary may not tell a State that goals set for students of one race must improve their progress 20 percent better than the progress of a group of students of another race. Yet the regulation says that States must establish goals and measurements for lower performing subgroups who “require greater rates of improvement,” which would necessarily mean that students of one race would have to do better than students of another race.

No. 2, the regulation requires federally prescribed actions to be taken in schools that do not annually test at least 95 percent of students.

The law says that States must annually test not less than 95 percent of all students and each subgroup of students, but States determine how to hold schools accountable for ensuring that 95 percent of students participate on annual tests. The law says that the Secretary of Education may not prescribe “the way in which the State factors” the 95 percent testing requirement into their accountability system. Yet the regulation we seek to overturn prescribes four different specific ways that States must take action in schools that miss the 95 percent requirement.

No. 3, the regulation prescribes that schools with consistently underperforming subgroups of students be identified with a lower summative determination.

The law says that States are required to identify schools for targeted support when a subgroup of students is “consistently underperforming” in a manner “as determined by the state.” So under the law, the Secretary can’t tell States how to identify the lowest performing schools or what a school’s rat-

ing should be. Yet the regulation we are seeking to overturn says that States are required to “demonstrate that a school with a consistently underperforming subgroup . . . receive a lower summative determination. . . . than it would have otherwise received.” The Department of Education is meddling into the methodology of school ratings again, despite the fact that Congress said it could not.

No. 4, the regulation prescribes the timeline for identifying schools with consistently underperforming subgroups.

The law says that States are required to identify schools for targeted support when a subgroup of students is “consistently underperforming” in a manner “as determined by the state.”

We had lengthy discussions about this. These issues in education are filled with conflict and filled with different opinions. I said many times during the debate that working on an education bill in the Senate is kind of like being in a football stadium on game day at Penn State or the University of Tennessee: Everybody in the stands has played football, and they know what play to call, and they usually do. So everybody had a point. We had to work these things out and we wrote down carefully the agreement we had. We wrote down that the Secretary of Education may not impose new requirements or criteria on State accountability systems, such as a timeline for the identification of lowest performing schools. Yet the regulation prescribes an exact timeline of 2 years.

No. 5, the regulation requires States to resubmit their plans to the Secretary every 4 years.

The law says that each State plan “shall . . . be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary by the State educational agency.” Yet the regulation says States must review and revise their State plans “at least once every four years” and “submit its revisions to the Secretary for review and approval.”

No. 6, the regulation dictates exactly how school districts with significant numbers of low-performing schools must measure resources for students.

The law says States must “periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement” in districts that are serving a significant number of low-performing schools. The law says the Secretary cannot tell States what to review. Yet the regulation says that in addressing resource inequities, States must review differences in the following: rates of ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers; access to advanced coursework; access to full-day kindergarten and preschool programs; access to specialized instructional support personnel; and per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds.

But the law said the Secretary could not tell States what to review.

No. 7, the regulation tells States how to count students in subgroups.

The law says each State decides the minimum number of students who should be included in the State’s count of subgroups. So, a State might decide that for students to be included in the State’s subgroup data, there needs to be at least 35 students, for example, of a subgroup in a school. The law says the Secretary may not impose new requirements or criteria on State accountability systems. Yet the regulation we are seeking to overturn says States must pick a number below 30 or States will have to explain themselves to the Secretary. That is in violation of a specific prohibition passed by this body with 85 votes and signed by the President of the United States.

Those are seven ways the regulation specifically violates prohibitions in the law that were intended to keep the Secretary from doing what the Secretary then turned around and did.

Here are 16 more ways the regulation exceeds the authority of the U.S. Department of Education. To some, this may seem minor. To some, it may seem dull. It is not dull to me. I don’t think it is dull to most Senators. Article I of the Constitution isn’t dull. We are elected to write the laws, and anytime we turn over to somebody else—whether it is the court, whether it is the executive branch—that constitutional prerogative, we violate our oath, in my opinion.

No. 1, the regulation limits how States measure school quality or student success. The law says States must include at least one measure of school quality or student success that has to be “valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide.”

The Secretary cannot tell States what measures to use in their State accountability system. Yet the regulation tells States they can only choose indicators that meet the criteria the Department came up with.

No. 2, the regulation limits how States measure school quality or student success for indicators used specifically in high school.

The law says States must include at least one measure of school quality or student success, specific to high schools, and it has to be “valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide.” The Secretary cannot tell States what measures to use in their State accountability system. Yet the regulation tells States they can only choose indicators that meet criteria the Department came up with.

No. 3, the regulation tells schools marked as low-performing that they will always be low-performing unless they improve on indicators the U.S. Department of Education has identified.

The law says something different. The law says that tests and graduation rates have to count more in the State accountability systems than indicators of school quality or student success. The Secretary of Education may not prescribe “the weight of any measure or indicator used to identify or meaningfully differentiate schools.”

The regulation says that a low-performing school must continue to be identified as low-performing unless it improves on tests and graduation rates, even if the school is making significant progress on other measures of school quality or student success, such as, for example, absenteeism or family engagement, something chosen by the State.

No. 4, the regulation requires school districts where schools aren't testing 95 percent of students to develop and implement a Federal improvement plan.

The law says States must annually test not less than 95 percent of all students and each subgroup of students. The law leaves it to States to determine what to do in school districts with schools that are failing to meet the participation requirement. Yet the regulation tells States how to address school districts where schools aren't testing 95 percent of students. It invents out of whole cloth the idea of a Federal improvement plan, and then it mandates it.

No. 5, similarly, the regulation requires schools that aren't testing 95 percent of students to develop and implement a Federal improvement plan.

The law says that States must annually test not less than 95 percent of all students and each subgroup of students. The law leaves it to States to determine what to do in schools that are failing to meet the participation requirement. Yet the regulation tells States how to address schools that aren't testing 95 percent of students.

Again, it invents out of whole cloth the idea of a Federal improvement plan with four federally prescribed elements, and then it mandates it.

No. 6, the regulation tells States how to measure high school graduation rates.

The law says each State will establish long-term goals for "all students and each subgroup of students in the State," including the goal of high school graduation rates using either the "four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate" or "at the State's discretion, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate." Yet the regulation says States can only use the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate to identify low-performing schools in their accountability systems.

You can see that throughout these examples there appears to be a deliberate attempt by the Department of Education not to interpret the law but to ignore the law or, specifically, to contravene the law, to thumb the nose of regulation writers at the Congress and the President who passed and signed the law.

No. 7, the regulation requires each State to come up with a definition for an "ineffective teacher." The law says each State will describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective teachers. Yet the regulations says States have to

define "ineffective teachers." It is going to make it nearly impossible for States not to implement an entire teacher evaluation system.

No. 8, in the same way, the regulation requires each State to come up with a definition of an "out-of-field teacher."

That is what the regulation does, but the law just says States will describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools are not served at disproportionate rates by "out-of-field teachers." The regulation says you have to define that.

No. 9, the regulation requires each State to come up with a definition for an "inexperienced teacher."

The law simply says a State will describe how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by "inexperienced teachers." Yet the regulation goes on to require a definition.

No. 10, the regulation tells States to report on the number and percentage of all students and subgroups of students who are not included in the State's accountability system.

The law says each State will report a clear and concise description of the State's accountability system, including the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students. Yet the regulation requires States to provide new information outside of the scope of what is required by the law.

No. 11, the regulation tells States how to rate schools and that the State accountability system has to produce a single rating for each school.

That was not envisioned by the law. The law says that States must create a system of evaluating all public schools in the State. It says, further, that the Secretary of Education may not prescribe the specific methodology used by States to evaluate schools. Yet the regulation tells States that the results must lead to a "single summative determination" for each school.

A State might choose to do that or a State might choose not to do that. That was the decision of the Congress, but the Department decided differently.

No. 12, the regulation adds a requirement that the State's accountability system has to include at least three levels of performance.

The law says that States have the flexibility to establish a system of meaningful differentiation of schools without any parameters or federally prescribed methodology. That couldn't be clearer—without any parameters or federally described methodology. Yet the regulation prescribes a requirement that States use at least three distinct levels of performance for schools.

No. 13, the regulation prescribes when schools may exit from identification as the lowest-performing.

The law says States must establish statewide criteria for schools to exit from being identified as in need of im-

provment. The law says that the Secretary of Education may not prescribe what the exit criteria are. That is a decision left up to States, but the regulation narrows the States' ability to develop their own criteria for schools to no longer be identified as the lowest performing.

No. 14, the regulation prescribes how States intervene in school districts with schools that are labeled as the lowest-performing. The law says that if a low-performing school does not meet a State's criteria for no longer being identified as lowest-performing, then the State must take a "more rigorous State-determined action." The Secretary of Education cannot prescribe, under the law, any specific strategies to improve schools. Yet the regulation requires the State to tell school districts to take interventions the Department has prescribed.

No. 15, the regulation prescribes how school districts intervene in schools that are labeled as low-performing.

The law says if a low-performing school does not meet statewide criteria for no longer being identified as lowest-performing, the State must take a "more rigorous State-determined action." The Secretary cannot prescribe any specific strategies to improve schools. Yet the regulation requires a school to take federally prescribed actions.

We have already tried Federal one-size-fits-all actions under the School Improvement Grant program in No Child Left Behind. We rejected that. We don't think Washington should be in the business of telling schools how to fix themselves.

Finally, No. 16, the regulation limits how States award school improvement funding to school districts and schools.

The law says States must establish the method they will use to award school improvement funding to school districts. The regulation dictates to States how much they have to award to low-performing schools receiving school improvement funds.

Here is what this resolution overturning the regulation would do. The resolution would ensure that the law fixing No Child Left Behind is implemented as Congress wrote it. The regulation violates the law and its clear prohibitions on the Secretary by prescribing new requirements through regulation or as a condition of a State plan approval.

In the law we passed, Congress reached an agreement about requiring States to identify a certain number and types of schools that need to be improved, but we left it to the States to determine how to go about fixing those schools and how long they had to fix the schools. The regulation prescribes how States and school districts intervene in and improve schools that do not improve.

Secondly, this resolution restores State flexibility. The regulation is in direct conflict with the intent of the law to allow States and school districts

to have greater flexibility to implement the law, as Congress intended.

Congress reached an agreement that there are some essential elements of a State accountability plan that need to be included in a State plan. The other half of the agreement was that we left to the States the decisions about how to include these factors into their accountability systems. This is about article I of the Constitution.

Congress wrote the law with specific rules in mind. The Secretary of Education and his or her bureaucracy do not get to treat Congress as a minor impediment to the education system of their choosing. If they want to write the laws of the land, they should run for Congress and get themselves elected, draft a bill or an amendment—not wait for Congress to finish our work and try to undo it through a simple regulation.

This resolution, overturning the regulation, would preserve local decision-making. As I mentioned, the Wall Street Journal editorialized, when we passed the law, that it was “the largest devolution of Federal control to States in a quarter-century.”

The regulation tried to restore Washington, DC, decision-making with mandates that States comply with specific requirements instead of letting States determine how to best proceed.

This resolution scuttles new and burdensome reporting requirements. The regulation created new reporting requirements on States and school districts that will drive up compliance costs and divert resources away from students and classrooms.

Let me conclude by dealing with some of the arguments and misinformation that I have been hearing about the resolution. No. 1, I want to make clear that this resolution overturning the regulation strengthens accountability in our public schools the way Congress determined to do it in the law fixing No Child Left Behind.

We transferred most of that responsibility for accountability from Washington, DC, to States and local school boards. We did not want a national school board.

The law also includes Federal guardrails to ensure a quality, public education for all students, including, for example, requiring States to identify and provide support to low-performing schools—at least the lowest performing bottom 5 percent of each State’s schools—and requiring academic and English language proficiency indicators to be included in each State’s accountability system. The law’s Federal guardrails will shape how States design their accountability systems because a State plan would not be following the law if the State fails to include accountability provisions in their plan.

The repeal of this regulation does not let States—the ones who are supposed to be addressing accountability—off the hook by any means. Repealing this regulation simply ensures that individual States and their Governors, leg-

islators, chief State school officers, local school boards, superintendents, principals, parents, and classroom teachers are responsible for these decisions.

This resolution, overturning the regulation, will allow States to implement the new law on the existing timeline to submit their plans and have the Department review and approve State plans.

U.S. Education Secretary DeVos has said that she favors the current timeline, the one established by former Secretary King. She said this at her confirmation hearing before our committee. She confirmed that again after taking office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary DeVos’s letter of February 10 to the Chief State School Officers outlining the timeline be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 10, 2017.

DEAR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER: Thank you for the important work you and stakeholders in your State are engaged in to develop new State plans and transition to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I am writing today to assure you that I fully intend to implement and enforce the statutory requirements of the ESSA. Additionally, I want to provide you with an update on the timeline, procedures, and criteria under which a State Educational Agency (SEA) may submit a State plan, including a consolidated State plan, to the Department. States should continue to follow the timeline for developing and submitting their State plans to the Department for review and approval.

On November 29, 2016, the Department issued final regulations regarding statewide accountability systems and data reporting under Title I of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the preparation of State plans, including consolidated State plans. However, in accordance with the memorandum of January 20, 2017, from the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff, titled “Regulatory Freeze Pending Review,” published in the Federal Register on January 24, 2017, the Department has delayed the effective date of regulations concerning accountability and State plans under the ESSA until March 21, 2017, to permit further review for questions of law and policy that the regulations might raise. Additionally, Congress is currently considering a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) (5 U.S.C. 801808) to overturn these regulations. If a resolution of disapproval is enacted, these regulations “shall have no force or effect.”

In a Dear Colleague Letter dated November 29, 2016, the Department notified SEAs that it would accept consolidated State plans on two dates: April 3 or September 18, 2017. The Department also released a Consolidated State Plan Template that States were required to use if they submit a consolidated State plan. Due to the regulatory delay and review, and the potential repeal of recent regulations by Congress, the Department is currently reviewing the regulatory requirements of consolidated State plans, as reflected in the current template, to ensure that they require only descriptions, information, assurances, and other materials that are “absolutely necessary” for consideration

of a consolidated State plan, consistent with section 8302(b)(3) of the ESEA. In doing so, the Department, in consultation with SEAs as well as other State and local stakeholders, will develop a revised template for consolidated State plans that meets the “absolutely necessary” requirement by March 13, 2017. The Department may also consider allowing a State or group of States to work together to develop a consolidated State plan template that meets the Department’s identified requirements through the Council of Chief State School Officers.

The regulatory delay and review, and the potential repeal of recent regulations by Congress, should not adversely affect or delay the progress that States have already made in developing their State plans and transitioning to the ESSA. The Department will be notifying States and the public of the revised template once it becomes available. In the meantime, States should continue their work in engaging with stakeholders and developing their plans based on the requirements under section 8302(b)(3) of the ESEA. In doing so, States may consider using the existing template as a guide, as any revised template will not result in descriptions, information, assurances, or other materials that States will be required to provide other than those already required under the ESEA. The Department will still accept consolidated State plans on April 3 or September 18, 2017.

For your reference, the following programs may be included in a consolidated State plan:

Title I, part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies;

Title I, part C: Education of Migratory Children;

Title I, part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk;

Title II, part A: Supporting Effective Instruction;

Title III, part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act;

Title IV, part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants;

Title IV, part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers; and

Title V, part B, subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program.

In addition, pursuant to ESEA section 8302(a)(1)(B), I am designating the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act as a program that may be included in an SEA’s consolidated State plan.

I appreciate the hard work and thoughtful attention you are giving to implementing the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. I understand that a great deal of work has already gone into the planning and preparation of your State plans, whether that is a consolidated State plan or individual program plans. One of my main priorities as Secretary is to ensure that States and local school districts have clarity during the early implementation of the law. Additionally, I want to ensure that regulations comply with the requirements of the law, provide the State and local flexibility that Congress intended, and do not impose unnecessary burdens. In the near future, the Department will provide more information on its review of existing regulations, as well as additional guidance and technical assistance.

We have a unique opportunity as we implement the ESSA. I look forward to working with you, districts, and parents to ensure every child has the opportunity to pursue excellence and achieve their hopes and dreams.

Sincerely,

BETSY DEVOS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. So there is no confusion, let me clearly state what that timeline is. No. 1, States should continue to submit State accountability plans by the April or September 2017 deadlines. No. 2, States should continue to implement a State accountability system in the 2017–2018 school year. No. 3, States should continue to identify the lowest performing schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement by the beginning of the 2018–2019 school year.

To write these plans, States need simply to consult the law. The Every Student Succeeds Act requires States to submit a plan for peer review and approval by Secretary DeVos and the Education Department. The Department is committed to working with States by providing technical assistance, issuing non-regulatory guidance and other support materials.

If questions arise, there are a variety of ways to answer the questions. The Department will continue to provide States with clarification on how to comply with the law through the use of non-regulatory guidance, “Dear Colleague” letters, frequently asked questions documents, webinars, phone calls, and in-person conferences. In other words, if there are any questions about how to comply with the new law, there are plenty of ways for Chief State School Officers and others to ask the U.S. Department of Education to provide the answers.

It is important to emphasize that this resolution does not in any way give the Education Secretary a path to creating a new Federal voucher program. Some of my friends on the other side of this debate have been resorting to scare tactics and alleging Secretary DeVos will use this opportunity to regulate into existence a mandate that State and local school districts adopt a school voucher program. The Secretary of Education does not have that power, and this Secretary of Education has said she does not want it. Secretary DeVos has repeatedly affirmed her opposition to federally mandating school choice, saying that she does “not and will not advocate for any Federal mandates requiring vouchers. States should determine the mechanism of choice, if any.”

A school choice program cannot be unilaterally created by the U.S. Department of Education. Only Congress could create a voucher program. I tried to do that on the floor of this Senate during the debate about fixing No Child Left Behind. I offered an amendment called Scholarships for Kids that would have allowed States to use existing Federal dollars to follow the children of low-income families to schools of their parents’ choice. Senator SCOTT of South Carolina offered a similar amendment, but only 45 Senators voted for our proposals. If you pay attention around here, you know that the most important things usually take 60 votes to gain approval.

Also, the 2015 law that we passed actually includes provisions that would

prohibit the Secretary from mandating, directing, or controlling a State, school district or school’s allocation of State or local resources, and it bars the Department of Education from requiring States and districts to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under the law—for example, vouchers. Now I agree that previous Secretaries of Education have imposed their own personal, policy preferences on States and school districts. I opposed such mandates and worked against them. Congress writes the law, not the Secretary and not the bureaucracy.

Instead of using this scare tactic to rile up teachers and parents around the country, misleading them and confusing them about what the Secretary of Education might do, I would take that argument and turn it around. If Congress takes a stand here and now and says that this regulation exceeds the authority granted by Congress—the authority delegated to the Secretary of Education—because the Secretary imposed conditions on States not allowed by the law, then that means any current or future Secretary of Education would be similarly prevented from imposing their own conditions on States.

So there could be no legal method of forcing States to adopt a voucher program, unless Congress passes a new law. There could be no legal method of reinterpreting the Every Student Succeeds Act to impose the next good education idea—however well-intended—unless Congress acts first.

The suggestion has been made that this new law requires regulations. This regulation is not required by the law. The law does not specifically call for accountability regulations. The law allows for accountability regulations, but “only to the extent that such regulations are necessary to ensure that there is compliance.” So there is no requirement for this regulation. It is allowed, but it is not required.

Congress wrote prohibitions on the Secretary so that States would not be faced with a bunch of new mandates that “add new requirements that are inconsistent with or outside the scope” or “add new criteria that are inconsistent with or outside the scope” or are “in excess of statutory authority granted to the Secretary.” That is what Congress did. In the law, we laid out requirements for State plans. States can simply follow the law. A regulation isn’t necessary.

Future Secretaries will still be able to write regulations on this subject. Under the Congressional Review Act, which is the procedure under which we are operating, if Congress overturns a regulation—as I hope it will in this case—the Department of Education is prevented from making final a new regulation that is “substantially the same” as the overturned regulation, unless Congress passes a new law to create an opportunity for that new regulation. But no court has defined what “substantially the same” means. But

the commonsense interpretation of that is very simple: The Department simply can’t turn right around and do the same thing Congress has just overturned. It could do something else by regulation, but it could not do precisely that.

So this is a question of whether we are going to restore the national school board that 85 Senators voted to reverse 15 months ago. And this is also a question of whether you believe that the U.S. Congress writes the law or the U.S. Department of Education writes the law. I believe that under article I of our Constitution, the U.S. Congress writes the law, and when signed by the President, then that is the law. The regulations must stay within it, and that is especially true when Congress has written explicit prohibitions about what a Secretary may do and may not do.

The remarkable consensus around the bill fixing No Child Left Behind was to reverse the trend to a national school board and restore to States, to classroom teachers, and to parents the decisions about what to do about their children in public schools. Teachers, Governors, school boards, and parents were all fed up with Washington telling them so much about what to do with their children in 100,000 public schools.

So this regulation, which contravenes the law specifically, goes to the heart of the bill fixing No Child Left Behind, which received 85 votes here in the Senate. And this resolution to overturn that regulation upholds the law that received “aye” votes from those 85 Senators. I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and to vote aye one more time.

I believe that overturning the regulation preserves the consensus and the compromise that we achieved when we enacted the law fixing No Child Left Behind.

I yield the floor.

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 come to the floor today on behalf of students, parents, teachers, and communities around the country to urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act and to oppose this resolution today.

This resolution will roll back a rule issued by the Department of Education that is critical to the effective and intended implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA.

I am urging my fellow Senators to vote against this resolution for the following reasons, and I will go through each one of them: First of all, this legislation will throw our States and

school districts into chaos just as they are beginning to implement our new law. Secondly, it will give Secretary DeVos a blank check to promote her anti-public school agenda. Third, passing this resolution would be a retreat from the bipartisan law President Obama called a Christmas miracle, one that takes us down a strong partisan path instead, which could undermine ESSA's civil rights protections and guardrails.

But before I go into that, I want to remind my colleagues of what we are working on here and what this resolution would unwind. As many of my colleagues remember well, in 2015, the senior Senator from Tennessee and I came together, with so many others in this body, to fix No Child Left Behind. We both agreed—in fact, nearly everyone in the country agreed—the law was badly broken. No Child Left Behind relied too much on high stakes standardized testing. It gave schools unrealistic goals but failed to give them the resources to meet those goals. And it included a one-size-fits-all punishment if those goals weren't met.

We knew overhauling our public education law was not going to be easy, but we took the time to listen to teachers, to parents, and to students around the country, to make sure their voices were heard. And I am proud that we were then able to break through the partisan gridlock in Congress, find common ground, and pass the Every Student Succeeds Act with strong bipartisan support.

After a major law like the Every Student Succeeds Act passes, Federal agencies usually issue rules to implement and clarify that law. The Every Student Succeeds Act maintains the Secretary's authority to issue rules and clarifications that are consistent with the law. This rule before us today is consistent with ESSA, and it provides important clarity to States, school districts, and schools.

Using such a blunt instrument like this resolution to overturn the entire rule will be a retreat from bipartisanship. Here is how: This resolution would roll back a critical Department of Education rule that gives States more flexibility in key areas while at the same time maintaining strong Federal guardrails to ensure our most vulnerable children don't fall through the cracks. This rule provides clarity on accountability, on reporting requirements, and State plan requirements. It helps ensure that no student, no matter where they live, can fall through those cracks. In other words, this is a rule that gets at the heart and soul of what we are trying to accomplish with our bipartisan law.

The Department of Education did not simply come up with this rule on its own. It incorporated over 20,000 comments from education stakeholders, State chiefs, and district superintendents, many of whom—including the State chiefs and superintendents—applauded the Department of Education

for listening to their concerns and incorporating those comments into the final rule that was then released last fall.

During the debate around the Every Student Succeeds Act, there was some division about what accountability should mean in the law, but the final law showed that we can balance flexibility with strong Federal guardrails, until this point, when Republicans now want to tear down the rule that ensures those guardrails go into effect.

Now I want to get into some of the challenges that would be created if this resolution passes and this rule was eliminated. One important thing this rule did was clarify State submission plan requirements and set deadlines for the submission of those plans. Based on this, States have been working now with the Department of Education for months on their State plans. Approximately 18 States and the District of Columbia intend to submit their plans in the beginning of April, but if this rule goes away now, if the rug gets pulled out from under these States, there could be chaos and confusion and the undermining of confidence in this new law.

By the way, we are already seeing this start. In February, Secretary DeVos sent a letter to our State chiefs suggesting a new template for their State submission plans would be "coming," even before the Senate voted on this resolution, and that the new template would be available less than a month before State plans are due. This could force those impacted States to abandon their plans and start from scratch, and it does not allow enough time for the stakeholder review process that is required in the law.

So that is the first reason we should oppose this legislation because there is simply no reason to insert more chaos into a system that is finally settling into our new law. The second reason is, passing this legislation would then give Secretary DeVos a blank check over implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act to promote her anti-public school agenda.

As we saw in her confirmation hearing, Secretary DeVos, we know, has dedicated her career to privatizing public education. She has a long record of fighting to cut investments in public schools and shift taxpayer dollars toward private school vouchers. In her hearing, she showed a lack of even basic understanding of key concepts in public education policy, and she has openly questioned the role of the Federal Government in protecting our most vulnerable students.

After her hearing, millions of people across the country stood up, made their voices heard, and called on the Senate to reject her confirmation. Although she squeaked through with a historic tie-breaking vote from Vice President PENCE, it was clear people across the country rejected her anti-public school agenda. Instead, they want the Department of Education to

stand with students and with our schools.

One month into her tenure as Secretary of Education, Secretary DeVos has not done a lot to reassure parents who had serious concerns. She has made mistake after mistake, from grossly misrepresenting the origins of the HBCUs to failing to protect transgender students in schools, proving what the American people saw at her confirmation hearing; that her lack of understanding of public education is hurting our students. We cannot, in good conscience, provide Secretary DeVos another potential tool to implement ESSA, our bipartisan bill, with her anti-public education slant, and that is exactly what passing this resolution would do.

If this resolution passes, make no mistake, I will do everything I can to ensure that Secretary DeVos implements ESSA, as Congress intended.

Let me be clear. Congress did not intend that DeVos or any future Secretary of Education could use this law to encourage, prioritize, or even require States to incentivize private school choice. We will work to ensure that she does not take advantage of the chaos that will follow, if this rule is overturned.

Providing Secretary DeVos a blank check would absolutely be the wrong way to go in the early stages of this law's implementation. So that is the second reason.

The third reason is, at its heart, the Every Student Succeeds Act is a civil rights law, and the rule that this resolution would eliminate reflects that reality. We know from experience that without strong accountability, kids from low-income neighborhoods, students of color, kids with disabilities, and students learning English too often fall through the cracks. Now it is up to all of us to uphold the civil rights legacy of this law and its promise for all of our students.

I was proud to work with my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, on this law. I know he is proud of what we accomplished, but I am disheartened to see my Republican colleagues jamming this partisan play through in the same fashion they did with Secretary DeVos's nomination.

Voting for this resolution will ruin the bipartisan nature of our Every Student Succeeds Act, and it will hurt our students, but by voting against this resolution, we can make sure ESSA works for all of our students, regardless of where they live, how they learn, or how much money their parents make.

Finally, I want to make one more point. Even people who had concerns with the final rule do not—do not—want to see it overturned. In fact, the American Federation of Teachers, civil rights groups, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—groups that aren't always actually on the same side of education issues—are all speaking out against rolling back this rule, and parents,

teachers, and community leaders are all on the same page.

In a letter to the Senate, Randi Weingarten, president of the American Federation of Teachers union said: “Repealing these regulations now would not just be counterproductive and disruptive but would demonstrate a disregard by Congress of school districts’ operation and timelines.”

In a letter to my colleagues, Senator McCANN and Senator SCHUMER, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and various education groups, including the National Center for Learning Disabilities, wrote that rolling back this rule “will cause unnecessary confusion, disrupting the work in states and wasting time that we cannot afford to waste.”

So if unions, business, and civil rights groups, disability advocate organizations, and the States are not asking for this, we must ask the questions, Why are my colleagues jamming this resolution through? What perceived problem are we trying to solve?

Millions of students, parents, and teachers have made their voices heard about the importance of public education. They want us to work together to uphold and build on our bipartisan law, not for it to become just the latest partisan exercise that only hurts our students.

A vote against this resolution is a vote for our students, it is a vote for our schools, it is a vote not to give Secretary DeVos power she can abuse, and it is a vote to keep working together to build on this bipartisan law, not tear it apart.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUDGET CUTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express serious concern about reports in the press that the administration is considering deep cuts in funding to crucial aspects of our Nation’s national security and our homeland security to pay for the construction of a border wall and also for a crackdown on illegal immigration.

The first target that alarmed me was America’s maritime guardian, the U.S. Coast Guard.

Even as the administration says it plans to secure the borders and increase funding for our military by \$54 billion, which, in fact, may be a good thing, it is reportedly considering cuts on the nondefense side—and that includes the Department of Homeland Security—with a cut of \$1.3 billion, or 12 percent, to the very military service that secures our vast maritime borders, and that is the Coast Guard. That plan just doesn’t make any sense, especially when it comes to securing our

borders. You would be putting a bunch of money in a wall, but you are losing the security of the border over here on the oceans.

The 42,000 member-strong Coast Guard plays a vital role in protecting our Nation from narcoterrorism, combating human smuggling, preventing and responding to maritime environmental disasters, and protecting lives and property at sea.

By the way, in other foreign parts of the globe, the U.S. Coast Guard is assisting the U.S. military in our military operations.

If securing our borders and supporting our military is a true priority for the administration, then it ought not be slashing the Coast Guard’s budget. Instead, we should be supporting the Coast Guard’s ongoing and much needed fleet recapitalization program, including the design and construction of the new offshore patrol cutter and the continued production of the new fast response cutter. These are desperately needed assets for the Coast Guard.

This Senator has personally visited dozens of Coast Guard units all around, not just in my State of Florida but in Alaska, the Great Lakes. The job the Coast Guard does is amazing. What I have witnessed firsthand is what they do in service to our country.

The constant theme I have heard from my visits is the need to modernize and become increasingly more nimble, given the host of threats that could be delivered from our maritime borders. Let me give just one example.

In the Caribbean, it is a Coast Guard admiral who heads up the task force that has all agencies of government participating as we look to protect the southern borders in the Caribbean, as well as the southern Pacific, from anything that is coming to our borders—drugs, migrants, terrorists, whatever. It is all agencies involved, but if, for example, there are U.S. Navy ships in the area or Air Force assets in the air that might pick up one of these threats coming toward America, they work hand-in-glove with the Coast Guard because it is the Coast Guard that has the legal authority as a law enforcement agency to stop, apprehend, and board that vessel.

We are doing all of this border protection with cutters that have an average age of 45 years old. The average age of a Coast Guard 210-foot medium endurance cutter is 48 years old. The Coast Guard’s high endurance cutter average age is 45 years. These are just two classes of ships that the Coast Guard uses for interdiction and rescue missions, and they do it worldwide.

As you may expect, with assets this old, the Coast Guard struggles with major, mission-debilitating casualties, which result in severe losses of operational days at sea and drastically increases maintenance costs. To correct that, the new offshore patrol cutters and the fast response cutters will give the Coast Guard an effective coastal

and offshore interdiction capability in order to meet objectives. What are they? Combating transnational organized crime networks, securing our national maritime borders, safeguarding waterborne commerce, and safeguarding life and property at sea.

Looking at the administration’s second target to pay for the wall, what is the second target? Believe it or not, FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Administration. That agency comes to the aid of millions of Americans during any kind of natural disaster, and they are singling that out for cuts? That doesn’t make common sense, and it certainly is not going to be a popular thing to do in the eyes of those who have to turn to FEMA after a natural disaster to try to get their lives back on track.

Last year, just taking 1 year as an example, two major hurricanes hit Florida, in addition to many other devastating natural disasters that struck nationwide and resulted in many deaths and billions of dollars of damage. FEMA was critical to people’s survival and recovery in each of those events. Just think of what we hear on the news all the time. There are storms, tornadoes, earthquakes. Remember the mountain that erupted out in the State of Washington decades ago, not to mention hurricanes.

For the sake of people’s safety and that of our country, we simply cannot use FEMA as a piggy bank to pay for the administration’s trillion-dollar spending programs.

The administration’s third target—this has just been reported. What is the third target? You are not going to believe this. It is TSA, the Transportation Security Administration. If we target TSA for budget cuts—is that really what we want to do in a threat environment? Every time we go through an airport, TSA is on the frontlines of protecting our country from terrorist attacks. That is its security mission at airports across the country—and, by the way, with the air marshals who fly on our flights. Need I remind the administration why TSA was created? It was after the September 11 attacks in 2001.

Funding is vital to ensure the success of TSA’s mission. In fact, just last year Congress responded to concerns over insider threats and security at airports, such as the bombings in Brussels and Istanbul, with the most extensive security-related measures in years. Specifically, what we did, particularly in the Commerce Committee when we formulated the FAA bill, is we included bipartisan provisions enhancing the background and vetting requirements for airport employees and expanded the random and physical inspection of airport employees in secure areas.

Remember the case at the Atlanta Airport? For several months, people had a gun-running scheme going from Atlanta to New York. They didn’t drive up Interstate 95 to take the guns; they had an airport employee in Atlanta

who could get into the airport, without being checked, carrying a sack of guns. That airport employee would go up into the sterile area where passengers are, go into the men's room, and would exchange knapsacks with a passenger who had come through TSA clean, and that passenger took the sack of guns on the airplane flight from Atlanta to New York. The New York City Police Department couldn't figure out how they were getting all those guns on the streets of New York. That was a gun-running scheme over several months. Thank goodness they were criminals and not terrorists. And you want to cut that kind of security?

Do you want to cut the strongest security we have at an airport when screening passengers who are going through? It is the nose of a dog, the VIPR teams. The trained dog teams and their handlers are the most efficient way to screen passengers. It is amazing what those dogs can sense. When we did the FAA bill last year, we doubled the number of VIPR teams, the dog teams, and you want to cut this? That was all done in a bipartisan manner. We doubled the number for the protection of the American public.

In that bill, we also expanded the grant funding to assist law enforcement in responding to mass casualty and active-shooter incidents, which is very important. Another tragic example of that is the recent shooting in Fort Lauderdale at the airport.

To counter the issue of long lines, which I know we all had to go through last spring, the legislation included provisions to expand TSA Precheck and require the TSA to evaluate staffing and checkpoint configurations in order to expedite passenger security screening.

Does that sound like a bunch of administrative mumbo jumbo? Perhaps. Let me tell you that it works and that all of it is designed to protect Americans going to airports and getting on airplanes.

None of this is possible without continued funding and, in fact, even more funding. Any cuts are certainly going to impair the TSA's ability to keep our country safe.

The bottom line here is that we must do whatever is necessary to keep our country safe and our citizens secure. Slashing the budgets of the U.S. Coast Guard or FEMA or the TSA is only going to make us less secure.

Need I say more about these proposals to pay for some of these other things, like a wall, by slashing these kinds of budgets?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Maryland.

RUSSIA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, along with the Presiding Officer, I have the distinct honor of serving on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and am the ranking Democrat on that committee. There are many areas of challenge for our national security. We

could talk about what we think is the greatest threat to the national security of the United States. Unfortunately, there are a lot of candidates.

One could certainly be China. China has been very provocative in the China Sea, raising concern about maintaining maritime security, which is so critically important to world commerce. Clearly China could be a candidate.

North Korea could be a candidate. We know that in North Korea, they have a nuclear capacity. We know their government will gas and poison people who disagree with them, including family. It is a repressive regime, and they are developing the capacity not only to have a nuclear weapon but the capacity to be able to deliver that nuclear weapon beyond just the region in which they are located. So we could pick North Korea.

We certainly could mention the threat of ISIS, which is a growing threat of terrorism that challenges not only the Middle East but our own country.

We could mention the security threat of Iran. Iran was one of the greatest sponsors of terrorism of any country in the world, which is causing major problems for the Sunni Gulf States, in Syria, and in the Middle East. Clearly Iran is a candidate for major interest in our national security.

But the country I would pick as the greatest threat to America's national security would be Russia. Russia has been very aggressive in trying to dominate beyond its own geographical borders. It has incurred into other countries and has attacked the United States of America.

I want to take us back to 1975 when the Helsinki Final Act was passed, through the leadership of the United States and the USSR.

I have had the opportunity through several Congresses to be either the chair or the cochair or the ranking member of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. I have spent a lot of time on the Helsinki work.

What was remarkable about that document that was entered into in 1975 was that it recognized that security is beyond just military in that for a country to be secure, it must pay attention to its borders, yes, and its military, but it also must have economic security and must respect human rights.

What was also very unique in the Helsinki Final Act was the commitment that these standards we agreed to would not only be of internal interest to the member country but that any country to the Helsinki Final Act could challenge the actions of any other country. We have not only the right but the responsibility to call out countries that fail to adhere to the basic principles that were agreed to in 1975. The Helsinki Final Act now applies to about 56 countries—all of the countries of Europe, Canada, the United States, and all of the republics of the former Soviet Union.

Let me review with my colleagues the guiding principles that were agreed

to in 1975 under the Helsinki Final Act, signed by Russia, so that they are bound by these principles. As I read through these 10 principles, let me talk about how Russia has violated every single one of the basic 10 principles they agreed to in Helsinki.

No. 1, sovereign equality and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty.

No. 2, refraining from the threat or use of force.

No. 3, the inviolability of borders.

No. 4, the territorial integrity of states.

In each of these cases, Russia has violated these basic principles. They invaded Ukraine and took over Crimea, annexing it against the will of a sovereign country. They are interfering in the eastern part of Ukraine as we speak, violating the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Russia's troops are in Georgia, violating the sovereignty of that country. Russia's presence in Moldova is not respecting the territorial integrity of a member state. Russia has violated the basic principles of sovereignty that were brought out in the Helsinki Final Act.

Let me read some of the other principles.

No. 5, the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Russia shoots first. They took their troops into Ukraine. They took their troops into Georgia. They have not used peaceful methods.

The sixth principle is the non-intervention in internal affairs.

Russia attacked the United States of America in our free election system. That is not subject to any dispute today. They attacked America. They interfered with our internal affairs. They tried to influence our election. That is an attack against America and a violation of their basic commitments.

Let me read through the remaining.

No. 7, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Ask the people who have disagreed with the Russian Government and who have tried to form a party whether there is respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Russia today. Ask independent journalists who are arrested and killed for trying to carry out their profession. Russia today is intimidating civil societies and NGOs, and anyone who disagrees with Mr. Putin is subject to arrest, torture, and perhaps death. We know that in the case of Mr. Magnitsky, which is a cause that has been taken up by this body with the passage of Magnitsky laws.

Another principle is equal rights and the self-determination of people. That is not present in Russia today.

No. 9, cooperation among states.

Let me conclude with the 10th principle: fulfillment in good faith of international legal obligations.

Russia entered into an agreement with regard to Ukraine's sovereignty, only to invade Ukraine a few years later. Ukraine gave up its nuclear stockpile, believing that Russia would

live up to its commitments. Russia has violated the Minsk agreements that were entered into to resolve the problems between Ukraine and Russia. Russia has not lived up to its international agreements.

Let me sort of summarize why I think Russia is the No. 1 candidate for concern with regard to our national security. They have violated the sovereignty of many countries of the world. They have violated the sovereignty of Ukraine and continue to do so. They have violated the sovereignty of Georgia and Moldova. They have attacked the United States of America through cyber. It may not have been a MiG, but it was a mouse, and its intended purpose was to bring down our democratic election system and to favor one candidate. That cannot go unanswered.

Today, Russia is engaged in Syria and supports the Assad regime, which attacks humanitarian convoys, uses the civilian population as an instrument of war, gasses its own people—violating basic international human rights and committing war crimes. That is what President Putin is doing in Russia today.

Russia's human rights records are deplorable. Kara-Murza has been poisoned not once but twice. He is an opposition leader. He is now in the United States and is recovering from the second poisoning episode. The Russian authorities tried to kill him. Why? Because he dared to oppose the Putin regime.

We need to speak out. We need to know more about that. It does not end there. Russia is violating the INF, the International Nuclear Force agreement, which is a major concern to all of us.

Russia's bottom line is that they are trying to dismantle the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which has been the bulwark of security since the end of World War II, the relationship between Europe and the United States, providing a blanket of protection not just for our physical security, but providing international leadership in dealing with the development of democratic countries around the world. That is what Russia is trying to do today, is to dismantle that protection.

What should we do? We have identified Russia as our No. 1 concern, and I think most Members of the Senate would agree with that assessment. I have talked to many, particularly on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What should we do? What is the role of Congress?

We know we are waiting for President Trump to give us his foreign policy as it relates to Russia, and that is an important thing for us to know—how the President intends to deal with a country that has done so many things against our national security interests.

We have a role. We are the first branch of government that is mentioned in the Constitution, article I.

We have responsibilities to act. We need to take steps, and I have encouraged my colleagues.

There have been a lot of accusations made around here about Russia's contacts with Americans and that Russia is stealing information through cyber and planting that information through WikiLeaks in order to influence elections. There is the potential contact with General Flynn, what happened with the Russian Ambassador, and what happened as far as domestic wiretaps. There have been a lot of comments made around here, but we do not have the facts.

First and foremost, we need an independent commission that is similar to what the Congress constituted after the attack on 9/11 so that we get independent, nonpartisan experts, without restriction to jurisdiction or turf, who can determine exactly what Russia's game plan is and what steps we can take to protect ourselves in moving forward and what action we should take against Russia. That is the first thing we should do. Congress should also pass a resolution. I have introduced one that would set up that type of an independent commission to look at what Russia has done.

There is a second issue, though, that I want to bring to our attention, and I know the Presiding Officer is very familiar with it. It is the Countering Russian Hostilities Act, which is a bill I filed. I am very proud that this bill was not created by one Member, it was created by a group of us working together and recognizing that Congress needed to speak with a strong voice.

I am proud that, in addition to my sponsorship, Senator MCCAIN helped draft this bill. Senator MENENDEZ is a key leader on this bill. Senator GRAHAM is one of the architects of the bill. We have Senator SHAHEEN, Senator RUBIO, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator SASSE, Senator DURBIN, Senator PORTMAN, Senator MURPHY, Senator GARDNER, Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator SULLIVAN, Senator DAINES, Senator DONNELLY, Senator YOUNG, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator COONS, and Senator CORNYN.

You might notice that I alternated between Democrats and Republicans because this is not a partisan effort. We all recognize the seriousness of what Russia has done to the United States. We all recognize that Congress needs to respond. When you are attacked, you don't stand by; if you do, you will get attacked again and the next time could be even more devastating. So we have to take action to protect ourselves.

So what the Counteracting Russian Hostilities Act does, first and foremost, is it codifies the sanctions currently imposed against Russia for its cyber attack on the U.S. election. Secondly, it extends those sanctions for what we call secondary sanctions—businesses doing business with those that are sanctioned—so we can enforce the sanctions.

The Presiding Officer recognized that when we were working on the North Korea sanctions law, we needed to strengthen that, and I congratulate the Presiding Officer on the work he did regarding North Korea, and I was pleased to join him. I am pleased he is joining with this group to see how we can strengthen our sanctions and pressure on Russia to know that they can't get away with this type of an attack against America, but then we go even further.

We recognize that Ukraine today—we have sanctions against Russia, but we can strengthen those sanctions. We can apply those sanctions to the energy sector. We can apply those sanctions to prevent American companies from financing the Russian economy through the moneys they need for sovereign debt or privatization. So we extend the program of sanctions to include those types of activities.

We take up two other major issues that I just want to share with my colleagues because these are contributions made by the Members who joined together to file this bill. We recognize that the rules of engagement have changed. Russia is using tactics today that we never thought would be used. They attack our country, get private information, give it to WikiLeaks, use it as part of a strategy to get news out there that could influence our elections. Then they develop fake news, use that fake news through social media to make it look like real news in an effort to try to affect our free election system in the United States. This is pretty frightening. We have to meet them. We have to protect ourselves.

So this legislation provides for a democracy initiative similar to what we have done on our security initiative with Europe. We have stationed NATO troops on the border countries of NATO with Russia to let them know we will not tolerate the invasion of a NATO country. We have done that. That is our security initiative. We have to have a democracy initiative to protect the democratic institutions of Western Europe because Russia will use the democratic institutions to try to undermine the democratic institutions—the free press, the opportunities of free speech, the opportunities to try to influence through their money the election process. They have done that. They tried to do it in Montenegro during the parliamentary elections to affect Montenegro's accession into NATO.

We have to protect the democratic institutions. This legislation would authorize that protection.

Then it sets up a resource so we can fight this propaganda, so we can find ways to counter Russia's use of propaganda in order to carry out their nefarious activities.

This is a comprehensive bill. I urge all of our colleagues to take a look at it. We are looking for input. We are looking to make sure this does exactly what we need it to do—to speak as one

voice in Congress to make it clear to Russia that it is not business as usual; that we intend to take action and be strong and let them know they cannot do this type of activity; that America will protect its national security.

There is another bill, let me just mention, that Senator GRAHAM is the principal sponsor of that I have cosponsored and others have sponsored also. It is the Russia Sanctions Review Act. I mention that one because we had a great debate here in the last Congress on the Iran nuclear agreement, and part of the reasons we had a great debate is because the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was able to pass a review act and get broad consensus on it, get it signed by the President, which gave us a role. More importantly, it gave the American people a role in getting transparency on a very important agreement—the Iran nuclear agreement. So we had time for public hearings. We had time for national debate. We had time for questions.

Because that law passed, I am convinced the agreement was stronger. The administration knew there were millions of eyes looking at what they were doing; they just couldn't do it in the dark of night. It helped us, I think, carry out our responsibility as the legislative branch of government.

So Senator GRAHAM and I and others believe we should have a similar process, if there is going to be a fundamental change in the relationship between the United States and Russia; that the President should consult and work with Congress and give us an opportunity for transparency and for the American people to be heard. That is exactly what this bill does. It is a bill that I think is for good legislating, for good governance, and I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at this, and hopefully we will be able to get this done.

I will just say in conclusion that we have no issue with the Russian people. They are good people. We want to have a good relationship with the Russian people. It is Mr. Putin and his government that are directing this country to do things in interference with the sovereignty of other countries—in violating human rights, in supporting violations of human rights, in war crimes, and they should be held accountable for that and for what they are doing in Syria, and, of course, very personally, attacking our own country. That is what we are aimed at.

Mr. Khodorkovsky was in my office yesterday. I think my colleagues might recall that he was a leader in Russia—a great business leader. He made a lot of money. He decided Russia needed reforms to protect the rights of all people, that human rights were not strong enough, the right of expression was not strong enough, so he took up that cause as a successful businessperson. As a result, he was arrested, served 10 years in prison, and they tried to keep him out of politics because he did not represent Mr. Putin's politics.

Well, he has been very active. He no longer lives in Russia for fear of his own life. He has been here championing the cause for good governance within Russia and the importance for the international community to be engaged in that. As he left my office yesterday, he said: Please continue to speak out. He said: Please continue to speak out.

The United States must lead when a country driven by Mr. Putin does what it does. It is our responsibility to speak out about this outrageous conduct—threatening the integrity of so many countries and violating the human rights of so many people.

We can make a difference. The Congress can make a difference. It is for all of those reasons that we need to act.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at the legislation I have talked about on the floor and which so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined. Let's get together and let's speak with a united voice and let Russia know we are going to protect the national security of the United States of America, and we are going to protect the rights of our friends.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from the great State of Maryland and to commend him for his leadership on the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor today, as well as his great work with the Helsinki Commission, his tireless bipartisan work with our committee chairman, and with many others.

We have just heard detailed, in terms of the legislation he has put forward, the effort, the time, and the engagement he has put forward in terms of standing up. I think it is important for all of our colleagues and the American people to hear us working together to push back on Russian aggression and on Vladimir Putin's regime for its interference in our most recent election and its long and sad record of appalling human rights violations.

In 1950, the CIA delivered a report to then-President Harry Truman that outlined two key goals of the Soviet Government. The first goal was "destruction of the unity among the Western countries, thereby isolating the United States." The second goal was "alienating the Western people from their governments so that the efforts of the Western countries to strengthen themselves would be undermined."

Nearly 70 years later, the regime of Vladimir Putin in Russia remains fundamentally committed to these same two goals, but today his government has a whole new arsenal of cyber tools and information tools which it uses to interfere in democratic elections here in the United States and across Europe—among the nations that are our vital allies—to launch propaganda and misinformation campaigns that spread

falsehoods and create a climate of doubt and uncertainty among citizens and democracies around the world.

Last week, on this floor, I rose to speak with my friend and colleague, Senator MARCO RUBIO, to highlight the threat that we know Russia poses to the American-led, rules-based international order that has been sustained by both Republican and Democratic Presidents and leaders in this body since the Second World War.

Just yesterday, several of us participated in a hearing of the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. We heard directly from representatives of the Governments of Ukraine, Poland, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. All of these nations know better than any others just how serious the Russian Government is today about fulfilling the goals the CIA quoted and outlined in that report from the 1950s. Russian troops today are massing on the borders of many of these countries. In the case of Ukraine, Russia has recently invaded and continues to illegally occupy Crimea while arming and supporting separatists in the eastern 20 percent of the country.

Russia previously invaded Georgia in 2008 and continues to occupy about one-fifth of its territory, backing rebels in the breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. The Russian Government has tried and, in several cases, succeeded in executing cyber attacks against these countries' governments, most famously against Estonia in 2007. Its ongoing disinformation campaigns have created widespread doubt about Western institutions like NATO, the European Union, the OSCE—organizations that have helped to maintain a stable and peaceful world for seven decades.

These Ambassadors and the Foreign Ministers who testified yesterday before our appropriations subcommittee made clear their countries depend on the United States not just for leadership, not just for military strength but for leadership and our commitment to effective foreign assistance. These are the same requests I heard last August from Eastern European leaders, when I led a bipartisan congressional delegation—two Republican House Members, two Democratic Senate Members, and I. The five of us went to Ukraine, Estonia, and the Czech Republic, and we heard exactly the same message—that they are threatened by a constant wave of attacks of disinformation, both overt and covert efforts to subvert their democracies and to change the direction of their nations.

Maintaining our forms of American leadership, our support for the democracies, the civil societies, and the military, and the strength of these nations in Eastern Europe is not charity. A world committed to democracy and the rule of law is a more stable world. A stable world means Americans are safer and more economically secure. It

is that simple. That is why we must push back against Russian aggression in a bipartisan way and stand up for our allies and our values.

Conversations like this one on the floor today are important to educate our American people about the true nature of the Russian threat we face. The Russian Government's current strategy relies on disinformation and propaganda in an effort to divide the American people, both from their government and from each other.

Our discussion this afternoon makes clear that both Republicans and Democrats in Congress haven't lost our will to highlight, to condemn, and to fight Russian actions. Unassailable facts must serve as the basis for a bipartisan foreign policy. A clear-eyed understanding of Russian intentions and actions will protect us from their anti-Western propaganda and avoid the internal divisions that Russia seeks to leverage in an attempt to project its influence worldwide.

To that end, I am determined to support the efforts of Senator CARDIN. I am also determined to support the efforts of Senator GRAHAM to provide sufficient funding that specifically targets the Russian Government's subversive actions. I will also continue to work with my colleagues, such as Senator CARDIN, to see that his bill, S. 94, the Counteracting Russian Hostilities Act, is marked up this work period so the full Senate can consider this important legislation. As Senator CARDIN commented, there are 10 Democrats and 10 Republicans who have already cosponsored this important bill.

Why is this bill, the Counteracting Russian Hostilities Act, so important? It will make sure the Russian Government pays a price for breaking the rules by supporting sanctions for its occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea, for its egregious human rights violations in Syria and elsewhere, and, most importantly, for directly interfering in our election. This bill would prevent the lifting of sanctions on Russia until its government ceases these activities that caused those sanctions to be put in place in the first place. The bill would also support civil society, pro-democracy, and anti-corruption activists in Russia and across Europe.

Today Vladimir Putin has a whole array of powerful modern tools that he intends to use to undermine democracy and promote his brand of authoritarianism, but as that 1950 memo to President Harry Truman made clear, Russia's goals haven't changed. Russia's goals are to oppose us, our vision, our values, and our democracy. We must make it clear that America's vision of a freer, safer, and more democratic world hasn't changed either.

I thank Senator CARDIN for organizing this discussion, thank Senator MENENDEZ for everything he has done to support these important efforts, and thank Senator GRAHAM for hosting yes-

terday's important hearing. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to continue with this fight.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in this important conversation on the Senate floor and, once again, to demand answers to the many questions raised about Russia's interference in our elections.

Not so long ago, I came to the floor to speak out against a belligerent act from an adversarial nation, an attempt to undermine American democracy and foment chaos and uncertainty on the world stage, an effort that we now know from our own intelligence community's assessment was ordered by President Putin himself, a campaign that senior intelligence officials have concluded "blend[ed] covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users, or 'trolls,'" to undermine our 2016 Presidential elections.

In recent weeks, the American people have been confronted by a daily drumbeat of headlines regarding Russian interference with our elections and possible ties to President Trump's campaign. They have learned that the President's former National Security Advisor, LTG Michael Flynn, was not truthful about the nature of the conversations he had with the Russian Ambassador shortly after President Obama sanctioned Russia for meddling in our elections.

They learned that Attorney General Jeff Sessions, the highest law enforcement officer in the land, did not fully disclose at least two meetings he had with the Russian Ambassador during his nomination hearings.

They have learned, through reporting in the news media, that U.S. law enforcement continues to investigation Russian agents' contacts with President Trump's inner circle.

Yet despite these revelations, the American people now face more questions than answers. Has anyone else on the President's team been in contact with the Russian Government? What were the nature of these conversations? How credible are reports of business dealings between Russian oligarchs and the Trump organization?

But here is the reason I came to the floor today, as serious as those questions are. Getting answers to these questions, whether it be through a special prosecutor, or an independent commission—on which Senator CARDIN has legislation and which I strongly, strongly support and believe it is the ultimate vehicle—or the Senate Intelligence Committee's own investigation—those efforts are not about President Trump. It is about the American people. It is about protecting our free

and democratic way of life and our time-tested system of self-governance. It is about showing our constituents that, when the stakes are high, when the allegations are this startling, when the implications are this alarming, we are capable of setting politics aside and getting to the truth.

Time and again, the President has dismissed the significance of Russia's interference in our elections, and he derides reports about his financial interests and campaign contacts with Russia as "fake news." Well, this isn't fake news. On the contrary, these are real threats—real threats from a real foreign adversary; real threats that undermine the integrity of our elections and, therefore, the security of our country; real threats from a brutal leader who sees the erosion of Western democracy as a strategic imperative for Russia's future.

So let's be clear about why these threats matter. Vladimir Putin's rise to power in Russia has been marked by the suppression of the freedom of the press, the oppression of the Russian people, the murder of political opponents, and the transfer of wealth and assets from the Russian people to a handful of powerful oligarchs.

President Putin sees the spread of Western democratic values that we enjoy here in our country and others in the Western world—like freedom of speech, the rule of law, and human rights—as a threat to his power. So Russia has embarked on a systematic campaign to undermine the democracies that uphold the international order established after World War II and that has been the bedrock of peace and tranquility, generally speaking, since then. These threats must be taken seriously.

Russia's aggressive behavior reaches back years and extends to this day. We saw it in 2008, when Russia backed illegal separatist forces in Georgia, declaring South Ossetia and Abkhazia independent states. We saw it in March of 2014—when I was in Ukraine—when Russia authorized the use of military force to annex Crimea, blatantly violating the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people and the Budapest Memorandum, a memorandum that we—the United States, Russia, and others—signed, saying that we would observe the territorial and sovereignty rights of Ukraine if they gave up the nuclear weapons that had been left to them after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

They did just that. They did just that, and what happened to them afterwards? Their territory has been annexed and invaded. Today, Putin continues to break ceasefires, sow discord, and incite violence throughout eastern Ukraine—an effort that to date has claimed 10,000 lives and displaced 2 million people.

Unfortunately, Russia's interference in our 2016 Presidential election is not an isolated instance. According to U.S. intelligence reports, these efforts are only the most recent manifestation of

the Kremlin's ongoing campaign to undermine Western democracy.

In recent years, we have seen Russian oligarchs funnel money to fringe political movements across Europe, and Russian operatives conduct sophisticated disinformation campaigns. After the revelations that Russia interfered with our own elections, Putin has shown no signs of slowing down. On the contrary, just weeks ago, Russian's Defense Minister announced that the Kremlin will begin using troops to enhance their information operations, emphasizing that "propaganda must be smart, competent, and efficient."

Again, Russia's end goal here is no mystery. Putin aims to undermine European unity and fracture the transatlantic alliance—an alliance that has served as a bedrock for international security, peace and stability, and economic cooperation between the United States and Europe for the past half century.

In the Middle East, President Putin continues to disregard international norms. He aligns Russia with Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terror. He aids Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad in his atrocities against innocent civilians. In Aleppo, Russian bombs fall on homes; Russian bombs fall on schools and hospitals; Russian bombs fall on aid convoys that only seek to feed starving, trapped families, and rescue children from the rubble.

Just last month, Russia violated the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty when they illegally launched a cruise missile, showing no regard for an agreement that has been a hallmark for nuclear security cooperation for nearly four decades. That is not an insignificant act.

The United States cannot ignore such destabilizing behavior. That is exactly why Senator GRAHAM and I introduced S. Res. 78 just 2 weeks ago, recognizing 3 years of Russian military aggression and calling on Russia to respect its obligations to the international community. Our resolution should serve as a reminder to this administration that the U.S. sanctions imposed on Russia for violating the international order should remain in place until Russia starts respecting and returning to that international norm.

Nor can we let Russian efforts to undermine Western democracies continue unabated. That is why I joined my colleagues in the Countering Russian Hostilities Act of 2017. This bipartisan bill codifies the sanctions imposed by President Obama for Russia's annexation of Crimea and interference in the U.S. elections into law.

It is the same type of proposition we had with the Iran agreement. We want a congressional opportunity to voice ourselves and make sure that those sanctions aren't lifted arbitrarily, capriciously, without Russia paying the consequences and coming back into the international order. At the same time, the legislation authorizes \$100 million

for the State Department and other agencies to counter Putin's propaganda.

The time for action—and for answers—is now. We can get to work immediately by holding hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to ensure that the United States has a strategy in place to protect the security of our democracy and promote stability abroad. From the spread of extremist propaganda across Europe and the denial of Ukrainian sovereignty, to the bombing of civilians in Aleppo and the cyber attacks against the Democratic National Committee, Putin's intentions are not up for debate.

Russia's destabilizing behavior should make it absolutely clear to the President of the United States that the Russian Federation is not our friend. But when the President hesitates to acknowledge this reality or fails to address such aggressive behavior, it is up to Congress to act. There can be no hesitation when it comes to protecting the security and sanctity of our elections.

But to take action we need answers. That is why we need an independent investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 elections. What President Trump fails to realize time and again is that this investigation is not about whether or not Russia successfully swayed the American elections. This investigation is not about him. This investigation is about the American people. It is about ensuring that our elections are free, fair, and secure so that our government that we elect is responsive and accountable to the people. It is about understanding Russia's tactics in cyber space and preparing for future attacks. It is about standing with our allies, preserving peace and avoiding war, and preventing the need to send our sons and daughters into harm's way. It is about ensuring that, when the President of the United States faces tough decisions, the American people can trust that he puts their interests—their interests—ahead of any other interests he has abroad.

It is time to protect the integrity of our elections and to secure our democracy against the cyber threats of the 21st century—whether they come in the form of election machine tampering, or paid propaganda on social media, or targeted hacks on political and public officials.

Russia poses a real strategic threat to the United States, to our core values, and to the international order. I call on the President to treat these threats with the seriousness they deserve.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect the integrity of our elections here at home, to defend democracy abroad, and to ensure that the transatlantic alliance, so vital to international security and stability, remains strong for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his excellent statement summarizing the challenge we face. I thank my colleagues from Maryland and from Delaware as well.

Yesterday, we had a hearing in the Judiciary Committee. There is an individual seeking the Deputy Attorney General spot. Of course, he is seeking this position—a key position—at a critical moment in American history.

The Attorney General of the United States of America, Jeff Sessions of Alabama, announced publicly last week, on Thursday, that he was going to recuse himself from any prosecution involving the Russians and the last Presidential campaign. That is historic, and it was the right thing to do. Many of us on the Democratic side have called on him for weeks to do just that.

Senator Sessions had been an active participant in the Trump campaign, and when he became Attorney General, we felt that, in the best interests of preserving the integrity of the Department of Justice, he had to step aside when it came to the investigation of Russian involvement in that campaign.

Of course, in the meantime, during the course of this national debate, the National Security Advisor to the President of the United States, General Flynn, resigned after he misrepresented to the American people and to the Vice President of the United States conversations he had with the Russian Ambassador. It came to light last week that then-Senator Sessions, during the course of his confirmation hearing, gave misleading comments and answers to a question by Senator FRANKEN, saying that he had had no contact with the Russians, either. In fact, he had.

He sent a clarification letter, but yesterday's hearing was about his successor, the Deputy Attorney General, who would have the power to oversee this investigation. The gentleman who was nominated is well known to the Senator from Maryland because he served as U.S. Attorney there for a number of years—since 2005. He served under President Obama. He was initially appointed under President Bush, a rare bipartisan selection, who, by every indication, is a professional prosecutor.

The disappointing moment at the hearing is when we asked Mr. Rosenstein if he had read the intelligence report that was publicly announced in January about the Russian involvement in our election campaign. It is an unclassified report. It is on the internet. It is about 15 pages long. It is as precise and conclusive as you can expect. It said quite clearly that the Russians did attempt to change the outcome of the election, that they were, in fact, working to benefit Donald Trump and against Hillary Clinton.

I quickly added that this was not published by the Democratic National Committee. This was by the intelligence agencies of the U.S. Government. I was disappointed when Mr.

Rosenstein said no, he had not read it. He was asked over and over again why he would not read a piece of information, a document so critical to his service as Deputy Attorney General.

I will set that aside for a moment and just observe the obvious. If you believe our intelligence agencies, there is no question that Russia was trying to change the outcome of the Presidential election. They were engaged, we believe, with up to a thousand trolls in some office buildings in Moscow, invading the internet, invading emails in the United States in an attempt to glean information that they could feed back to the public through WikiLeaks and other sources.

Although there is no evidence to date that they had any impact on the actual casting or counting of ballots, their intent is clear. They wanted to pick Donald Trump as President. They believed he was a better choice for Russian interests than Hillary Clinton.

Is that worthy of an investigation? I certainly hope so. To our knowledge, it is the first time in the history of the United States that a foreign power—and one that has been an adversary time and again to our interests around the world—tried to invade our election. It was, in fact, a day that will live in cyber infamy in terms of this Russian effort.

If we ignore it, we can expect several things. Get ready for the next election. Do you think they learned anything during the course of the last one? Do you think the Russians will be involved again? It would be naive to believe otherwise.

Secondly, there is a critical element here that we cannot ignore. Three weeks ago I visited Warsaw, Poland; Vilnius, Lithuania; and Kiev, Ukraine. I talked to those leaders—in a couple of instances, the Presidents of those countries, as well as opinion leaders, parliamentarians—and they continued to raise the same question to me. It came down to this: If the United States does not take seriously the invasion of Russia in your own Presidential campaign, will you take it seriously when Putin invades our country? You have told us under the NATO alliance, article 5, that you will stand by our side and protect us. If you don't take Putin seriously when he invades your own Presidential election, there is a lot of doubt.

Questions are being asked. Several Republican Senators have stepped up. I want to salute them. I will start with LINDSEY GRAHAM, who yesterday, again before the Senate Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, made it clear that he believes we have to thoroughly investigate this Russian involvement in our Presidential election.

A few others have said the same. Unfortunately, the reaction by many Republican Senators has been lukewarm to cold. They don't want to spend the time to look into this. They would rather start talking about inves-

tigating leaks in the Trump administration or even the President's far-fetched tweets suggesting that somehow President Obama was engaged in a wiretap. It is something that has been denied not only by the former President but also by the former Director of National Intelligence and the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

To date, there is not one shred of evidence for the claim made by President Trump in his tweets in the early morning hours of Saturday. At the same time, the need for this investigation continues. You have heard catalogued in detail—and I will not repeat it—Russian aggression over the last several years.

I have seen it. I have seen it throughout history, at least during my lifetime, and I have seen it more recently in Ukraine, in Georgia, and threats that go on every single day in countries in the Baltics and Poland. It is clear to them that they are fighting a hybrid war, not just the military threat, which is very real, but also cyber threats that at one point closed down the Estonian economy—a Russian cyber invasion closed it down—and propaganda threats, which are nonstop through cable television known as RT, Russia Today. They continue to broadcast false information into countries like the Baltics and try to do it with impunity. That is the reality of what we are facing.

The question we face, though, as the U.S. Senate sworn to uphold this Constitution, is whether we are prepared to defend it against foreign powers that will undermine it, in this case the Russian Federation.

There has been a suggestion that the intelligence committees can have an investigation of this matter. I would say that in and of itself is not objectionable, but it is certainly not complete and satisfactory. The Intelligence Committee is going meet behind closed doors. We will not see the witnesses. We will not hear their testimony. The American people may not ever hear who testified and what they had to say.

Some parts of this must continue to be classified, and I understand that. But by and large, the American people have a right to know what the Russians did and how they did it so that we can make sure we defend ourselves against this in the future. The Intelligence Committees have a role, but not in its entirety.

I think there should be a special prosecutor from the Department of Justice to see if any crimes have been committed. I don't know where the evidence will lead, but we should have someone we trust, a person of integrity, who will step up and assume that role and make that investigation for the Department of Justice.

One other thing: I think this is of sufficient gravity that we should have an independent, transparent, bipartisan commission. My colleague, Senator CARDIN of Maryland, is the sponsor of that legislation, which I am

happy to cosponsor. That is the ultimate answer.

Let's get to the bottom of this once and for all to make certain we know what the Russians tried to do to us and to make doubly certain that it never happens again. That is the reality of this challenge.

I hope we can get bipartisan support for it. When it comes to sanctions against Russia, we have had good bipartisan support, and that is encouraging—equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans saying they should pay a price for what they did. Let's get the investigation to its conclusion.

Leon Panetta is a friend of mine and served in our government at many different levels. In the Sunday talk shows, he talked about what he would recommend to the Trump administration. He said to them very simply: Get in front of this. Don't keep reacting to this. Say that if you have done nothing wrong you are going to cooperate fully with any investigation to get to the bottom of it. That is the way to deal with it.

I hope we will have an end to the tweets and a beginning of the cooperation that is necessary so that we can get to the bottom of this situation and know the facts, wherever they may lead us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MR. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator DURBIN, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator COONS for joining on the floor today to talk about the threat that Russia poses.

Senator DURBIN is absolutely correct, and I thank him for his leadership on this. The only way the American people will have a full accounting of what Russia's intentions were and what they did in attacking our country is to have an independent commission.

We had such a commission after the attack on 9/11. Democrats and Republicans came together. There was no controversy about that. We wanted to find out what and how we were attacked, how they got through our intelligence network, how they put together the horrific attack on our country, and then we wanted to know how we could get recommendations to protect us moving forward.

I am going to tell you, that commission served a very important national security function because we learned a lot. We learned that we were stovepiping too much information. We weren't sharing it. The way the agencies were set up, it was more over turf than it was over mission. Congress acted on the recommendations, and we are safer today as a result of it.

We don't know what Russia's intentions are all about. We suspect that they are trying to undermine our democratic system of government. We suspect that Russia is interested in regaining its reputation of the former Soviet Union. They are looking for a greater geographical footprint. We see

that in their military operations, not just on their border countries such as Ukraine or what they are doing in Georgia or Moldova, but we see that also in the Middle East where they have a military presence today, and they want to have a footprint there.

We believe they want to become a greater Russia. We know they don't like democratic systems of government. Their government stays in power through making sure that there is no effective opposition. They have quelled any opportunity for a Democratic opposition and for the free press.

We know those—but what are their ultimate aspirations? What do they intend to do with the transatlantic partnership? We talked about that. We are safer today because of the transatlantic relations. NATO has made our Nation safer. The strength of the EU has made our Nation stronger.

We know Russia is trying to interfere with that. They interfered with the Montenegro election in an effort to prevent Montenegro from agreeing to join NATO. We know they are trying to pull other nations out of Europe. We know that.

What we need to have, though, is a full accounting as to what happened in the attack on our country and how we can prepare ourselves to defend ourselves. By the way, it might also give us a blueprint for what we need to do to show Russia we will not tolerate that type of activity.

Senator DURBIN is absolutely right. We have responsibilities in Congress. The committee I serve on, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—our relationship with Russia, we have to have hearings. Senator MENENDEZ was right in calling upon our committee to have additional hearings. What is Russia doing? How does it affect not only our relationship with Russia, but how do we deal with Europe? How do we deal with the authorization for use of military force? If we were attacked, can you use cyber as an attack vehicle? Does that require congressional authorization?

We have to be prepared in our committees. The Intelligence Committee has a responsibility to find out exactly what happened and whether we need to change our intelligence network because Russia was able to invade our country. They were able to get private information and then send it to WikiLeaks to use politically against us. They may compromise some of our classified information. We don't know. We need to find that out.

The Intelligence Committee has a function to play. The Judiciary Committee has a function to play. I know the subcommittee is doing some work under Senators Whitehouse and Graham. The Armed Services Committee certainly has a role to play.

There is only one way the American people will get a clear view of how serious this matter is and that we are taking every conceivable possible step to make sure we protect the national se-

curity of the United States and our Democratic institutions, which are part of our national security, and that is to have an independent commission.

There are no turf problems there. They can look at everything. They can have a transparent process, and the American people can get an eye as to what is happening. They can make the recommendations we need.

I thank Senator DURBIN for underscoring that point. It is something I think we will ultimately get to. I was hoping we could get to it sooner rather than later because I think the American people would have a great deal more confidence.

I thank Senator COONS for putting this in historic perspective. He is absolutely right; we go back a long time as to what Russia's intentions are all about. I thought that was extremely helpful to fill in all of the aspects of what we are trying to do.

Senator MENENDEZ's point was very critical; our reasons for being here and our reasons for wanting to take action are to protect our country, the American people. We are not talking about any one person or any one election. This is not challenging the results of this past election. This is all about making sure that we protect the integrity of our free election system and, particularly moving forward, knowing that Russia may very well be engaged, as we speak, in trying to interfere with the elections in the Netherlands and Germany and France. We need to have a better game plan on how to deal with this.

As Senator MENENDEZ said—I think it is a very important point; I want to underscore this: You can't trust Russia. Let's be clear about that. Ask the Ukrainians. They signed the Budapest Declaration. The United States was part of that. They very clearly gave up their nuclear capacity, and in exchange they got the security from Russia on their jurisdiction, on their territory, on their sovereignty. Look how long that lasted before Russia invaded Ukraine, annexed part of Ukraine, and they continue to supply resources to disrupt the eastern part of Ukraine so Ukraine will have a very difficult time in its integration into Europe. That is what Russia is doing today in contravention to their written commitments with Ukraine.

Then I might tell my colleagues: Look at the Minsk agreement set up to try to end this hot war, and Russia has violated all the aspects of the Minsk agreement. You can't trust Russia's agreements.

As Senator MENENDEZ pointed out—he is right—look at the INF. Look at the treaty obligations. Russia is violating their treaty obligations, which directly affect the security of Europe. These are pretty serious things. We counter this by unity.

That is why I am so proud that we have Democrats and Republicans working together. This is not one party. Both parties recognize the danger of

Russia. Both parties recognize that we have to protect ourselves. I would just urge my colleagues to follow this vigorous strategy, where we can show the American people that unity and that resolve and that we will not allow Russia to attack our country, that we are going to prepare to make sure that we defend our democratic system of government and that we will be united in standing up to those types of activities that are against our national security interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Maryland.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, we have now had a little more than 24 hours to get a peek at the Republican plan to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. Now we know why they kept it in hiding for as long as they did—because it is a total mess and it will wreak havoc on the healthcare system in the United States of America and severely harm millions of Americans. After 7 years in waiting, is this really the best they can do? The first thing people need to know about the Republican plan to replace the Affordable Care Act—let's be clear. This is no replacement. This is a fake replacement. The first thing they need to know about it is, it will strip away affordable healthcare for millions of Americans in order to give the wealthiest households a huge tax cut.

How big is that tax cut? First of all, it goes to households who make over \$250,000 a year. Here is the thing. The richer you are, the more money you make over \$250,000 a year, the bigger the tax cut you are going to get under the Republican healthcare plan, under TrumpCare. In fact, if you are a millionaire, you are going to get a tax cut, on average, of about \$50,000—to be precise, a \$49,370 average tax cut for millionaires. If you are in the top one-tenth percent of American households, you are going to get, on average, a \$200,000 tax cut under the Republican plan to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

That is great news if your name is Donald Trump or you are one of the billionaires or millionaires in his Cabinet. It is great news if you have loads of money. I want to be clear. I have nothing against millionaires. The more millionaires, the better in terms of growth in the economy, but certainly at this point in time, they don't need a tax cut, and they certainly shouldn't have a tax cut when the impact of that is to harm tens of millions of Americans and hurt their healthcare.

I guess we are beginning to learn exactly what President Trump meant when he said that his healthcare was going to be "much better." Yes, if you are one of those folks in the top one-tenth percent of American income earners, if you are in the wealthiest strata of this country, you are going to get a big tax break. So I guess it is much better for you from that perspective.

You know whom else this is going to be better for? It is going to be better for insurance companies and their CEOs. It is really hard to believe, but if you look at the House bill—and now I know why it was under lock and key for so long. If you look at it, you are going to find that their plan gives insurance companies a new tax break when they pay their CEOs multi-million-dollar bonuses. In fact, the bigger the bonus the healthcare company pays to the CEO, the bigger tax break the corporation gets, the more American taxpayers will be subsidizing those bonuses for those insurance CEOs.

So you know what, you are a CEO of an insurance company, you raise the premiums, the company makes more money, and you get a bigger bonus. Taxpayers foot the bill in terms of larger taxpayer subsidies to those CEOs. All in all, when you add up all the tax breaks for these CEOs and the insurance companies and the wealthiest Americans, it is a tax break windfall of \$600 billion. That is the number by the experts in the Joint Committee on Taxation here in the Congress. These are the nonpartisan experts who look at legislation and determine what the fiscal impact will be. What they say is that the TrumpCare bill will provide tax breaks in the amount of \$600 billion over the next 10 years. I guess that is what President Trump must have been referring to the other day when he tweeted about his “wonderful new healthcare bill.” It will be wonderful for those who are getting those big tax breaks.

We know who the winners are. Who are the losers? Well, just about everybody else ends up on the short end of the stick—just about everybody else in America. That is why you are seeing such strong opposition coming from all over the country. First, there are the millions of Americans who are going to lose their healthcare coverage altogether because they can't possibly afford to pay the huge additional premiums and copays and deductions they would be faced with under these plans that would be offered. Then there are tens of millions of more who will pay much more for much less coverage.

Older Americans are going to be especially hard hit, which is why we are all hearing from AARP. You know AARP—they sometimes give their opinion, they weigh in a little bit here and there, but they are out full force against this TrumpCare bill because it is going to have a very negative impact on seniors in America. They call it a sweetheart deal to big drug companies and other special interests. They argue—and we will talk about how it will weaken Medicare. They say it is going to impose an age tax on older Americans, and that is what it does. In fact, they calculate the following:

The change in structure will dramatically increase premiums for older consumers. We estimate that the bill's changes to current law's tax credits could increase premium costs for a 55-year-old earning \$25,000 by

more than \$2,300 a year. For a 64-year-old earning \$25,000 that increase rises to more than \$4,400 a year.

A year extra—\$4,400 more a year for that 64-year-old earning \$25,000 to pay for their health insurance, the health insurance they have today. Then they calculate that it will be \$5,800 more for a 64-year-old earning \$15,000. In other words, compared to the Affordable Care Act, the less income you have, the more you are going to be paying under TrumpCare than you are paying today under ObamaCare, under the Affordable Care Act.

We are also hearing from groups that fight for the rights of people with disabilities from all over the country, that are against this legislation because of its impact on Medicaid and the impact those cuts to Medicaid will have on people with disabilities throughout the country.

We are also hearing about the impact on Medicare. One of the promises Candidate Trump made was that he wasn't going to do anything that would harm Medicare. That is what he said then, but, in fact, in January, Congress received a letter from the Medicare actuaries. These are the professionals who look at the impact of various proposals on the Medicare system. What they concluded was, this proposal to provide tax cuts to wealthy Americans would actually reduce the life of the Medicare program by 3 years.

Here is what they are proposing. We are going to give a tax cut—and one of the tax cuts means that wealthy Americans will not have to pay a portion of their Medicare taxes. That portion of their Medicare taxes today goes into the Medicare trust fund. You say to those wealthy Americans: We are going to give you a tax break that is going back in your pockets. That means it is no longer going into the Medicare trust fund. That shortens the life of the Medicare trust fund. That is the view, that is the opinion, those are the facts stated by the actuaries for Medicare.

As you begin to reduce the life of the Medicare Program, there will be more and more pressure to go to the plan that has been much discussed, especially by House Republicans, to turn Medicare into a voucher program. The AARP raises this issue, as well, in their letter. If you are going to start cutting down on the Medicare trust fund, if you are reducing the revenues going into that trust fund because you are giving wealthier Americans this tax cut, obviously, there is less money in that program to pay for the bills of Medicare.

One of the ideas that has been pushed is: All right, let's save money for Medicare by transferring the risks Medicare currently takes onto the backs of seniors. So we are going to start giving them a voucher, a voucher that does not keep pace with the rising costs of Medicare. That means that over time, seniors have to pay a lot more, get a lot less in healthcare, and that is how they save the Medicare plan money.

Make no mistake, by providing a tax cut, and particularly the tax cut to the wealthy paying into the Medicare Program right now, you are hurting Medicare.

I know that the President says he is a terrific negotiator, just a terrific negotiator, and I have here a book by Trump, “The Art of the Deal.” I don't know whether Donald Trump is a good negotiator or a bad negotiator, but what I know is this: When you look at this TrumpCare plan, whoever did the negotiating was negotiating on behalf of very wealthy special interests at the expense of people in the rest of the country.

So all the talk we heard throughout the campaign and since about looking after the little guy, all the talk we heard about the middle class being squeezed, which is very real out there in America, all the talk we heard about struggling Americans, when you look at TrumpCare, it hurts exactly those people.

If President Trump was negotiating this deal, he got a great deal for the billionaires and millionaires who are in his Cabinet. They are going to see a great tax break windfall. I mean, I would like to get a calculator and take a look at what the size of the tax break will be to the members of the Trump Cabinet because it is going to be huge. But ordinary Americans are going to take it on the chin. They are going to be very badly hurt, which is why apparently people are trying to rush this through the Congress so quickly.

First, it was in some remote room, and you needed bloodhounds to go out to try to find out where it was, and now we know why it was kept so secret—because it is such a bad deal for the American people.

Now that it is in the light of day and the details are coming out and we are getting more and more letters from groups from around the country—AARP, the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, hundreds of other groups. The letters are pouring in. What is the response? Let's try to get this through the Congress as fast as possible before the word gets out even farther around the country.

It is ironic because I remember that during the debate over the Affordable Care Act, which took months and months—I mean, it took over 7 or 8 months—our Republican colleagues accused us of moving too quickly, of not having sufficient debate and input. Yet what we are seeing right now, now that the bill has come out of hiding, is an effort to try to move that bill through the House in a matter of weeks without any hearings. And then we are hearing over here in the Senate that the plan will be—and maybe the Republican leader can clarify this at some point, but the plan will be to not send it to any of the committees in the Senate for a review but to try to bring it up immediately here on the floor of the Senate without any committee consideration, totally outside the regular

order, flying directly in the face of the complaints that were made many years ago, when the process took well over 7 months, went through all the committees, and was thoroughly deliberated throughout the country.

Today I am looking at some of the publications, and I see Republican colleagues preemptively criticizing the Congressional Budget Office for what it might say about what TrumpCare is going to cost the American people.

Mr. President, I know you and our colleagues know that CBO is the referee on which we all rely. I know some people like to make up their own alternative facts, but you need to have some referee here in Congress when it comes to budget issues because otherwise people just make up whatever numbers they want.

It is also important to know that the current head of the Congressional Budget Office is somebody who was jointly selected by the Republican chairman of the House Budget Committee and the Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. In other words, the current head of the CBO was picked by the Republican chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees. It is very important that we have that nonpartisan referee in these discussions. Yet, in the House of Representatives, they are acting on TrumpCare right now in committees without even the benefit of the analysis from the Congressional Budget Office. Apparently, they are afraid of what it might be and what it might say.

If people want to defend this TrumpCare proposal, they are obviously free to do it, but we should do it in the regular order, and we should do it based on information from sources like the Congressional Budget Office so people can have all the facts when they make these decisions which will impact the American people.

One fact we know right now is the fact that I mentioned at the outset, which is from the Joint Tax Committee, the nonpartisan experts, saying that TrumpCare will provide a \$600 billion tax cut windfall. We also know it is a fact from the Medicare Actuary that by providing very wealthy Americans with this tax break, you are going to take some years off of the life of the Medicare Program. Those are real facts.

So when I look at this deal, whoever negotiated this deal was clearly looking out for the very wealthiest in this country. That is where the facts lead.

Again, I don't know if President Trump is a good negotiator or a bad negotiator. What I do know is that if he negotiated this TrumpCare deal, he was negotiating on behalf of the millionaires and billionaires in his Cabinet. He was negotiating on behalf of the insurance companies that are now going to get a tax break for the multi-million-dollar bonuses they pay to the CEOs. The larger the bonus, the bigger the tax break under this bill. I know he

wasn't negotiating for everyday working Americans and certainly not for older Americans or Americans with disabilities. That is why the AARP and others are weighing in so strongly against this.

We are going to have a little more time to debate here in the Senate, apparently, than in the House, but I would hope we would send this through the regular order because it requires a thorough vetting of the facts, and the American people deserve that kind of transparency and accountability in this process. I am absolutely confident that when the American people get a good look at this deal, they will know it is a very bad deal for the country and for millions of Americans.

I hope we will get on with that process. I hope the bill will never arrive in the Senate. I hope the folks in the House will recognize that it is a bad deal for the country and go back to the drawing board because when I heard the mantra "repeal and replace" and when I heard President Trump say that replacement was going to be much better and cover more people for less cost, I think people took that seriously. Now when they actually take a look at TrumpCare, as it is emerging from the House, they see something very different. They see something that is, quote, wonderful for the 1 percent of Americans who are going to get a tax cut, but it is really lousy for everybody else in the country.

We need to defeat this charade. This is not a replacement. This is a fake. The American people are catching on quickly. That is why it is very important that we not try to rush this through, that we have an opportunity to discuss it in the light of day. I am absolutely confident that if we do the right thing in terms of a full democratic debate, TrumpCare will go down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reject this resolution to roll back accountability for the billions of dollars that are sent to States to help educate children.

When Congress updated the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 2015, it was a bipartisan achievement. Republicans and Democrats came together on the 50th anniversary of that landmark civil rights law to rewrite it into what became the Every Student Succeeds Act.

When President Obama signed this K-12 legislation into law in December of that year, he called it a "Christmas miracle." It received 85 votes in the Senate. It was one of the most important pieces of bipartisan legislation passed in the last Congress.

It wasn't the bill I would have written, but it was a bipartisan compromise. It gave States and districts far more flexibility when it comes to improving their struggling public schools. At the same time, it also maintained critical civil rights and ac-

countability protections to ensure that when the Federal Government gives States billions of dollars to improve the education of their students, that money goes to the schools and students that need those Federal resources the most. It was a critical step toward making sure we are building a future not just for some of our kids but for all of our kids.

When Congress passes big, complex laws like the Every Student Succeeds Act, it always leaves some of the implementation details to the agency that has to enforce the law. That is why I fought hard to make sure the Department of Education had the tools it needs to write clarifying rules and guidelines to enforce the Every Student Succeeds Act. That was a condition of my vote and the votes of lots of other people. We won that fight. The authority to enforce the rules is right there in the law. It was debated in public, and it was part of the bipartisan agreement between Republicans and Democrats.

Last November, the Department of Education—after careful consultation with teachers, school leaders, State education leaders, and parents—issued new rules to enforce this law. Today, congressional Republicans are trying to take a sledgehammer to these new rules.

When these new rules were issued, everyone who works in education agreed that they were critical and necessary. Teachers were fine with the new rules. State education leaders were fine with the new rules. Civil rights leaders were fine with the new rules. Everyone was ready to get to work. Apparently, congressional Republicans do not care. Instead, they want to blow up these critically important accountability rules even though the people who work in or around public education did not ask them to do so. This makes no sense.

Groups that often disagree with each other over public education policies are united in their belief that this resolution is a dumb idea. It is opposed by teachers; civil rights organizations, such as the NAACP and the National Council of La Raza; and organizations representing students with disabilities, such as the National Center for Learning Disabilities. It is even opposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce because they know this resolution will only make it more difficult for States as they try to implement the new education law. And this resolution will undermine the work States are currently doing right now to improve their public schools with the new law.

Last week, many of these groups signed on to a letter that states: "This action will cause unnecessary confusion, disrupting the work in states and wasting time that we cannot afford to waste."

In fact, even conservative education policy experts at the Fordham Institute—a right-leaning educational policy think tank—argue that congressional Republicans should not swing a wrecking ball to these guidelines.

They identified over 20 provisions in these rules that actually provide more flexibility to States by clarifying ambiguous sections in the law, and they concluded: “Senate Republicans, then, should scrap their plan to use the Congressional Review Act to kill all of the accountability regulations outright.”

Killing these new rules now would lead to chaos and confusion just when States, districts, and school leaders are beginning to implement this new K-12 education law. States have already spent months drafting their plans for complying. Eighteen States, including Massachusetts, intended to submit their implementation plans to the Department of Education next month. If this resolution passes, all of that work will be thrown into limbo.

These clarifying rules include important provisions that allow States to send additional Federal resources to struggling schools, whether or not those schools already receive Federal dollars; provisions that give States more flexibility in educating their English learners in the manner that best meets the needs of each individual student; provisions that ensure that parents have more information about how their child’s public school is doing and sets clear guidelines with what States and districts must disclose to parents and when they must disclose it; and provisions that promote transparency by preventing States from manipulating their graduation rates or data on how much money they are investing in each student. These regulations were carefully crafted over the course of 1 year of input from teachers, school system leaders, and student advocates. Both Republicans and Democrats should support these provisions.

I think we all know what is going on here. Betsy DeVos is the new Secretary of Education. Congressional Republicans have decided they want to hand over the keys to her with no restrictions whatsoever. The resolutions we are debating today would give Secretary DeVos more freedom to push States in whatever direction she felt like. If you are a teacher in Tennessee or a principal in Massachusetts, you should be furious about that. Congress is about to scrap a year of hard work and a year of careful compromise in order to give Secretary DeVos a blank check.

It is a blank check for Betsy DeVos. This is the same Secretary of Education who has never attended a public school, never taught in a public school, and never led a public school. This is the same Secretary of Education who proved to the world, during her confirmation hearing, that she doesn’t have a clue about public schools. This is the same Secretary of Education who still holds shady investments that could be hiding conflicts of interest. This is the same Secretary of Education who has used her vast fortune to advance her extreme privatization agenda. This is the same Secretary of Education whom Jeff Sessions and the

Vice President of the United States had to drag across the finish line in an unprecedented tie-breaking confirmation vote. She is the one to whom Senate Republicans want to give a blank check to figure out where she wants to drive public education—a blank check to push her radical privatization agenda.

States and school districts are planning for the next school year right now. They are figuring out how to implement this law and improve the education of kids as I speak. They are doing hero’s work every day while Congress wastes time and creates more confusion.

Handing this law over to an Education Secretary with no experience in public education without any accountability rules to guide its implementation is an insult. It is an insult to teachers, an insult to school leaders, and an insult to families everywhere.

This is not a game. Congress should not be playing politics with the education of our children. Instead of disrupting the important work that States and districts are doing to educate our kids, Congress should get out of the way and let States finish what they have already started. Let them get to work. That is why I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon following my colleagues, Senator McCAIN and Senator CARDIN, to speak to the legislation that I am cosponsoring and that they have introduced to ramp up sanctions on Russia. I think it is important to emphasize that this is a strongly bipartisan legislative effort.

Indeed, for more than seven decades, Congress has stood strong on a bipartisan basis, first against the Soviet Union and now against Russian threats against the United States and our European allies. Working across the aisle in Congress, we have supported the NATO alliance. Beginning after World War II with the Marshall Plan and continuing to this day with the European Reassurance Initiative, we have helped to build the richest economies and the most robust democracies the world has ever seen, protected in large part in Western Europe by NATO.

Today we face new and unprecedented threats from an increasingly aggressive Russia. Russia continues to illegally occupy territory in Georgia and Ukraine. It is on the march in Syria, and it is building up its military presence and making threatening moves to-

ward the Baltic States and in the Balkans.

There is growing evidence that it is actively interfering to spread disinformation and manipulate the outcome of elections this year in France, Germany, and across Europe. In fact there is evidence to suggest that they were involved in the Brexit vote and in the Dutch referendum last year.

Right here in our own country, Russia has used brazen cyber attacks and other measures to aggressively interfere in our Presidential election last fall. This was an attack on our sovereignty, on our democracy, and on the American people, and it was unprecedented. It requires the strongest possible response, short of armed force, to demonstrate to Vladimir Putin that this behavior will not be tolerated and it must not happen again. That is exactly the purpose of these comprehensive sanctions.

I agree with Senator CARDIN, the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Foreign Relations Committee should play a pivotal leadership role in both our legislative and oversight capacities in pushing back against Russia’s aggression in all its forms. By all means, this includes making the case that the skills and experience of our State Department and USAID professionals are more important than ever.

In Eastern Europe, in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, and all across the world, they are working to increase the resilience of our allies by strengthening democratic institutions, fostering the rule of law, and fighting corruption. These initiatives have played an indispensable role in helping the United States prevail in the Cold War, and they are every bit as important today as we oppose Russian aggression.

We had the opportunity in the Armed Services Committee to hear from an expert talking about Russia and about Russia’s strategy. One of the things he pointed out is that, just as Russia is building up its military might, just as it is expanding its propaganda initiatives through television broadcasts like “Russia Today” and “Sputnik,” it is also looking at how it can undermine Western democracies as a way to interrupt the transatlantic alliance—the alliance between the United States and Europe that has been so important to stability in the world for the last 70 years.

That is Russia’s real goal. They want to undermine Europe. They want to undermine the West and the United States. One of the ways they are trying to do that is by disrupting our elections. We can’t allow this kind of aggression to go unpunished. If we do, we will surely face further attacks from an emboldened Russia looking to disrupt our democracy. Indeed, I think this attack should be answered with the most punishing economic and financial sanctions that we can muster, and we need to work even harder to

shore up our European allies who are facing Russian aggression and interference.

As we look at the upcoming French and German elections, there is no doubt that Russia is trying to interfere with those elections, as well, with the goal of undermining our democracy. When one begins to mess around with our elections, they strike at the heart of a democracy that is the foundation of this country.

I command Senator MCCAIN and Senator CARDIN for introducing this bipartisan sanctions legislation, and I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will join us in passing these comprehensive sanctions against Russia.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING JACK ROBINSON

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the life and legacy of Jack Robinson, who passed away on March 1, 2017, in Pierre, SD, at the age of 92.

Jack dedicated his life to public service—first to his Nation in the U.S. military and later to thousands of students as a teacher in Pierre.

When Jack graduated from high school in 1942, he was awarded a scholarship to Yangton College, but instead of furthering his education, he answered the call of duty amidst World War II and enlisted in the U.S. Army.

After transferring from the infantry to the Army Air Corps, he completed navigation school and became a crew member on a B-17 bomber. He and his team were eventually sent overseas to England and completed 27 combat missions over Germany before being shot down on March 2, 1945. Shortly afterward, Jack returned home to South Dakota.

Throughout the rest of his life, he was a strong advocate for the military and a true patriot. With the stories he told and the love of country he shared, he showed what it meant to be a true American hero. For that, he affectionately adopted the nickname “Captain Jack.”

There are not enough words in a dictionary to describe what we owe to the men and women who fought in World War II to save our Nation and to save democracy for the world. Jack Robinson put his own dreams aside and put his own life in great danger for our country and for all of the future generations of Americans.

After World War II, Jack graduated from Yankton College and taught high school science at Highmore, SD, for 2 years. Then he earned his master's degree in biology from the University of

South Dakota. For the next 35 years, Jack was a teacher at Riggs High School in my hometown of Pierre. There, he created advanced biology and aeronautics programs for his students and inspired several young South Dakotans to become doctors. Dr. Brent Lindbloom of Pierre said his father and Jack Robinson were the reasons he became a doctor. “Mr. Robinson was a great teacher,” he said. “He taught us how to study and inspired us to pursue our dreams.”

I couldn't agree more.

As a teenager, Jack taught me navigational skills needed to properly fly an airplane, fueling a lifelong passion that continues today. As Jack would say, “you have to know the difference between compass course and compass heading.”

Over the years he taught many others navigational skills as well. But he didn't just teach young people how to fly in the skies. He was a tremendous role model for all of us and for all the students he taught.

As a bomber crew member, Jack defended our gift of democracy. As a teacher, he gave us what we needed to become responsible adults and pursue our own dreams. In 1994, Jack was inducted into the South Dakota Aviation Hall of Fame as a combat crew member. I can state that he was very proud of that moment. But more important than his many achievements as a war hero and as a teacher was his life as a husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

We are a better people because Jack touched so many lives with his knowledge, kindness, and passion for living. His loss is felt by countless South Dakotans.

With this, I welcome the opportunity to recognize and commemorate the life of this great public servant and personal role model of mine, Mr. Jack Robinson.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CIVIL RIGHTS AND EDUCATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to talk about an upcoming CRA that will be on the floor potentially this week that would cancel out an important regulation that is designed to build upon this country's history of making sure there is a marriage between civil rights and education to make sure that children in this country, regardless of their race, regardless of their learning ability, regardless of their religion, regardless of their income, get an equal chance at education.

Frankly, the whole reason the Federal Government is involved in the question of education is due to civil rights. This used to be a purely local concern, and the Federal Government stepped into the question of local education because Black kids throughout the South were not getting an equal education. They were living in segregated schools and getting an education that was of far lesser quality. So the Federal Government has always been involved in education because it is a matter of civil rights.

I want to talk about this issue through the prism of one individual. I am going to call him James, but this is a true story—a story, frankly, that could be told millions of times over across the country.

James went to school in an urban district in Connecticut. He was a 10th grader. At the beginning of James's 10th grade year, he had a habit of walking out of class. In the middle of class, he would just get up and walk out after 10 or 15 or 20 minutes, and he would wander the halls of this big, urban high school until inevitably he was met by a security officer or a teacher or an administrator. They would bring him down to the office, and they would call his grandmother, as he lived with her. He would get suspended for a couple of days, and then he would come back.

It played out so often—this cycle of James walking out of class, being brought down to the principal's office, being suspended—that somewhere around the end of October, during his sophomore year, he had been out of school more days than he had been in school.

One day, though, James goes through this cycle again. He is in the hallway, and he runs into an assistant principal. He is sort of sick and tired of this story playing out over and over again. He raises his voice. He has some words. James has never hurt anybody in his life, no history of violence, but the assistant principal decides to call the police. The police come and they arrest James for disorderly conduct, essentially for having words with an assistant principal. Now James, at 16 years old, has a criminal record. At the time, he was treated as an adult in Connecticut, so he has an adult criminal record.

It turns out that James was walking out of class every day because he couldn't read, and he was mortified. He was embarrassed because he had been socially promoted through the years. He had a learning disability that was going untreated, and he was in the 10th grade with the ability to only read at an elementary school level. No wonder he was walking out of class every day. He literally couldn't follow along. It was embarrassing. He didn't want to be called on by the teacher so he left. Nobody ever figured that out until he got arrested and finally got a legal aid lawyer, who happened to be my wife, who identified his disability and the fact that it was being unaddressed.

The fact is, a big part of this story is tied up in the fact that James was Black, and he was a big kid. So the police got calls maybe because he appeared to be threatening in a way that he simply was not. I can say that because the data backs up the fact that Black kids and disabled kids are treated very differently in schools today. Wherever you are, whether in Connecticut, in North Carolina, or in California, Black kids—especially Black boys—are suspended and expelled at a rate that is twice that of their White peers for the exact same behavior. Take mouthing off to a teacher. When that happens, Black kids, Black students, are twice as likely to be suspended for mouthing off to a teacher than a White student.

James's story is not unique. It is not unique because it happens in every State across the country, and it is not just in suspension and expulsion rates, it is also in achievement rates as well. We know the statistics. The graduation rate for African-American students is 16 percent lower than their White peers. I can go down the line and tell you about the different story when it comes to achievement and treatment of African-American students as compared to White students.

Racism isn't gone in this country. It might not be overt. Sometimes it might not even be conscious, but it is still there. Discrimination against kids who are different, whether they be poor or disabled, didn't vanish. It is still all over.

JOHN LEWIS is a civil rights icon. We celebrate him every day, Republicans and Democrats, in the U.S. Congress. He got mercilessly beaten over the head simply because he wanted to vote. JOHN LEWIS is still alive, but you know what, so are the people who beat him. We are only a generation removed from an era of open, unapologetic racism in this country. To think that we don't need civil rights protections for kids any longer is to deny reality. Racism doesn't look the same as it used to. Discrimination against kids who are different isn't as overt as it used to be, but the data is the data. It is still there.

No Child Left Behind got a lot wrong, but one of the things it got right was that it shed a light on this disparate treatment, these disparate outcomes between Black students, Hispanic students, disabled students, and their peers, because it forced States—and this was a Republican and Democratic accomplishment at the time—it forced States to disaggregate results. So you had to look at how were disabled students doing, how were Black students doing, and if they weren't measuring up and if they weren't getting closer to the performance of their nondisabled or White peers, then you had to do something to turn those students around, turn their performance around.

Now, the part that No Child Left Behind got wrong is big and significant. Part of it is that it required every sin-

gle one of those kids to hit the 100-percent proficiency mark, when progress is important to measure as well. It also told States exactly what to do to turn around the experiences of those kids. It is not the same in Connecticut as it is in North Carolina, and it is not the same in an urban district as it is in a suburban district. So when we got together on this floor and passed, in a bipartisan way, the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we did something really important. We preserved those requirements to disaggregate results for Black kids and for Hispanic kids and for kids with disabilities, but then we left it up to States to decide what proficiency is, and we left it up to States as to how they would turn around the experience for these kids if they weren't meeting those State-set goals. We gave an enormous amount of discretion and flexibility to States, but we preserved the basic expectation that our education policy was still going to be civil rights policy: Pay attention to how those vulnerable populations with a history of discrimination levied against them performed and require States to pay attention to the interventions.

That was a bipartisan achievement, and when we did it, we knew the regulation was going to be needed because, as with many education statutes, they are very vague. Republicans and Democrats understood that there was going to have to be a regulation to provide some clarity to States on how you build these locally driven accountability systems.

So the regulation we are talking about here today was not one of these that came out of left field. It was not one of these regulations that was political in nature; no, it flows from a bipartisan act that preserved accountability requirements for kids.

It is important for a variety of reasons. One, it is important because there are some really vague terms in the statute that do need clarification. For instance, one of the things we voted for, Republicans and Democrats, is we voted to say you have to show that you are providing improvement for African-American students, let's say, and if they are not showing continuous improvement, then you have to have a turnaround plan. By the way, that turnaround plan is totally yours to decide; no sanctions from the Federal Government if it is not X turnaround plan or Y turnaround plan. That is the old law. The new law says it is yours to decide.

"Continuous improvement" is a super vague term. It is one of those obvious terms that has to have some regulatory guardrails put around it because what if the State said "continuous improvement" is improvement over 20 years. Well, kids come in and out of schools in 2 or 3 or 4 years and a 20-year period of looking at a particular subgroup's performance is meaningless to kids.

So the regulation says continuous improvement means 2 years; look at

how a kid does over 2 years. And then it says, if 2 years doesn't work for you, you can make it longer but just tell us why. That is an important protection, and it still preserves enormous flexibility for States.

States want this regulation because it also gives them other types of flexibilities. An example is, when you are looking at performance, the statute suggests that you can have students who are meeting goal or students who are not meeting goal. The regulation recognizes that is, frankly, a really arbitrary way to look at performance. So the statute says: Yes, that is what the regulation says. The statute says: Meeting goal and not meeting goal, but you can get extra credit for students who are close to meeting goal, who have shown growth. You can get credit for students who are way above goal, your high-achieving students. You don't have to measure your schools just based on how many students meet goal. That is flexibility States want, that they likely don't have without the regulation.

Another example, for English language learners, proficiency goals should vary based on where you started. If you start here with no English skills, then your proficiency target should be different than if you started with a pretty advanced understanding of the language. The statute just says you have to have a proficiency goal. It is unclear whether you can have different ones for different levels of learners. The regulation makes it clear: Give States that flexibility.

So that is why States didn't ask for this CRA. This is different than these other CRAs. States didn't ask for this CRA. All of the educational groups we listened to—teachers, superintendents, principals—they weighed in on this regulation. They didn't love every piece of it, but they were ready to implement it. None of these groups were coming up to the Congress asking for this regulation to be withdrawn. Would they have liked it to be fixed or tailored? Sure. But here is what they understood, and here is why I am really concerned.

Secretary DeVos could fix the things she doesn't like or Senator ALEXANDER doesn't like through the regular notice and comment period. I think there is 80 percent of this regulation that everybody agrees on, that just dots the i's and crosses the t's on a bipartisan commitment to accountability, and maybe there is 20 percent or 10 percent that Senator ALEXANDER and some other Members think goes a little bit too far, but when you pass a CRA, you don't allow for a regulation to be passed in the future that is substantially similar to the entirety of the regulation. The courts aren't going to look, or, frankly, even know, what parts of the regulation you didn't like and the 80 percent of the regulation you wanted to preserve.

The Department of Education can't pass anything that is similar to this

ever again. So one of the things the regulation says is that you get a 1-year delay because it is just too quick to come up with accountability systems for this coming school year. That is gone. When this CRA passes, every school district in the Nation has to develop an accountability system for this calendar year because without the regulation, you don't have that flexibility.

So what makes me, frankly, so disturbed about this CRA is that it could happen another way, which would preserve the pieces of the civil rights protections that all of us agree on, which is the majority of the regulation. To my mind, it violated the spirit of our agreement when we passed this law. Here was a really amazing achievement; that we were able to rewrite the No Child Left Behind law—essentially repeal it and replace it with something better—that Democrats and Republicans could agree upon. In my mind, that agreement was predicated upon the Department being able to enforce maybe the most important part of the law for big constituency groups in this country—the accountability section, the civil rights protections.

By passing this CRA, we are essentially making it impossible for any regulation ever again to be passed to implement the accountability sections and the civil rights protections in this law. Why? Because you can't pass anything that is substantially similar—substantially similar to the parts you like, substantially similar to the parts you don't like. This isn't like these other CRAs where Republicans didn't like any part of it, where Republicans didn't see any need for the regulation to go forward. This is different. We agree on 80 percent of this one, but the 80 percent is likely gone by passing this.

I guess part of what disturbs me here is that we worked, locked arm in arm, in passing this law. I really do believe that by passing this CRA, Republican leadership—HELP leadership—is violating the agreement we had to make sure this law went into force and effect in the way we all intended.

It happened in the context of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee that isn't working this year like it used to work. I have such great respect for the chairman and the ranking member of that committee. They pulled off some big bipartisan wins during the time of their tenure, including the Workforce Investment Act, the rewrite of the No Child Left Behind Act, and some other smaller wins that people didn't necessarily think as much about, and leading up to the end of last year, the passage of a major new commitment to reforming mental illness and mental health in this country.

That spirit of bipartisanship, which was present in the HELP Committee in a way that it wasn't present in other committees, is disappearing before our eyes. We were mad that we only got 5 minutes to question Betsy DeVos be-

cause it felt like the committee was hiding her from public view. Democrats were asking for more time to ask more questions, and we didn't get it. That rarely happens in that committee, where the minority party is just asking to be heard and is shut down.

We begged for the CRA not to come before this body because there was another way to get it done that didn't violate the spirit of our agreement around the rewrite of the No Child Left Behind law, but we were denied in that request. Now we are voting on a CRA that is potentially going to be devastating not just for kids out there who need protection but also for States that want this flexibility.

Finally, we are on a schedule, according to the majority leader, that is going to bring a healthcare bill that will rewrite the rules for one-sixth of the American economy to the floor of the Senate without any debate in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, without a single hearing on the bill, without a markup, and without any ability for amendment.

I listened for 6 years to my Republican friends tell me that the healthcare bill, or the Affordable Care Act, was rammed through Congress and that the biggest problem was the fact that it was done outside of the public view for expediency's sake. Now, I was there in the House of Representatives, and let me express the unbelievable irony of those complaints now that there will be no process for the committees to consider the replacement to the Affordable Care Act.

The House and the Senate had hundreds—hundreds—of meetings and hearings. The HELP Committee alone—I don't have the numbers in front of me—considered hundreds of amendments and adopted over 100 Republican amendments in the markup process. The Senate's session was the second longest in the history of the Senate, in for more than 20 days debating that bill. The reason there was so much tempest out in the American public over the Affordable Care Act was because it was open for debate for so long.

The Finance Committee had a full process. The HELP Committee had a full process. The Ways and Means Committee had a full process. The Energy and Commerce Committee had a full process.

None of that is happening here. This bill is being jammed through, as we speak, the Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committees. This bill is going to be jammed onto the floor, perhaps without any committee process, in the Senate. The target is from introduction Monday to passage in the House in 3 weeks and perhaps just a few more weeks before it passes the Senate. So spare me the complaints about the Affordable Care Act being rushed into place when this process is going to make that look laborious in comparison.

What pains me is not just this CRA, which is unnecessary, but it doesn't have to happen this way. What pains me is a committee process that when I got here had a reputation for being truly bipartisan, for being one of the more functional, if not the most functional, committee processes. That is being blown up most significantly by the rush job—the rush job on the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act, which nobody in the American public is going to have enough time to look at it and see it.

I ask my colleagues one more time to reconsider their votes on this CRA. We are at our best when we come together around the idea that every kid in this country should have a chance at a quality education, no matter what color their skin is, no matter what their learning ability is. I know my colleagues have a couple problems with this regulation. I get it. But by passing this CRA, the regulation is gone and never coming back, and the States that want the flexibility, that are begging for the flexibility, won't get it. It will just be an unworkable section of the bill. A section that was supposed to be bipartisan now fundamentally won't work because we can't get a regulation passed that is at all substantially similar to the good parts or to the bad parts.

This body is at its best when we stand together—Republicans and Democrats—and say that no matter what you look like, no matter how well you learn, no matter how much money you have, you get a quality education. We did that when we voted together on ESSA, and we are going back on that bipartisan commitment by passing a CRA that is unnecessary. As to the bad stuff you don't like, it can be gone in a matter of months by a regular process of notice and comment in the Department of Education.

This is part of a disturbing new trend line in this committee toward partisanship and away from a history of commitment to our kids—Republican and Democrat.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Thursday, March 9, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 57, with the time equally divided in the usual form until 12 noon, and that at noon, the Senate vote on passage of the resolution with no intervening action or debate. I further ask that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate then resume executive session for the consideration of

Executive Calendar No. 18, and that the cloture vote on the nomination occur at 1:45 p.m.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

REMEMBERING THE SOLDIERS OF 2ND BATTALION, 131ST FIELD ARTILLERY REGIMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week, we remember the brave men of Texas who gave so much to preserve freedom in the Pacific and survived the greatest horrors of World War II. Soldiers of 2nd Battalion, 131st Field Artillery Regiment from Camp Bowie, TX, a Texas National Guard unit, were fighting alongside Australian forces on Java, an island in Indonesia, against invading Japanese forces. On March 8, 1942 the Americans and their Australian allies were captured by the Japanese. A report was never filed by the Japanese to identify the captured unit. As a result, the Texas soldiers had disappeared and were dubbed “the Lost Battalion.”

They were combined with survivors of the USS Houston, CA-30, which had been sunk in the Battle of Sunda Strait on March 1, 1942, and dispersed to POW labor camps located in Burma, Thailand, and Japan to work as slave laborers. They worked on the Burma-Siam Death Railway, building a railroad through the jungle and into the coal mines, docks, and shipyards in Japan and other Southeast Asian countries. For 42 months, the men of 2nd Battalion, 131st Field Artillery and the USS *Houston* suffered together through humiliation, degradation, physical and mental torture, starvation, and horrible tropical diseases, with no medication.

Five hundred and thirty-two soldiers of the battalion, along with 371 survivors of the USS *Houston* were taken prisoner. As many as 163 soldiers died in captivity, and of those, 133 are estimated to have died working on the railroad.

In August of 1945, after 42 months of captivity and forced labor, the survivors of 2nd Battalion, 131st Field Artillery Regiment and the survivors of the USS *Houston* were returned to the United States. March 8, 2017, marks the 75th year since their capture on the island of Java, and these soldiers deserve to be remembered for their heroic service and sacrifices in the Pacific theater of battle.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT BACKUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize a Vermont treasure, Dr. Robert Backus of Grace Cottage Hospital, who is retiring after nearly four decades of dedicated service to the rural community of Townshend, VT.

Dr. Backus, or “Dr. B” as his patients often call him, is a natural heal-

er. He discovered his passion for medical sciences as a young hunter. After serving with the Peace Corps in Brazil, he traveled to Australia to complete a medical internship and his residency. Years later, while on a trek across country from California, Dr. Backus found himself meandering along the winding roads of Vermont’s Route 30, and he discovered the place he continues to call home today. The people of Townshend are glad he never left.

After settling in Vermont, Dr. Backus went on to complete his premedical studies at the University of Massachusetts and, later, Dartmouth College. He then received his doctorate in medicine from the University of Vermont in Burlington. Soon after, Dr. Backus took a job working as deputy to Dr. Carlos Otis, the revered founder of Vermont’s Grace Cottage Hospital, one of the State’s leading rural providers.

Dr. Backus is perhaps most well-known for always being there for his patients, even if they are admitted to a different hospital. He is also known for his strong commitment to the community. For example, each year, Dr. Backus dedicates his time to collecting items for the Grace Cottage Fair, an event that supports the work and patients of the hospital. He also enjoys singing in the West River Valley Chorus with his wife, Carol.

Dr. Backus remains committed to staying active in his community after retirement, and as a grandfather to six, he is also looking forward to spending more time with his family.

I am proud to honor Dr. Backus’s commitment to our State, and to the health and well-being of Vermonters. I know we will continue to see great things from him, and I wish him the very best as he enters a well-deserved retirement.

CRA DISAPPROVAL OF BLM PLANNING 2.0 RULE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate approved H.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act, CRA, that overturned the Bureau of Land Management’s resource management planning rule, commonly referred to as the planning 2.0 rule. I oppose this misguided revocation of a rule that would have allowed greater public involvement in the land-use planning process, increased government transparency, and improved the efficiency in making sustainable multiple use decisions for our public lands.

The BLM is responsible for administering 245 million acres, or over 10 percent of the total area of the United States, and 700 million acres, or 30 percent, of the Nation’s mineral estate. The majority of BLM lands are in the 11 western States and Alaska.

Across the West, the economy has changed significantly in recent decades. From 1990 to 2010, the population in the West grew by 36 percent, and the

economy of the West has grown faster than any other region in the country. As new people and new businesses have moved West, demands on public lands for outdoor recreation, hunting, fishing, tourism, conservation, and renewable energy development have been increasing. These demands have the potential to lead to conflicts with uses such as grazing, timber, mining, and oil and gas extraction.

The planning 2.0 rule represented a new approach to addressing increasingly complex challenges on public lands and balancing what are competing uses and, quite frankly, at times competing values for the use of our public lands. Planning 2.0 was the first update of the BLM’s planning regulations in 34 years. It included tools to help local land managers respond to these new challenges and the changing needs of western communities.

Under the BLM’s 1983 planning regulations, the BLM’s planning process has been far too slow. State, local, and tribal governments and the public have been frustrated with the BLM’s inability to complete resource management plans that support key infrastructure projects like pipelines, utility corridors, oil and gas leasing areas, and other management designations. It takes an average of 8 years to complete a resource management plan, and the public is provided few opportunities for input. By the time a plan is completed, it is almost already out of date. Since public involvement doesn’t occur until nearly the end of the planning process, new information provided near the end can require revision and cause further delay. Litigation also can stall the process and add significantly more time and costs.

Nullifying planning 2.0 through CRA disapproval permanently forces the BLM to use a planning process that wastes taxpayer money and is inefficient at best.

Planning 2.0 provided earlier and more frequent opportunities for public involvement as part of the new planning assessment step. By inviting State, local, and tribal governments and the public to share information and participate in developing alternatives before the draft resource management plan could be published, planning 2.0 made it possible to discover the issues and potential conflicts and work out solutions before huge investments of time and labor were expended. Early involvement and collaboration with the public and all stakeholders made the planning process more efficient and effective.

Under planning 2.0, the formal planning process remained largely unchanged: a draft environmental impact statement and a draft plan were still required, but with an expanded public comment period, from 90 days to 100 days. Draft plan amendments are often less complex, and so the minimum comment period was reduced from 90 days to 60 days. The rule provided opportunities to extend any comment period as necessary.

Planning 2.0 preserved and enhanced partnerships with State, local, and tribal governments in the planning process. The rule maintained the coordination and consistency requirements, and it recognized the special roles of State, local, and tribal governments, affording opportunities to participate side-by-side with the BLM as cooperating agencies. The final planning 2.0 rule took meaningful steps to accommodate requests from States and local governments to improve the planning process and to ensure governors were able to raise concerns and fully engage in the planning process, as required by the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act.

As vice chair of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I closely review Federal actions that affect native people and Indian Country. Under planning 2.0, the right of federally recognized tribes to government-to-government consultation was clearly enumerated and protected. The BLM worked extensively to make sure the new planning process was more inclusive. Planning 2.0 recognized the value of the knowledge, history, and culture that tribes bring to the planning effort. By formalizing the tribal consultation role and providing early and more frequent opportunities for tribes to provide input, the BLM had taken an important step to ensure Indian Country was able to be fully engaged in the process. Repealing planning 2.0 through the CRA now risks ignoring the concerns of tribes in favor of commercial interests and their lobbyists in Washington, DC.

Pressures on BLM lands have increased in scale and complexity, and planning 2.0 encouraged the collection and use of high-quality data. It encouraged flexibility to identify a planning area boundary that reflects the resource issues. By looking at larger landscapes, local offices could have collaborated where there are shared resource issues and could have reduced conflicts and litigation for large-scale projects. Planning 2.0 would have enabled the BLM to set clear goals and allowed local offices to work together on landscape-wide planning where resource issues span multiple administrative jurisdictions.

The rule identified important corridors for wildlife and critical habitats early in the planning process so that those important areas could be managed and conserved in balance with other uses and development decisions. Working across boundaries is especially important to tackle wildfire prevention and eradication of invasive species, which are degrading our public lands and placing neighboring private lands at risk of harm. Efficient and collaborative planning is desperately needed to approve infrastructure projects, pipelines, and energy transmission corridors that are stalled under the current planning process. Eliminating planning 2.0 reinstates a cumbersome and inefficient planning process that increases burdens on industries and the public.

Opponents of the planning 2.0 rule mischaracterized the rule as a last minute “midnight rule” that excluded public comment. This is simply not true. The planning 2.0 initiative went through a transparent rulemaking process over 2 and a half years. The BLM responded to over 3,000 public comments on the draft rule and made critical changes in the final rule. Congress held two hearings on planning 2.0, and the BLM incorporated that information before publishing the final rule. The BLM conducted extensive public outreach through public meetings, webinars, an extended public comment period, and input from a broad spectrum of the public that resulted in significant revisions to the final rule.

However, the CRA resolution disapproving planning 2.0 was accomplished without public hearings and without transparency. Management of our public lands will now revert back to a process that gives commercial interest greater power and the public less opportunity for meaningful involvement.

Opponents of planning 2.0 expressed concern that emphasizing landscape-scale planning could result in the primacy of national objectives over State and local objectives. This is not true. Planning 2.0 did not centralize decisionmaking in Washington, DC, or dilute local control of the planning process. The rule actually allowed for more local community involvement and preserved the priority status for local governments and states in land use planning. Increasing the opportunity for public voices helped develop plans that met the increasingly diverse needs of western communities. Further, the rule did not require all resource management plans to be multistate landscapes. The rule provided the process for planning at larger landscape-scales when it made sense given the resources involved.

The use of the Congressional Review Act to revoke planning 2.0 is a reckless tactic. Specific concerns could and should have been addressed through the regular rulemaking process or targeted legislation by Congress instead. Under the CRA, once Congress passes a resolution of disapproval, the BLM is prohibited from writing a new rule that is “substantially the same” without additional legislative action. As a result, many of the provisions of planning 2.0 that improved the planning process cannot be enacted or proposed again without express congressional approval.

Secretary Zinke has now been confirmed and should have been given the opportunity to consider revising planning 2.0 and making any necessary changes. With passage of H.J. Res. 44, Secretary Zinke will face considerable legal uncertainty, and his authority to reformulate a new planning rule will be limited substantially. This resolution should have been rejected and the new administration given the opportunity to reformulate planning 2.0 and to

make sure the public continued to have a voice in decisions that affect their way of life.

KINGSPORT CENTENNIAL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Tennessee General Assembly’s proclamation recognizing the city of Kingsport, TN, centennial celebration.

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

KINGSPORT CENTENNIAL

Whereas, it is fitting that the members of this legislative body should pause in their deliberations to recognize and honor those venerable communities of this State that are marking special occasions in their histories; and

Whereas, the new city of Kingsport was incorporated in 1917, using the historical name of a nearby town that was previously incorporated in 1822 but lost its charter after the Civil War; and

Whereas, Kingsport is the first thoroughly diversified, professionally planned, and privately financed city in twentieth-century America; and

Whereas, Kingsport was the first city in Tennessee, and one of the first in the nation, to adopt the “model city charter” establishing a city manager form of government; and

Whereas, Kingsport was produced by the marriage of New South philosophy and Progressivism, born at a time when capitalists turned their attention to Southern Appalachia; and

Whereas, the seeds planted in 1917 grew to become the corporate headquarters of Eastman, a Fortune 300 company with a significant global presence that has provided economic opportunity for generations of Tennesseans; and

Whereas, early founders coined the term “Kingsport Spirit” to describe the work ethic, can-do attitude, and caring culture that are still widely prevalent today; and

Whereas, Kingsport continues to be a leader in innovation and collaboration to redefine the economic future of Tennessee and Tennesseans; and

Whereas, on this milestone occasion, it is fitting that we recognize and honor the city of Kingsport and its residents: Now, therefore,

I, Randy McNally, Speaker of the Senate of the One Hundred Tenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, at the request of and in conjunction with Senator Jon Lundberg, do hereby proclaim that we honor and commend the fine citizens of Kingsport as they celebrate their city’s centennial and extend to them our best wishes for continued success and prosperity in the future. Proclaimed in Nashville, Tennessee, on this the 13th day of February 2017.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MEDINGER

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor John Medinger on his retirement from Federal and public service. John has dedicated his career to improving the lives of individuals in the La Crosse community and across the State of Wisconsin, most recently as my southwestern Wisconsin regional representative. I am so pleased to celebrate John’s legacy of dedicated public service and positive social change.

John was born in La Crosse, WI, and has been the community's strongest advocate ever since. He graduated from Aquinas High School and went on to receive his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

John's public service career began in 1972 with his work at Volunteers in Service to America, VISTA to combat poverty and racial inequality in Virginia. During his time in Virginia, John developed a passion for social justice that guided his future work as a public servant.

In 1976, John was elected to represent the 95th district in the Wisconsin State Legislature, where he ultimately served as assistant majority leader of the assembly. As a State representative, John became known for fighting domestic abuse. He authored one of Wisconsin's first domestic violence bills to create safe houses for victims and worked with Wisconsin police departments to make combating domestic abuse a top priority. He was also known for his early leadership on gay rights issues, fighting for marriage equality, and proudly participating in La Crosse's first PRIDE Fest.

I have known few public servants as dedicated as John in serving the people he represents. He embodies the true meaning of public service. No request was too small for his devoted attention. In fact, John was famous for coming to work on Monday after a weekend of local events with a fist full of paper scraps covered in scribbled notes from people he ran into, describing their concerns. John remembered every one of those concerns as he advocated for his constituents on the assembly floor. During a time of increasing partisanship, he had a knack for bringing opposing sides together in the interest of bettering the lives of Wisconsinites.

After 16 years, John left the State legislature. Although he claimed his departure was to get away from long legislative speeches, it was clear he wanted to be closer to the people he cared so much about in his hometown. Unable to stay out of public service for long, John announced his campaign for mayor in the Spring of 1997. As mayor of La Crosse, John adhered to his fundamental belief that he was there to serve all residents of La Crosse—not just those who supported him. Guided by his VISTA experience, John created the city's first anti-racism task force and encouraged people of color to run for local office. He is especially well-loved by the African-American and Hmong communities in La Crosse.

Three U.S. Senators, myself included, had the privilege of having John represent us in southwestern Wisconsin. Although times have changed and technology has advanced—much to John's chagrin—his knowledge, dedication, and connections are irreplaceable.

John has taught those lucky enough to have worked with him what it means to be a true representative of the people: take your work—but not

yourself—seriously, don't hold a grudge, keep your word, and, above all, put constituents first. I will miss John a great deal, but I am delighted to wish him and his wife Dee the very best in this new chapter.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT GENERAL HAROLD "HAL" GREGORY MOORE, JR.

- Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I mourn the loss of LTG Harold "Hal" Gregory Moore, Jr., and to honor his life and memory as one of Georgia's great citizens and military heroes.

Having served in the U.S. Army for 32 years, Lieutenant General Moore was known for valiantly and courageously protecting his fellow Americans during the Korean and Vietnam wars and for always leading by example.

He is perhaps best known for leading the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry Regiment in the first major battle against North Vietnamese forces in the Ia Drang Valley on November 14, 1965. During that 4-day battle—which would set the tone for the entire conflict—then-Lieutenant Colonel Moore kept the promise he had made to his men: that he would be the first to set foot on the battlefield, the last to step off, and that, dead or alive, he would leave no man behind. For his leadership and dedication to his men at Ia Drang, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for valor.

Lieutenant General Moore passed away on February 10, 2017, leaving behind 5 children and 11 grandchildren. He was buried with his wife of 55 years, Julia Compton Moore, at the Main Post Cemetery in Fort Benning, GA. His funeral was attended by more than 500 people, showcasing the extent to which his service, sacrifice, and leadership touched the lives of countless others.

We will forever remember and forever aspire to live our lives in the spirit of selflessness, bravery, kindness, and compassion with which Lieutenant General Moore led his.●

REMEMBERING CARMEN DELGADO VOTAW

- Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a distinguished woman from the State of Maryland. Carmen Delgado Votaw, who passed away on February 18, 2017, was a civil rights pioneer, a public servant, a storyteller, and a beloved community leader.

Ms. Votaw was born on September 29, 1935, in Humacao, PR. She studied at the University of Puerto Rico and graduated from American University in Washington, DC, with a bachelor of arts in international studies. She was subsequently awarded an honorary doctorate in humanities by Hood College in Frederick, MD.

Ms. Votaw was appointed by President Jimmy Carter to serve as cochair of the National Advisory Committee on Women. She served as president of the Interamerican Commission of Women of the Organization of American States in 1979–80. The first president of that body, she remains just one of two women from the United States to have served as the commission's president.

During her career, Ms. Votaw travelled to more than 80 countries and met with more than 50 heads of state. She was a member of the U.S. delegation to the International Women's Year conference, attending conferences in Mexico City, Copenhagen, Nairobi and Beijing.

Ms. Votaw was chief of staff for Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner Jaime B. Fuster from 1985–91. As the first Hispanic female chief of staff for a Member of Congress, she worked to address the challenges facing 3.5 million Puerto Ricans living on the island and to build a strong network for women in the Federal Government. After leaving the U.S. House of Representatives, she was involved with the Girl Scouts of the USA, United Way of America, and the Alliance for Children and Families.

Ms. Votaw was an author of a number of publications on women, including "Puerto Rican Women: Mujeres Puertorriqueñas," "Notable American Women," "Libro de Oro," and "To Ourselves Be True." These stories highlight the wonderful accomplishments of women, particularly Hispanic women, who led remarkable lives and serve as role models for younger women.

As a stalwart defender of civil rights for diverse populations, especially Hispanics, Ms. Votaw received the Hispanic Heritage Award for Education, the Mexican American Women's Primeras Award, and numerous awards from NASA, FEW, and national and local civic organizations.

Ms. Votaw served on the boards of directors of numerous women's organizations, including the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women, which she served as national president and president of the DC chapter, the Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women's Voters, the Girl Scouts of the USA, the International Girl Guides, the National Women's Political Caucus and its Appointments Coalition, the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center, and the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. She was also active with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, the Gala Hispanic Theatre, and the Maryland Women's Heritage Center, and she was a longtime member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

In 1992, Ms. Votaw was inducted into the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame for her numerous contributions to the community. In addition, she was recognized by the National Women's History Project for Distinguished Lifetime Achievement in 2014.

Ms. Votaw died on February 18, 2017. She is survived by her husband of more

than 50 years, Gregory B. Votaw; three children, Stephen G. Votaw of Arlington, VA, Michael A. and Liz Votaw of Potomac, MD, and Lisa Votaw and Brian Olson of Steamboat Springs, CO; and six grandchildren—Daniel Votaw, Alexandra Votaw, Anna Votaw, Michael Todd Votaw, Taylor Delgado Olson, and Abby Olson.

Ms. Votaw's extraordinary and transformational contributions to our State, Nation, and world will have an impact on the lives of girls, women, and families for generations to come. Her vision of inclusivity and creating opportunities for women broke barriers and shattered institutional societal stigmas that prevented women from achieving their dreams. Ms. Votaw lived a life of extraordinary accomplishment, and we owe her a tremendous debt of gratitude for her outstanding work in increasing equality and opportunity throughout the world. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Carmen Delgado Votaw and in expressing our deepest condolences to her family and countless friends.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:10 a.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 bill, without amendment:

S. 442. An act to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 375. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the “Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

H.R. 1174. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

H.R. 1362. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'au'a'a Hunkin VA Clinic.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1174. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1362. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'au'a'a Hunkin VA Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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 Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 563. A bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 564. A bill to repeal debt collection amendments made by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 565. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 566. A bill to withdraw certain land in Okanogan County, Washington, to protect the land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 567. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 568. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 569. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 570. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 571. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 572. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. Kaine, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 573. A bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 574. A bill to restrict the use of funds for the long-range standoff weapon until the Secretary of Defense completes a Nuclear Posture Review that includes an assessment of the capabilities and effects of the use of the long-range standoff weapon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 575. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to restrict the debt collection practices of certain debt collectors; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 576. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 577. A bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 578. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide requirements for agency decision making based on science; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 579. A bill to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 580. A bill to establish agency procedures for the issuance of guidance documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 581. A bill to include information concerning a patient's opioid addiction in certain medical records; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 582. A bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 583. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to

hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 584. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 585. A bill to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Govan as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Roger W. Ferguson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 83. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States from Mexico and China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 84. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

s. 14

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

s. 65

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to address financial conflicts of interest of the President and Vice President.

s. 67

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina

(Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 67, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the designation of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes.

s. 130

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 130, a bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives.

s. 147

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 147, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

s. 168

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to amend and enhance certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation.

s. 175

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

s. 206

At the request of Mr. KAINES, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants.

s. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

s. 299

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes.

s. 362

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to provide that 6 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes.

s. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as

cospromises of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

s. 384

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

s. 405

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 405, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide an exclusion from income for student loan forgiveness for students who have died or become disabled.

s. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

s. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

s. 425

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

s. 438

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 438, a bill to encourage effective, voluntary investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual Federal awards to employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes.

s. 465

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 465, a bill to provide for an independent outside audit of the Indian Health Service.

s. 538

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 538, a bill to clarify research and development for wood products, and for other purposes.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include in each contract into which the Secretary enters for necessary services authorities and mechanism for appropriate oversight, and for other purposes.

S. 544

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 544, a bill to amend Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 549

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 549, a bill to block implementation of the Executive Order that restricts individuals from certain countries from entering the United States.

S. 550

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 550, a bill to restore statutory rights to the people of the United States from forced arbitration.

S. 552

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 552, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide justice to victims of fraud.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution approving the discontinuation of the process for consideration and automatic implementation of the annual proposal of the Independent Medicare Advisory Board under section 1899A of the Social Security Act.

S.J. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 27, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Clarification of Employer’s Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness”.

S.J. RES. 32

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

S.J. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees.

S. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 23, a resolution establishing the Select Committee on Cybersecurity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 581. A bill to include information concerning a patient’s opioid addiction in certain medical records; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise again today to share the story of this beautiful young lady, Jessie Grubb. She is a West Virginian who passed away a year ago last week, and she was only 30 years old. She was a bright young lady with a great future ahead of her.

After years of struggling with heroin addiction, she had been doing very well. She had been sober since August of 2015. She had surgery for an infection related to a running injury and died a day after leaving the hospital.

Her story of addiction is known to many. We have told it many times here. Her father David, a former West Virginia State legislator who served with me, a friend of mine, shared their family struggle with addiction when President Obama traveled to West Virginia to bring attention to the growing opiate epidemic that we are all encountering in all of our States.

West Virginia has been hit the hardest by the opioid epidemic, where drug overdose deaths soared by more than 700 percent from 1999 to 2013. More than 600 lives were lost last year—just last year alone—to prescription drug overdose, legal prescription drugs.

Jessie’s story and her family’s pain are all too common in West Virginia and throughout this Nation. As I said, we lost 627 West Virginians to opiates last year alone.

When you think about it, this is a pill, this is a product that is manufactured by some of the most regarded institutions, pharmaceutical manufacturers in the country. It has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration, which basically says what we can use and what we should consume should be safe for us.

It is then prescribed by the most trusted person who is not in our family—and next to our family is a doctor. You would think that this is something that should be helpful for us, that should be part of the healing process. Instead, it has been part of the killing process. It has no home. It is a silent killer. We kept our mouths shut; we didn’t say anything for many years, and now we have an epidemic on our hands, which we are trying to control.

We had 61,000 West Virginians who used prescription pain medications for nonmedical purposes in 2014. This includes 6,000 teenagers. As I have said, our State is not unique. The Presiding Officer’s wonderful State of North Carolina is facing the same challenges we are.

Every day in our country, 91 Americans die from a prescription opiate or heroin overdose. Since 1999, we have lost almost 200,000 Americans to prescription opioid abuse.

Jessie’s story deeply impacted President Obama, and I spoke with him about her death and the pain her family is going through. He reached out to David and Kate and the entire Grubb family. It is horrific.

When President Obama came to Charleston, Jessie was in a rehab facility in Michigan for the fourth time. Before her life was taken over by addiction in 2009, Jessie’s future was bright. She was the beloved daughter of David and Kate Grubb, a beloved sister to her four sisters, and a beloved friend to so many.

She was an excellent student, scoring in the 99th percentile on all of her tests since she had been in education. She was a cheerleader at Roosevelt Junior High School, and she was an avid runner, an athlete.

At the time of her death, she was looking forward to running in her first marathon. She had been training for that. The only trouble she had ever gotten into at school was when she protested the Iraq war, and she was on the right side of that one.

Needless to say, she was a natural-born leader. After graduating from Capital High School, she was thrilled and looking forward to her bright future at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

She was sexually assaulted during her first semester, which caused her to withdraw from school and return to Charleston. The traumatic event that caused Jessie to turn to heroin to escape the pain was that horrific experience.

Over the next 7 years, Jessie would battle her addiction. She would overdose four times and go into rehab four

times. Until her death, she had been sober for 6 months and was focused on making a life for herself in Michigan. All of her hard work was ruined because of a careless mistake.

I introduced this piece of bipartisan legislation; everybody has been so kind on that. It makes so much common sense. I introduced it almost a year ago. At the time, I told David, Kate, and the family: This is something that should be a no-brainer. This is something we should easily pass. It was called Jessie's Law, after this beautiful young lady.

I will explain how the events unfolded, and then I will go into the bill. Her parents, David and Kate, traveled to Michigan for her surgery. They traveled to Michigan, and they told her doctors and the hospital personnel that she was a recovering addict. Jessie confirmed it. She said: Yes, I have struggled. I am clean. I am proud, and I want to get healthy. I want to get my leg injury fixed, and I want to run that marathon.

After Jessie's surgery, the discharging doctor, who said he didn't know she was a recovering addict—the parents were there when she was admitted. She told him. You would have thought they would have asked: Do you have any allergies, penicillin?

You would have thought they would have flagged it: I am a recovering addict.

They sent her home with a prescription for 50 oxycodone—50 oxycodone—because they did not know, because her records had not been properly identified, that she was very prone, being a recovering addict, to any type of opiate. There are other ways of treating pain. Not knowing, the doctor went ahead and released her with what a normal person would get for pain relief.

Needless to say, she should never have gotten that prescription—no way, shape, or form. We must ensure this never happens again. That is why today I am reintroducing Jessie's Law.

Let me tell you what I ran into. David and Kate accompanied her as the parents. They were with their beautiful daughter. They both confirmed that she had an addiction problem and she was recovering: Please, we want you to notify anybody who handles, anyone who dispenses, anyone who is working with Jessie. Please know what we are dealing with is very fragile.

I said: We will write the legislation. And we did; we wrote the legislation. If you have a consenting guardian, parent, and a consenting patient, it should be flagged. Because of privacy laws, we know we are very concerned about that. For some reason, I cannot get past the bureaucracy of getting this bill to the floor to be voted on because they are saying there is objection to the privacy laws with the parents' being involved. So guess what. I finally called David, and I called Kate, and I said: I know you would think it makes common sense that, basically, we should be able to pass legislation the

way we would like to pass it—where the parents acknowledge it and the patient, who is their child, acknowledges it. They both are cooperating, and it should be done.

In order to try to get this piece of legislation passed as quickly as possible, we are taking off the parents. It is only the patient herself. Jessie comes in and says: I want you to know I am a recovering addict. Please make sure that everybody who handles my case knows that. That is all we are asking for. I am hopeful, Mr. President, that you and others will be able to join me because we don't want anybody in North Carolina going through what we have gone through in West Virginia or what the Grubb family has gone through, losing this beautiful, bright, talented young lady. It should never happen in this country.

Even the healthcare providers are saying: We need this legislation to go forward so we can identify that, so we can mark that, hotline that, redline that, and so that anybody who is handling Jessie from the beginning to the end, especially when they are discharged, is going to have knowledge. In no way, shape, or form will anybody prescribe an opiate or any type of addictive painkiller that they are going to be affected by, because their life has been changed by it already.

The bottom line is that we need to go at this problem from every angle with the help of everyone: family assistance, counseling programs, drug courts, consumer and medical education, law enforcement support, State and Federal legislation. We need everything. This is a fight we can't lose.

This is the first time in my lifetime that my State has fallen under 50 percent of adults of working age not working. We are down to 49.6 percent. We have always had the reputation of having some of the greatest workers—hard workers—giving you a good hard-working day for good hard-working pay. They have always been there. We just have too few of them. There are three things that keep you out of the workforce, basically: a lack of skill sets, if you are addicted or you have a criminal record, or a combination. Addiction has taken over and has basically changed the lives of Americans, changed the lives of West Virginia, and it is ruining families.

There is no way that her sisters and David and Kate, her parents, are ever going to get over losing Jessie. There is no reason they should have lost Jessie and no reason you should lose another North Carolinian—none of us. As to the situation where they are going in and they are identified by all the professionals with the help they need in the systems they are asking for, we owe that to every person in America, and we owe it to Jessie.

So I am asking for the cooperation of all my colleagues—the continuous support, tireless work that everyone has done. Jessie's death is heartbreaking and reminds us all that this is one

death that could have been prevented and one death that should never happen again because of a lack of legislation that prevents us, because of the privacy laws, to identify a person that is in need.

If you are looking at addiction and happen to be looking at addiction as an illness, an illness needs care. If they need care, then we are going to give them the care to protect them while they are getting that care. That is all this does. I hope it is something we can do as quickly as possible. We will be forever grateful. In Jessie's memory, her parents are going to be forever grateful. Basically, Jessie's life will not be in vain. That is exactly why I am here. I am not going to sit still and lose a beautiful person who could contribute to society the way this young lady was going to contribute to society and say there is nothing we can do. We can do it and do it in her honor.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 583. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 583

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 “American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING HIRING AND TRAINING OF VETERANS.

Section 1701(b)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including by prioritizing the hiring and training of veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)” after “Nation”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE TRAFFICKING OF ILLICIT FENTANYL INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM MEXICO AND CHINA

Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 83

Whereas the United States continues to experience a prescription opioid and heroin overdose epidemic that claimed more than 33,000 lives in 2015;

Whereas fentanyl is a synthetic opioid and the euphoric effects of fentanyl are sometimes indistinguishable from the euphoric effects of heroin or morphine;

Whereas the effect of fentanyl can be up to 50 times stronger than heroin and 100 times stronger than morphine;

Whereas although pharmaceutical fentanyl can be diverted for misuse, most fentanyl deaths are believed to be linked to illicitly manufactured fentanyl and illicit versions of chemically similar compounds known as fentanyl analogs (collectively referred to in this preamble as “illicit fentanyl”);

Whereas illicit fentanyl is potentially lethal even if only a very small quantity is ingested or inhaled;

Whereas across the United States, illicit fentanyl use and related deaths are rising at alarming rates;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is cheaper to manufacture than heroin and the sale of illicit fentanyl is highly profitable for drug dealers;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is sold for its heroin-like effects and illicit fentanyl is often mixed with heroin, cocaine, or methamphetamine as a combination product, with or without the knowledge of the user;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is often produced to physically resemble other opioid pain medicines, such as oxycodone, which sell for high amounts on the street;

Whereas drug users often overdose on illicit fentanyl because users are unaware that they are ingesting illicit fentanyl and do not anticipate the toxicity and potential lethality of illicit fentanyl;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, between 2014 and 2015, the death rate from overdoses caused by synthetic opioids, including illicit fentanyl and synthetic opioid pain relievers other than methadone and heroin, increased 72 percent;

Whereas, in 2016, the Drug Enforcement Administration (referred to in this preamble as the “DEA”) issued a National Drug Threat Assessment Summary, which found that Mexican transnational criminal organizations are—

(1) the greatest criminal drug threat to the United States; and

(2) poly-drug organizations that use established transportation routes and distribution networks to traffic heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana throughout the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, the DEA issued a National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary, which found that “starting in late 2013, several states reported spikes in overdose deaths due to fentanyl and its analog acetyl-fentanyl”;

Whereas the 2016 National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary found that—

(1) Mexican drug traffickers are expanding their operations to gain a larger share of eastern United States heroin markets; and

(2) the availability of heroin is increasing throughout the United States;

Whereas in 2015, there were more than 9,580 overdose deaths in the United States caused by synthetic opioids, including—

(1) illicit fentanyl; and

(2) synthetic opioid pain relievers other than methadone and heroin;

Whereas the number of deaths attributable to illicit fentanyl may be significantly underreported because—

(1) coroners and medical examiners do not test, or lack the resources to test, routinely for fentanyl;

(2) crime laboratories lack the resources to test routinely for fentanyl; and

(3) illicit fentanyl deaths may erroneously be attributed to heroin;

Whereas, in March 2015, the DEA issued a nationwide alert on illicit fentanyl as a threat to health and public safety;

Whereas, in October 2015, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention issued a health advisory through its Health Alert Network—

(1) to make public health officials aware of the increase in fentanyl-related overdose fatalities;

(2) to provide recommendations for improving detection of fentanyl-related overdose outbreaks; and

(3) to encourage States to expand access to, and training on, naloxone;

Whereas, in August 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention updated the health advisory issued in October 2015 to make public health officials aware of the increasing—

(1) availability of counterfeit pills containing various amounts of fentanyl and fentanyl-related compounds; and

(2) frequency with which fentanyl-related compounds are mixed with, or sold as, heroin;

Whereas illicit fentanyl has the potential to endanger public health workers, first responders, and law enforcement personnel who may unwittingly come into contact with illicit fentanyl by accidentally inhaling airborne powder;

Whereas, according to the DEA—

(1) Mexico is the primary source for illicit fentanyl trafficked into the United States; and

(2) distributors in China are the source of the fentanyl analogs and the precursor chemicals to manufacture fentanyl analogs that are found in Mexico and Canada;

Whereas fentanyl produced illicitly in Mexico is—

(1) smuggled across the southwest border of the United States, or delivered through mail and express consignment couriers; and

(2) often mixed with heroin or diluents in the United States and then distributed in the same United States markets in which white powder heroin is distributed; and

Whereas United States law enforcement officials have recently seen—

(1) an influx of illicit fentanyl into the United States directly from China;

(2) shipments of the equipment to manufacture illicit fentanyl, such as pill presses; and

(3) some illicit fentanyl products being smuggled into the United States across the northern border with Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the use of illicit fentanyl in the United States and the resulting overdose deaths are a public health crisis;

(2) the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States, especially the trafficking of illicit fentanyl by transnational criminal organizations, is a problem that requires close cooperation between the United States Government and the Governments of Mexico and China;

(3) the United States Government and the Governments of Mexico and China have a shared interest in, and responsibility for, stopping the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States;

(4) the United States should—

(A) support efforts by the Governments of Mexico and China to stop the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States; and

(B) take further measures to reduce and prevent heroin and fentanyl consumption through—

(i) enhanced enforcement to reduce the illegal supply; and

(ii) increased use of evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery services; and

(5) the United States Government, including the Secretary of State, the Attorney

General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, should use the broad diplomatic and law enforcement resources of the United States, in partnership with the Governments of Mexico and China, to stop the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 84—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 84

Whereas, as of March 2017, there are more than 3,672,000,000 women in the world;

Whereas women around the world—

(1) have fundamental rights;

(2) participate in the political, social, and economic lives of their communities;

(3) play a critical role in providing and caring for their families;

(4) contribute substantially to economic growth and the prevention and resolution of conflict; and

(5) as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in the advancement of food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas at his confirmation hearing, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson—

(1) spoke about the importance of empowering women; and

(2) noted that there is “study after study to confirm that when you empower women in these developing parts of the world, you change the future of the country”;

Whereas 2017 marks—

(1) the 22nd anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, at which 189 countries committed to integrating gender equality into each dimension of society; and

(2) the 6th anniversary of the establishment of the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, which includes a comprehensive set of commitments by the United States to advance the meaningful participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war or peace;

Whereas the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, revised in June 2016, states that “[d]eadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peacebuilding and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their voices heard, and their perspectives taken into account.”;

Whereas there are 63 national action plans around the world, and there are several additional national action plans known to be in development;

Whereas the joint strategy of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development entitled “Department of State & USAID Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism” and dated May 2016—

(1) notes that women can play a critical role in identifying and addressing drivers of violent extremism in their families, communities, and broader society; and

(2) commits to supporting programs that engage women “as key stakeholders in preventing and countering violent extremism in their communities”;

Whereas, despite the historical underrepresentation of women in conflict resolution processes, women in conflict-affected regions have nevertheless achieved significant success in—

- (1) moderating violent extremism;
- (2) countering terrorism;
- (3) resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation; and
- (4) stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security—

- (A) services;
- (B) institutions; and
- (C) venues for decisionmaking;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, peace negotiations are more likely to end in a peace agreement when women’s groups play an influential role in the negotiation process;

Whereas, according to a study by the International Peace Institute, a peace agreement is 35 percent more likely to last at least 15 years if women participate in the development of the peace agreement;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in security forces vastly enhances the effectiveness of the security forces;

Whereas, on August 30, 2015, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom highlighted, “our goal must be to build societies in which sexual violence is treated—legally and by every institution of authority—as the serious and wholly intolerable crime that it is. We have seen global campaigns and calls to action draw attention to this issue and mobilize governments and organizations to act. But transformation requires the active participation of men and women everywhere. We must settle for nothing less than a united world saying no to sexual violence and yes to justice, fairness and peace.”;

Whereas approximately 15,000,000 girls are married every year before they reach the age of 18, which means that—

- (1) 41,000 girls are married every day; or
- (2) 1 girl is married every 2 seconds;

Whereas, according to UNICEF—

(1) approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of girls between the ages of 15 and 19 are victims of physical violence; and

(2) it is estimated that 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas, according to the 2016 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime entitled “Global Report on Trafficking in Persons”—

(1) 79 percent of all detected trafficking victims are women and children; and

(2) while trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced labor are the most prominently detected forms of trafficking, the trafficking of women and girls for the purpose of forced marriage is emerging as a more prevalent form of trafficking;

Whereas 603,000,000 women live in countries in which domestic violence is not criminalized;

Whereas, on August 10, 2012, the Federal Government launched a strategy entitled “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, which is the first interagency strategy that—

(1) addresses gender-based violence around the world;

(2) advances the rights and status of women and girls;

(3) promotes gender equality in United States foreign policy; and

(4) works to bring about a world in which all individuals can pursue their aspirations without the threat of violence;

Whereas, in June 2016, the Department of State released an update to the strategy entitled “United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally”, based on internal evaluations, lessons learned, and consultations with civil society, that underscores that “preventing and responding to gender-based violence is a cornerstone of the U.S. government’s commitment to advancing human rights and promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls”;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve—

- (1) strong and lasting economic growth; and

- (2) political and social stability;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—

- (1) $\frac{1}{3}$ of the 778,000,000 illiterate individuals in the world are female; and

- (2) 130,000,000 girls worldwide are not in school;

Whereas, according to the United States Agency for International Development, as compared to uneducated women, educated women are—

- (1) less likely to marry as children; and

- (2) more likely to have healthier families;

Whereas, although the United Nations Millennium Project reached the goal of achieving gender parity in primary education in most countries in 2015, more work remains to be done to achieve gender equality in primary education worldwide by addressing—

- (1) discriminatory practices;
- (2) cultural norms;

- (3) inadequate sanitation facilities; and

- (4) other factors that favor boys;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, women have access to fewer income earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household or engage in agricultural work than men, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by—

- (1) natural disasters; and

- (2) long term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas women around the world—

- (1) face a variety of constraints that severely limit their economic participation and productivity; and

- (2) are underrepresented in the labor force;

Whereas closing the global gender gap in labor markets could increase worldwide gross domestic product by as much as \$28,000,000,000 by 2025;

Whereas despite the achievements of individual female leaders—

- (1) women around the world remain vastly underrepresented in—

- (A) high-level positions; and

- (B) national and local legislatures and governments; and

- (2) according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 22 percent of national parliamentarians and 17.7 percent of government ministers;

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, during the period beginning in 1990 and ending in 2015, global maternal mortality decreased by approximately 44 percent, but approximately 830 women die from preventable causes relating to pregnancy or childbirth each day, and 99 percent of all maternal deaths occur in developing countries;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization—

- (1) suicide is the leading cause of death for girls between the ages of 15 and 19; and

- (2) complications from pregnancy or childbirth is the second-leading cause of death for those girls;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that

women and girls comprise approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ of the 65,300,000 refugees and internally displaced or stateless individuals in the world;

Whereas it is imperative—

- (1) to alleviate violence and discrimination against women; and

- (2) to afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas violence, discrimination, and harmful practices against women and girls are a direct result of negative social norms that undervalue females in society; and

Whereas March 8, 2017, is recognized as International Women’s Day, a global day—

- (1) to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women in the past, present, and future; and

- (2) to recognize the obstacles that women face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) supports the goals of International Women’s Day;

- (2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of a country to generate—

- (A) economic growth;

- (B) sustainable democracy; and

- (C) inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women human rights defenders and civil society leaders, that have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) recognizes the unique cultural, historical, and religious differences throughout the world and urges the United States Government to act with respect and understanding toward legitimate differences when promoting any policies;

(5) reaffirms the commitment—

- (A) to end discrimination and violence against women and girls;

- (B) to ensure the safety and welfare of women and girls;

- (C) to pursue policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide; and

- (D) to promote meaningful and significant participation of women in every aspect of society and community;

- (6) supports sustainable, measurable, and global development that seeks to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women; and

- (7) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women’s Day with appropriate programs and activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Legislative Hearing on S512 the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act.”

COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building. The Committee will hold a Hearing on “Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission.”

HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., on the nomination of Hon. Elaine C. Duke to be Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m. to conduct an oversight hearing on “Identifying Indian Affairs Priorities for the Trump Administration.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., to receive a briefing on Cyber Security from the Defense Science Board.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., to receive testimony on the Global Nuclear Weapons Environment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Mary Schuh, a fellow in my Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 115th Congress.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent that Sonia Tarantolo, a foreign policy fellow in her office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 115th Congress.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tim Abram, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges through July 31, 2017.

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

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION COORDINATION AND PLANNING AREA REFORM REPEAL ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 496 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 496) to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 496) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 496

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL.

The rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform” (81 Fed. Reg. 93448 (December 20, 2016)) shall have no force or effect, and any regulation revised by that rule shall be applied as if that rule had not been issued.

APPROVING THE LOCATION OF A MEMORIAL TO COMMEMORATE AND HONOR THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF OPERATION DESERT STORM OR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Energy and Natural Resources Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 1.

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

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) was ordered to be engrossed for a third

reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 1

Whereas section 8908(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code, provides that the location of a commemorative work in Area I, as depicted on the map entitled “Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs”, numbered 869/86501 B, and dated June 24, 2003, shall be deemed to be authorized only if a recommendation for the location is approved by law not later than 150 calendar days after the date on which Congress is notified of the recommendation;

Whereas section 3093 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 113-291) authorized the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia, to honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has notified Congress of the determination of the Secretary of the Interior that the memorial should be located in Area I; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the location of a commemorative work to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield authorized by section 3093 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 113-291), within Area I, as depicted on the map entitled “Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs”, numbered 869/86501 B, and dated June 24, 2003, is approved.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 84, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 84) supporting the goals of International Women’s Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, on this International Women’s Day, we celebrate the remarkable social, economic, and political achievements of women around the world, but we also take stock of the barriers that continue to prevent hundreds of millions of women from contributing their talents as equal members of the human family.

As in years past, this year I am again joining with Senator SUSAN COLLINS in submitting a bipartisan resolution commemorating International Women’s Day and highlighting its goal of advancing the equality and empowerment of women all across the globe. I especially appreciate Senator COLLINS’

unwavering support in working with me on this resolution.

It has been said that no nation can get ahead if it leaves half of its people behind, and in the 21st century, wherever women are respected and treated as equals, we excel, as the Presiding Officer knows, as legislators, as scientists, as entrepreneurs, artists, inventors, warriors, and in every other field. But the harsh reality remains that women make up some 51 percent of the world's population, yet we account for an estimated 70 percent of those living in poverty and two-thirds of those denied even a basic education.

So on this International Women's Day, we celebrate women's achievements, and we rededicate ourselves to achieving an equal voice, equal participation, and equal rights for all women. We also acknowledge that we still have much difficult work ahead of us.

Research tells us that women and girls' equality can be transformational for their communities and for entire countries, yet in some of the poorest parts of the world—and even in some wealthier countries—women and girls continue to be held back by injustices such as child marriage, sexual and domestic violence, denial of education, and lack of access to contraception and maternal healthcare.

In recent years, we have learned more about the intersection of so many of these issues that affect women. When girls are forced into early marriage, when women are denied contraception and have children at a very young age, this typically ends any chance to gain an education and income-earning employment. This lack of economic influence means that women remain powerless within their families and, too often, within their communities. And this, in turn, can lead to violence against women and the denial of women's most basic human and civil rights.

The good news is that this same interconnectedness can work to empower women and to lift up communities. When women and girls' rights are respected, when we have access to education and family planning services, this unleashes women's ability to participate equally in the community, in the workplace, and even in the political arena.

Indeed, we can now quantify so many of the positive ripple effects. For example, each additional year of education increases a woman's income by 25 percent. We know that children born to educated mothers are twice as likely to survive past the age of 5. By mobilizing the talents of the previously neglected half of the population—in too many places—we create more stable societies and more rapid economic development.

For decades, the United States has been a world leader in advancing and protecting the rights of women and girls around the world, including their access to contraception and family planning. In particular, I want to applaud the excellent work of the State

Department's Office of Global Women's Issues. I am sponsoring legislation in this session to give this office permanent authorization, with an ambassador leading it.

However, on this International Women's Day, we must also acknowledge actions to abdicate America's leadership role in advancing women's rights. Indeed, both at home and abroad, the Trump administration has exhibited a dangerous obsession with rolling back women's reproductive rights. President Trump has promised to nominate Supreme Court Justices who will overturn *Roe v. Wade*. He has joined with some of the Republican leaders in Congress in pledging to terminate funding for Planned Parenthood.

In one of his first official acts, the President signed an Executive order reinstating and expanding the Mexico City policy, also known as the global gag rule. This rule prohibits U.S. financial aid to many international organizations that offer contraception and comprehensive family planning services to women.

As if the reinstatement of this policy weren't bad enough, the administration's Executive order dramatically expanded the policy to apply to all U.S.-funded global health programs—so not just family planning and counseling programs. But we believe that this expansion will include our HIV/AIDS program, known as PEPFAR, which has been so positive in saving so many lives in Africa. It was started by George W. Bush. We also think it will affect initiatives that fund the fights against the Ebola and Zika outbreaks, and this puts at risk 15 times more funding and millions more women and their families around the world.

Taken together, all of these actions by the new administration I believe amount to an assault on the safety and well-being of women and girls across the globe.

I have joined with Senator SUSAN COLLINS, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, and 45 other Senators in introducing bipartisan legislation to permanently repeal the global gag rule. I believe—and it is well documented—that this is a misguided policy that ignores decades of research.

We shouldn't allow extreme ideology to triumph over the urgent practical needs of women across the world. The facts make clear that when family planning services are accessible and contraceptives are affordable, rates of unplanned pregnancies and abortions go down.

According to the World Health Organization, there is an estimated 225 million women in the world who would like access to family planning services, and we know that makes a difference. Here in the United States, the abortion rate has dropped to the lowest level since 1943, a success that is directly attributable to the reduced cost sharing for contraception under the Affordable Care Act. I can attest to that because in New Hampshire, we have one of the

lowest incidences of teen pregnancy in the country.

In January, we saw millions of women, men, and children, turn out for marches in Washington, New York, London, Nairobi, Tokyo, in my home capital of Concord, NH, and in dozens of other cities across the country and around the world. I think we can look at that as an early celebration of International Women's Day because what we heard from those marching was that we were marching in defense of the rights of American women, of Muslim women, of women of color, and of all women and girls across the globe.

The world heard our message loudly and clearly. We will not allow our reproductive rights and our human rights to be taken away. We will not allow women to be targeted for discrimination. We will not be taken backward.

That was our message in January, and it is our message on this International Women's Day. We have fought long and hard for equal rights and equal treatment here in the United States.

We are also celebrating women here in the United States. We have many women who have taken the day off to recognize the role that women play that is so significant in our society, and many of us are also wearing red to demonstrate that. So on this day of celebration and solidarity, we are determined to go forward to build on the progress of recent decades, and we rededicate ourselves to achieving respect, equality, and justice for every woman in every community and every country across the globe.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 84) 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, MARCH 9, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that morning business be closed; finally, that 30 minutes of the majority time on H.J. Res. 57 be under the control of Senator BLUNT or his designee.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—Continued

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators LANKFORD and WARREN.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in December of 2015, President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act after it passed this body with overwhelming bipartisan support—85 of 100 Senators supported the bill. The Wall Street Journal called the Every Student Succeeds Act “the largest devolution of federal control to the states in a quarter-century.” It also had the support of Governors, State legislators, chief State school officers, school district superintendents, local school boards, principals, and teachers unions, who all agreed on the need to replace No Child Left Behind.

The core of the education reform in the Every Student Succeeds Act was to restore local control to the States—not just control for them but that they would have the responsibility and the authority for things such as school accountability, teacher evaluation, student evaluation. It is very clear. In fact, the Every Student Succeeds Act says things very specifically. States are solely responsible for choosing which standards to adopt. The Secretary cannot mandate, direct, or control State standards. The Secretary of Education cannot require, coerce, or incentivize States to adopt common core State standards. States are responsible for choosing which assessments to adopt. The Secretary of Education cannot mandate, direct, or control State assessments for education. States design their own system for holding schools accountable and decide which schools to identify for school intervention and support. The Secretary cannot add new requirements or criteria on State accountability systems that are not in the law. States and local school districts decide what strategies they will implement to help fix identified schools without Federal interference. The Secretary of Education cannot prescribe how States and local school districts improve those schools.

Congress passed that clear education law to take power out of Washington, DC, and from the Department of Education and the Secretary of Education and hand it back to the States.

Five months after the bill was signed, the Obama administration changed their mind and released regulations to take back school decision-making and accountability, in direct violation of the law.

Eighty-five of one hundred of us agreed that our passion is for every

school district, every parent, every State to take care of every child; that no child would be left behind by switching to local control rather than Federal centralized control. But when this new rule was put out by the Obama administration, they reinterpreted that clear law. Let me tell you what they said in the rule.

In the rule, they dictate to States the consequences for schools that don’t annually test at least 95 percent of their students.

They prescribe to the States and school districts how they would intervene and improve schools that don’t exit from this identification process of being an underperforming school.

They limit how States may measure school quality or student success based on 4-year graduation rates.

They define how much weight States must afford to non-test-based indicators in their accountability systems.

This regulation prescribes the long-term goals and measurements of progress that States would use for their student subgroups.

This new regulation prescribes when schools may exit from comprehensive support based on improvement.

This new regulation mandates that States comply with specific Washington, DC, created requirements instead of letting the school districts or the States determine how best to proceed on those requirements.

This new regulation limits how States award school improvement funding to school districts and schools.

This new regulation adds a new and burdensome reporting requirement every 4 years on States and local school districts that will drive up compliance costs and will divert resources away from students in the classrooms, in direct violation of what we passed.

This new regulation requires States to establish a statewide definition for “infective teacher,” requiring a statewide system of evaluation controlled by DC.

This new regulation limits how students are scored when they have exited from special education.

This new regulation controls how the school report cards are created and how long they are.

This is what we were exiting from with No Child Left Behind. We said in that vote for Every Student Succeeds that Washington, DC, should not do this. This rule directly violated the spirit and the letter of the law and will put the new Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, in charge of school evaluation, teacher evaluation, and student success. That is not her role or the intent of this law when we passed it, regardless of who is the Secretary of Education. Our intent was to provide maximum flexibility for the States and the parents. The rule is central control from Washington, DC.

It is essential that we stop this rule right now. While some of my colleagues have said: Let’s just wait, and we will do regulations, and we will unwind

some of this—they are basically admitting that the Trump administration will fix the Obama administration overreach. I understand that statement. I think there will be some unwinding of regulations, but here is why it must be done right now—two reasons. One is, when we do this right now with a Congressional Review Act, we settle this forever, that no administration ever, as long as this law is in place, can repropagate a rule and turn right back around and say Washington, DC, is going to control teacher evaluation, student success evaluation, and school evaluation. This ends that forever.

The second thing is, right now schools in Oklahoma have already diverted resources in their administration, and they are filling out forms that are due to Washington, DC, in April to fulfill this new requirement that was put down by the administration. If we don’t end this now, the districts in Oklahoma and in all of the States represented by this great Senate—their administrators will be working on forms for Washington, DC, rather than educating children at home. Let’s get those folks back in the classroom, working on things that matter, not some form that no one in Washington, DC, will read anyway. Why don’t we allow our schools to focus on educating kids instead of filling out forms for the Secretary of Education? That is the reason we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act.

I encourage this body to support H.J. Res. 57 when it comes up. This will fix this overreach and will put a permanent marker down to say we meant it when Congress said to the administration: Do not control local education. Let the States and the parents do it.

With that, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF SEEMA VERMA AND THE REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against the confirmation of Seema Verma to serve as Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

CMS oversees the administration of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. These programs provide healthcare coverage to grandparents, people with disabilities, foster kids, seniors living in nursing homes, single mothers, and babies. CMS is also in charge of implementing many parts of the Affordable Care Act and making sure that the protections guaranteed in the law are enforced.

In other words, CMS is the part of government that we entrust with carrying out the commitments we have made to protect our health and our access to healthcare. We need someone to run these programs who is a champion for Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act and someone who can stand up to Republicans in Congress and stand up to the Trump administration when they try to burn these promises and turn their backs on the people who need help.

On Monday night, the Republicans finally revealed their latest plan to rip health insurance away from millions of Americans. After years of railing about how the ACA was too long and too complicated, the Republicans spent weeks working on a secret plan—locked in a room, hidden somewhere in the United States Capitol. They didn't want anyone to see it. Here is a news flash: If you have to hide your plans from the American public, that is a pretty good sign that you are headed in the wrong direction.

Now we know why they were so afraid to let anyone else take a look at the plan. The plan is ugly—really, really, ugly. The Republicans' plan would rip health insurance away from millions of Americans.

Right off the top, the bill will end the Medicaid expansion established in the ACA. Right now, 11 million adults are covered by that expansion, and the Republican plan will end it. That is right—end it. Millions more Americans are using ACA subsidies to buy their health insurance. For the families who need it most, those subsidies will be cut. For seniors, prices will rise, and that means millions more people will not be able to afford health insurance.

The Republican bill promises tax credits to help people pay for their insurance, but this is an empty promise because the tax credits are designed to be too small to actually cover the costs of paying for healthcare. If you have a 2-month break in your health insurance coverage, no matter the reason, the Republican bill would let insurance companies charge you a 30-percent penalty on top of your premium for an entire year. That is right. If you lose your job and scramble to find a new plan, you have exactly 62 days to lock down that plan because 1 day longer than that, and you are slapped with a 30-percent penalty.

By the way, it is not a penalty paid to the government to help finance healthcare. No. It is a penalty paid to a \$1 billion insurance company. Republicans should be ashamed of themselves.

Too bad if being able to buy affordable coverage on the ACA exchange has given you access to health insurance while you start your small business. Too bad if your healthcare has given you free cancer screening. Too bad if your healthcare has given you access to treatment for substance abuse disorder. All that is gone under the Republican plan.

So there it is—the Republicans' plan to take away health insurance for millions and millions of Americans. The Republican plan is cruel, and it gets worse.

The Republican healthcare plan gets worse because it also delivers a gut punch to the rest of the Medicaid Program—the part that predates the ACA by decades. It does so by putting a cap on overall funding that States can receive and then strictly limiting the growth in that cap. This growth rate is deliberately set lower than the actual growth rate in medical costs for Medicaid beneficiaries. Why? So Republicans can cut the Federal Government's commitment to Medicaid without using the word "cut."

I don't know if they think we are just too dumb to notice, but they are cutting Medicaid. Of course, people will still get sick and will still need medical care, so what the Republicans are doing is shifting hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicaid costs to State governments, which will struggle to pick up the tab, or shifting those costs to hospitals and doctors, who will not get paid, or shifting it to the families themselves, who will try to manage those bills.

Understand what that means. Right now, if you qualify for Medicaid coverage, you get Medicaid coverage. That has been the law for decades, but the Republicans want to change that. With the cap, if you qualify for Medicaid coverage, you will get something. Nobody is really sure what. All we know is that it will not cover your expected costs of care. Think about the impact of that.

The reckless Republican plan will blow huge holes in State budgets. The Republican plan will blow huge holes in rural hospitals' budgets and in the budgets of opioid treatment centers and community health centers all across this country.

Massachusetts is using some of its Medicaid funding right now to fight the opioid crisis, but the Republican plan makes it harder to wage that fight in Massachusetts and in every other State that is battling this terrible epidemic.

The Republican plan will leave millions of people who have decent Medicaid coverage holding the bag when they get sick. That is not healthcare; that is a con job.

But it gets even worse. The bill cuts funding for Planned Parenthood, which provides maternity care and birth control. It gives insurance companies the green light to jack up costs for people over 50, blowing up the limits that were established in the ACA to make sure seniors could afford healthcare.

But there is one more very, very ugly reason the Republicans should be ashamed, and that is because while they are gutting Medicaid, slashing health coverage for sick Americans, and slapping penalties on people who lose insurance through no fault of their own, Republicans are also handing out hundreds of millions of dollars in tax

cuts to rich people and giving a special gift to insurance company CEOs.

The Republican plan repeals two Medicare taxes that apply only to high-income taxpayers. Who benefits most from this repeal? Millionaires. They get a full 80-percent of the tax cut. It is a benefit that is worth an average of \$50,000 each. That is right. The tax cut that millionaires will get from the Republican plan to rip up healthcare is more than many families make in a year.

The Republican plan also hurts Medicare by taking money away from the Medicare trust fund, where it really belongs.

Right now, the law says insurance companies can deduct only \$500,000 in executive compensation, but the Republicans think that is too hard on insurance companies and their CEOs. So sad. So they have lifted the cap to a full \$1 million. The Republicans are determined to help boost the pay of insurance company CEOs. No wonder the Republicans didn't want to let anyone see this plan.

This is literally a backroom deal to strip away lifesaving healthcare from babies, to drive the costs out of sight for seniors, to deny help for people with disabilities, and to make insurance more expensive for hard-working entrepreneurs. In exchange, insurance company CEOs and millionaires get giant tax deductions. Unbelievable. Less health insurance for people who need it; more tax cuts for wealthy insurance company CEOs. This is the deal it took Republicans years to come up with? They should be ashamed.

I have received letters and emails and calls from families in Massachusetts who depend on Medicaid and the ACA. These families are shouting as loudly as they can about how important Medicaid and the ACA are to them. We need someone running the CMS who is listening and someone who has their backs, who will tell Republican politicians that their secret deals are terrible, who will tell them that their plans to take away coverage will hurt people, who will tell them that their recklessness will blow up State budgets.

Seema Verma has a deep knowledge of the Medicaid Program, having worked at the State level to design and implement Medicaid waivers. Ms. Verma says she wants to help States like Massachusetts invest in innovative ways to improve care for Medicaid beneficiaries while lowering costs—improve care and lower costs. That sounds great, but she has also advocated for changes to Medicaid that violate the fundamental principles of the program. She has designed Medicaid plans that impose work requirements as a condition of receiving Medicaid coverage even when they make no sense. She has sought to increase the out-of-pocket costs that Medicaid beneficiaries must pay and has put in place rules that lock people out of the program just at the moment they most need coverage.

We need a CMS Administrator who will stand up to the backroom bullies who are plotting to gut Medicaid, not one who wants to sneak cuts into the very programs that need to be defended. For that reason, I oppose Ms. Verma's nomination.

One of my constituents who receives Medicaid coverage in Massachusetts, Lee from Holliston, wrote me to say: "I just need to know it is going to be okay."

Lee, I wish I could tell you that it is going to be OK, but I cannot tell you that. What I can tell you is that you are not alone. Americans depend on the ACA and Medicaid to provide healthcare coverage. They depend on it when they get sick, and they depend on it to stay alive. Now that the Republican politicians have finally emerged from their secret basement room and unveiled their ugly plans, I promise you I am in this fight all the way. We need millions of people like you all across this Nation to make their voices heard so that Republican politicians do not destroy your healthcare.

In January, Senator STABENOW and I held a forum for the then-nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tom Price. At this forum, we heard from individuals who were concerned about the impact that cuts to Medicare and Medicaid would have on their lives. I would like to share some of my interactions with a few of these individuals back in January by reading from the transcript Senator STABENOW introduced into the record at Congressman PRICE's hearing before the Finance Committee.

I started by thanking everyone for being there and said this about where we were:

Yesterday at the hearing for Congressman PRICE to be Secretary of HHS, I asked him about the cuts that he has proposed to Medicare and Medicaid. He's already proposed \$449 billion in cuts to Medicare and over \$1 trillion in cuts to the Medicaid program. And so I asked him if he would commit to follow through on Donald Trump's promise, "I won't cut Medicare or Medicaid."

There was a lot of dancing back and forth, but the bottom line is that no, he would not make that commitment, which I suppose should not have been a surprise.

What I want to do as briefly as I can is to focus just a little bit on down the line and put a face on that, what it means to put those kinds of cuts into the system.

I started with Ms. Fleming, and here is what I asked her.

I said: "You used to work at United Airlines. . . . How many years did you pay into the Medicare system?"

Ms. Fleming said: "Thirty-nine years."

I asked: "How long have you worked there?"

Ms. Fleming said: "Thirty-nine years."

I said: "Thirty-nine years that you paid into the Medicare system. Where else is it we need to spend \$449 billion so that you can spend more out-of-

pocket? So that money can go somewhere else—like tax cuts for rich people?"

I asked Ms. Jensen:

Just because I want to be clear about this, one of the things that Medicaid does is make sure you get access to mental health services. If you lose that access, what happens in your life?

So I had asked Ms. Fleming about the Medicare cuts. Here is what Ms. Jensen told me about the Medicaid cuts:

That would entirely change my life. I wouldn't be able to afford the services I need. My medications alone, right now, run about as much as my rent. And I know that weekly counseling or therapy sessions would really be out of reach. It would threaten not only the growth of my business but the existence of my business.

She runs her own small business.

She said:

Basically: no Medicaid, no business. That would kind of be the end of one of my dreams. And untreated disorders—my untreated disorder—I know I would retreat from society. I would retreat from my loved ones. I would not be a productive citizen. I would probably get into trouble and cost the taxpayers some money. Mental and behavioral health is no joke. There are fatal consequences, and it's a matter of life and death for a lot of people, including me.

Then I turned to the third of our witnesses, Ms. Serafin. She has dealt with both systems—both Medicare and Medicaid—and I asked her to focus just for a minute on the Medicaid part of that. She was taking care of her elderly mother.

I said:

Your mother—after your father passed—your mother declined, needed full time care. And she was supported by Medicaid during that period of time. She was able to be in a facility that could take care of her.

If Medicaid had not been available to you, if there had been a trillion-dollar cut to Medicaid, what would have happened to you and your husband?

Here is what Ms. Serafin said:

Well, physically, I could not take care of anyone else.

She had her own disabling medical problems. She said:

I can hardly take care of myself. So, we would have had to hire someone, or we would have had to move because our home was not accommodating for another person with a disability.

Secondly, the care my mother received in the nursing home was so personally gratifying, I could sleep at night. My mother was a really strong woman. She could have been a CEO. She was born in the wrong era. But as a daughter—as mothers and daughters often do—we didn't always see eye to eye on everything!

The people in the nursing home loved her—they loved her feisty manner, they loved the things she would say. And I would think, "Oh, God, I would never say that!" But they thought she was wonderful.

I made the point that my mother was a little like that too.

Ms. Serafin said:

I would sleep at night. I could feel good. Because I cannot do things as it is for myself, and there were loving people who would go to her and say, "I love you, Anita," and

it just made my heart feel that wonderful feeling.

So that is the face of Medicaid.

We had one more witness, and this witness was Ms. Ornella, who had her son Sam with her.

I said:

Sam is the happy face of Medicaid. Sam is a little boy who was born with multiple difficulties and who flourishes and who receives support from Medicaid.

So I asked:

If there's a trillion dollars in cuts to Medicaid, and Sam is not able to get the help he needs through Medicaid, what happens to Sam?

Ms. Ornella said:

We barely qualified for Medicaid as it was, so if there were any cuts to it, we would have been in that group of people who I believe wouldn't have qualified. Medicaid has provided him to be able to go to his kidney doctors and keep his status check on his kidneys, which is what we think his long-term issues are going to be.

Medicaid has been there to cover tests for swallowing, for swallowing functions, for all the different parts of his body that are affected by his disorder. So my fear is, that if we do get employer-based coverage, anything can happen in life—what if my husband lost his job and then we didn't qualify for Sam to get Medicaid anymore? How would we deal with that double whammy of losing employer coverage and then not qualifying for Medicaid for a medically complex child?

We heard from four people at this forum, and I am very grateful to all four of them for putting a face on what Medicare and Medicaid means. I suggested to Congressman Price that if he is confirmed to be the head of HHS, that he cut out the statement that Donald Trump had made, "I will not cut Medicare or Medicaid," and that he tape it above his desk and look at it every single day. Because that is what the people at that hearing were all about.

They are the reason we must not cut Medicare and we must not cut Medicaid, and I thanked them all for being with us.

Alice, Sam, Diane, and Ann really put a face on the importance of Medicare and Medicaid at that forum.

I have heard from a number of hospitals, community health centers, and behavioral health organizations in Massachusetts about the importance of Medicaid to them for being able to provide essential services to the people who need it most, and I want to share some of the comments they have given to me.

John Nash, the CEO of Franciscan Children's Hospital, highlighted the importance of Medicaid in providing healthcare coverage for our children. Here is what he wrote to me:

Dear Senator Warren, at Franciscan Children's, our mission is to provide a compassionate and positive environment where children with complex medical, mental health, and educational needs receive specialized care for people who are committed to excellence, innovation, and family support, so that these children can reach their fullest potential and live their best lives. Located in the Boston metropolitan area, we are one of four institutions in the country offering this unique array of services to children with complex needs.

In Massachusetts, we are the only pediatric, post-acute care provider that offers hospital-level care for children with complex medical conditions. We are also one of the largest pediatric mental health providers in Massachusetts, offering a complete continuum of inpatient, residential, and outpatient programming to ensure that children have access to the services they desperately need.

Franciscan Children's is proud to be an independent, unaffiliated provider that coordinates across the healthcare system to deliver high-quality, low-cost, specialty services to children who come to us from every major health system and intensive care unit from across the State. Collectively across our programs, we serve more than 12,000 children a year.

Families who have had a child or children with special needs often face tremendous financial burdens. Many view hospitals like ours as a second home. Almost 60 percent of the families that we serve in our inpatient medical program are on Medicaid.

In federal discussions about the Affordable Care Act, it is crucial to realize that Medicaid is the most important health coverage program for children. As many as 30 million children nationally and 355,000 children in Massachusetts (29.6% of the state population of children) are covered. Children covered by Medicaid—compared with those who are uninsured—generally go on to enjoy better health, lower rates of mortality, and higher educational and economic outcomes as they become adults.

Massachusetts is seeing the returns on investments made in Medicaid. Our rate of uninsured children is at the lowest on record. Cuts to Medicaid will have a negative impact on children and may increase healthcare costs. Furthermore, any cuts to the Medicaid program will threaten our institution's long-term ability to serve children and their families who may not receive care otherwise. As the population of children with complex needs continues to grow at the rate of 5 percent annually, these funds will be vital to our future and to theirs.

We support the belief that access to affordable care is essential for all individuals. Our families, whose resilience and strength continues to inspire us every day, depend on this principle being upheld. Our children deserve every opportunity to reach their fullest potential and live their best life.

This letter is just a reminder of who gets Medicaid and how Medicaid changes the lives of the children who need it most and of their families. We cannot cut this program without taking away the futures of these children. This is an economic issue, but it is also a moral issue.

I heard from the Behavioral and Health Network, a nonprofit community behavioral health agency in Western Massachusetts, and they shared with me an individual story they wanted to tell me about Tasha.

Tasha went from homelessness to addiction and then to recovery—highlighting the importance of Medicaid funds in supporting individuals who are dealing with substance abuse disorder. The behavioral health network shared a story, and this is how they tell it:

Tasha M. recalls how her addiction started. She never envisioned how and where it would end. As a teenager, she remembers being homeless, her mom surrendering her to foster care twice and living a dysfunctional life, leading to the development of an eating disorder and hospitalization.

It was during that hospital stay where she was also receiving treatment for an injured back, that she was prescribed a bottle of painkillers. That started Tasha on the road to addiction, and ultimately to BHN's, "My Sister's House"—and her eventual recovery.

Once addicted to pain pills she remembers "hospital hopping" to feed the addiction. "I felt so alone," she said. Moving in with an aunt brought the prospect of turning the page and leaving her addiction behind. Instead, Tasha started to work as a bartender, ultimately succumbing to alcohol and hitting bottom. Tasha says, "I lost everything."

Moving back to Massachusetts, she "tried to start anew." But instead she found herself back in the clubs and around alcohol and, eventually, in a detox program through BHN's Carlson Center. After that one-week stay, she entered Hope Center, a BHN 30-day recovery addiction treatment program in Springfield. Once released, the grip of addiction surfaced again. "I remember getting ready to go clubbing with my boyfriend. We were in line to go into a club and I realized I didn't have my ID. I went home and I found my ID lying on top of my AA book. I thought, 'wow, that's a sign'—and I need to get back in the program."

BHN assisted with entry into My Sister's House, a BHN community-based program for women in recovery, where its residents have daily therapy and support, peer meetings and are connected to community resources.

It is also where Tasha met an intern who inspired her. "I remember I was one of her first clients. She said I couldn't go back to my old ways . . . she really believed in me."

Tasha's recovery has come full circle. After successful re-entry into the community, she acquired a job as an administrative assistant at a daycare center, and eventually became a social worker helping mothers of children navigate the complexities of parenting.

Tasha's story doesn't end there. Tasha was offered a position at My Sister's House, where she assists other young women who find themselves on the sometimes bumpy road to recovery. "For me, it's about giving back . . . I'm grateful to them."

About the new opportunity to help others at My Sister's House, Tasha said: "I always said to myself I was going to come back to this House . . . this is my second home."

Tasha's journey was supported by an organization whose funding is 56 percent State and Federal contracts and 42 percent fees from Medicaid, Medicare and a small percentage of private insurances. Clearly, the impact of affordable insurance and funds from CMS and the State creates needed access and opportunities for changing lives [like Tasha's]. Individuals can embrace help, move beyond despair and hardship, and establish meaningful life experiences, employment and self-sufficiency. Without affordable insurance, Medicaid and Federal and State funds, that could not happen.

Thank you, Tasha, for telling your story. Thank you to the Behavioral Network for sharing your story. Thank you for all of the amazing work that you do every single day.

The Boston Medical Center, the State's largest safety net hospital, also shared their perspective on how changes and cuts to Medicaid would seriously impact the progress they have made in working to provide high-quality, cost-effective care to their patients. Here is what Boston Medical Center said:

At Boston Medical Center (BMC), our mission is to provide Exceptional Care without

exception to all of our patients. As the largest health safety net system in Massachusetts and in New England, BMC and the patients we serve would be severely impacted by major changes to the Affordable Care Act.

Massachusetts health care reform in 2008, and subsequently the Affordable Care Act, supported our efforts to provide high-quality, cost effective care to the many, formerly uninsured, patients who became insured through Medicaid and subsidized products. BMC has worked diligently with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to transition the payment and delivery of Medicaid services in a more cost effective manner. With a strong understanding of the need to ensure that the future of Medicaid is sustainable, our collective efforts have begun to produce encouraging results.

Medicaid—and access to affordable, subsidized health care insurance—is an important federal/state partnership that allows the most vulnerable in our population to receive the health care they need. At BMC, we see firsthand how it affects the lives of our patients. In addition to providing funding for important primary care services, it is a lifeline for those with chronic diseases and mental health and substance abuse needs.

BMC has used Medicaid funding to develop and implement a number of very promising programs aimed at improving the quality of care for our low-income population and doing it in a manner that is the most cost effective. We aim to keep our patients out of the hospital while giving them the care necessary to lead fulfilling lives.

Some of these efforts include innovative programs for pregnant women and babies both before and after delivery. Post-partum depression is an all-too-common issue for new mothers. BMC has designed a program that embeds necessary behavioral health services into the OB/GYN visit setting, thereby allowing them to receive the necessary mental health care along with their medical visit.

At the same time, we have several successful programs focusing on newborn infants—ranging from babies born prematurely to those born addicted to drugs. As New England's largest trauma center, we routinely treat large numbers of patients who have been victims of violence. In an effort to help break the trend of violence in the inner city, BMC offers many programs that help those victims break that cycle through counseling, education and support.

Boston, like many cities across the country, has seen an unacceptable level of opioid related deaths. Probably our most critical efforts today include programs that successfully treat opioid and other drug addictions while guiding patients toward prevention of future drug abuse and a life where they can hold a job and maintain their relationships with their families.

Working with the Commonwealth, BMC has also used Medicaid funding to redesign how health care is provided in a manner that ensures the highest quality patient care in the most affordable, patient-centric manner. The groundwork has been laid over the last several years with Medicaid waiver funding. As we prepare for implementation of the Medicaid waiver extension, we have just begun to roll-out our Medicaid Accountable Care Organization, (ACO). The ACO structure requires that we will be accountable for the full cost of each Medicaid patient's health care, while it will allow the flexibility to provide the right care that might not have previously been covered (e.g. purchase of humidifier for an asthmatic child that will help prevent hospitalizations). Patients will benefit through further integration of care across the delivery system continuum,

while reimbursement for the cost of treating those patients will be contained in a defined agreement.

These important Massachusetts efforts of transforming the delivery and payment system for Medicaid will be dealt a serious blow if the underlying Medicaid funding is changed. Additionally, if Medicaid and subsidized healthcare eligibility changes result in our patients losing access to affordable health care, not only will the patient's quality of life suffer, but the lack of funding will not allow [us] to continue to provide those patients with many of these critical services.

BMC is committed to maintaining the provision of exceptional care without exception and it will require the financial partnership with the federal and state government to ensure that our low-income patients have access to that care.

Boston Medical Center absolutely provides "Exceptional Care without Exception," and Medicaid helps them carry out that critical work.

The Boston Center for Independent Living shared with me a story from a constituent named Ty who receives healthcare from One Care, a program in Massachusetts that integrates care for beneficiaries who are dually eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid. So I will tell a little bit about Ty's story.

Ty Muto, a 39-year-old transgender man, was recovering from colon surgery in 2014 when he stopped outside of his work and was assaulted by three men yelling homophobic slurs. He survived the attack with a traumatic brain injury and spinal cord injury and is only alive thanks to several necessary, timely medical interventions. A former mediator and American Friends Service Committee volunteer, Ty is enrolled in One Care with the Commonwealth Care Alliance. They provide medical care, visiting nurse support, physical therapy, and medical rides. His Care Manager helped him apply for Social Security and find housing, which really improved his life! On several occasions his visiting nurse has identified urgent medical conditions and he has been able to take a medical ride to the hospital where he receives care—avoiding lengthy and expensive emergency room visits at local hospitals that aren't equipped to care for his specific condition. Ty says the only reason he's alive today is because of all of the services and care he gets through One Care.

That is the work being done at the Boston Center for Independent Living, and it can only be done because they receive the support of Medicare and Medicaid.

The Boston Center for Independent Living also shared with me a story from another constituent named Olivia.

Olivia Richards is a 33-year-old woman on One Care and, as she emphasizes, a lifelong Bruins fan! Her plan with CCA allows her to be an active member of the community and her care coordinator assists her in managing her seizure disorder, paraplegia, PTSD, and ADHD. Olivia grew up in the foster care system and, after college, rather than move in with an abusive family member, she tried to make it on her own and she ended up homeless. Left without insurance—and trying to keep up with her di-lanthin, ADHD and asthma medications from seven- to fourteen-day sample packs from a free clinic—she went on and off medication and eventually ended up in a psychiatric hospital for a month.

If she had been making that transition in the post-Romneycare age, she would have

maintained her health insurance and been able to stay on MassHealth. Olivia raves about her coordinated care manager (CCA) and how she's helped stabilize Olivia's health—recognizing issues before they become emergencies. Prior to One Care, Olivia went to the emergency room every few months with a severe UTI that landed her in the hospital. Her care coordinator recommended she see an infectious disease doctor, who prescribed a preventive antibiotic—something none of the many doctors she'd seen had put together. Olivia hasn't been to the hospital for a UTI since.

This time around, when Olivia needed emergency care, her care coordinator sent community medics to her apartment—providing her with better care and avoiding an expensive emergency room visit and other complications. Before One Care, Olivia was using a third-hand wheelchair with a bent frame and a wheel that she had to weld back together every few months. Medicare and Medicaid kept dodging responsibility for wheelchair repairs. Olivia's care coordinator helped her get a new chair.

That is a real quality-of-life improvement for Olivia.

I want to say a special thank you to both Ty and to Olivia for sharing their stories, for letting us make them public, and a very big thanks to the Boston Center for Independent Living for all that you are doing every single day to help the people of Massachusetts. We are all deeply grateful for your work, and we want to continue to support it here in Congress.

Many of my constituents have written to me, fearful of what changes to Medicare or Medicaid might actually mean to them. Jeffrey, who is from Gardner, wrote to me to share his constant worries about health insurance coverage. This is what he wrote:

Dear Senator Warren,

I hope this message finds you well, and I want to thank you for your continued fight for the rights of everyone in Massachusetts & the nation.

Unfortunately, this election has left me with some constant worry, as I'm sure it has many. I'm a graduate student and have a year and a half left until I complete my masters degree in counseling psychology.

Obviously because of this, I work part-time, and am not offered health insurance through my employer. I have been on MassHealth (Tufts Network Health, to be exact) since 2013 when I decided to make a career change.

I have some issues that require prescriptions and doctors visits monthly. I'm not sure if they can be deemed as preexisting conditions, but these are prescriptions I can certainly not go without, nor could I go without insurance for a year and a half.

Obviously I don't enjoy being on MassHealth, but for right now it's what is necessary. My question may be a difficult one to answer, due to the fact that no one truly knows what will happen after inauguration day. I do know Massachusetts is better protected than other states to keep its citizens insured, and I know that you and Governor Baker have vowed to fight for this right, as well as for many others—which I could not be more thankful for!

If the new establishment has their way and repeals federal funding to Medicaid, will people in Massachusetts such as myself be thrown off their insurance? I know we rely heavily on a waiver that was signed recently, and it's a "wait and see matter," but I suppose my question is, will I be protected since

I have documented needs for insurance already in place? Or are my conditions going to be deemed "not severe enough?"

All I can say, Jeffrey, is we don't know yet, but I can promise you that I am fighting to make sure you remain protected.

Elise from Scituate wrote to me about the importance of Medicare and Medicaid funds in supporting nursing homes, adult day health programs, and other needs of older adults. Here is what Elise had to say:

Dear Senator Warren,

I am writing to you because I am very concerned about the direction of the incoming administration, President-Elect Trump, and his cabinet choices. It was certainly a difficult election period. The policies and direction of these individuals is particularly troubling for those who are older, or who may have mental illness, disabilities, or developmental challenges.

As many are not aware, the federal rules, regulations, and budget do affect the management of services in the states. As a consultant in Massachusetts in both nursing homes and adult day health programs, I see the strong need for cooperative and supportive federal and state funding as well as regulatory processes for ongoing care. Very few of the individuals in these settings are paying privately. Medicare and Medicaid—as well as the VA—are the major funders for these programs.

In Massachusetts, we have 45,000 nursing home beds, or approximately 400 skilled nursing facilities. Home care incorporates adult day health, and we have roughly 14,600 participants in Massachusetts alone. Our population is aging, and access to good services are critical to good care and quality of life.

In addition, there are many programs that continue to need commitment and funding to manage necessary services to individuals. These include: housing (Section 8), elder and those with disabilities home care, services to the blind, and community mental health care—to name a few.

Changes in these benefits would jeopardize the delicate balance of home and community care, rehabilitation, and perhaps ultimately end up costing more for care. For example, if we don't have resources to assist people to return to the community, institutional care may be the only answer—and a costly one.

The notion of having poor individuals pay for their Medicaid benefits, and/or privatizing this to an insurance base is ill-founded and often becomes costly to manage, as well as lowers benefits. Aside from providing services to our citizens, the reduction in these programs will drag the overall economy down.

The healthcare industry (private enterprise) is dependent upon a multitude of programs to generate profit. For example, if Mr. X needs a wheel chair and Medicare does not pay for one, Mr. X will not pay for a new wheel chair. He will either borrow one, or purchase one used, or perhaps "do without." This scenario, regardless of the product, will duplicate itself throughout health care and service provision. Companies that have dependency upon Medicare funds may have to close or cut back. Service providers, such as Visiting Nurses, will be facing similar results.

I have been in the older adult/health care/medical field since 1969. I have seen changes over time to services from government provisions to privatization. Privatization is the one of the poor outcomes when government monies are used to pay for services rendered. I remain a very strong advocate for individuals and their families as they try to meet

the challenges of obtaining just and fair services.

Thank you, Elise. I appreciate your writing. Medicare and Medicaid provide critical funds to support nursing homes and senior citizens in Massachusetts. I agree that we must fight to protect these programs.

I have many constituents writing in. My constituents are shouting as loudly as they can about the need to protect Medicare and Medicaid. We need a CMS Administrator who will stand up for

Tasha and for other individuals who are struggling with addiction, who will stand up for those who are relying on Medicare to help with Parkinson's, who will stand up for our hospitals and healthcare providers to ensure that they have the resources they need to adequately serve their patients. I am listening. I am fighting.

Republicans are trying to cut back-room deals to end these protections. I promise you, I will do everything in my power to prevent them from destroying

your healthcare. That is why I am here.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:34 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 9, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN FLEMING AND FAMILY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. John Fleming, his wife Suzanne, and children John and Andrew, who all tragically died in a plane crash over Lake Erie last December.

John was born December 30, 1970 in Youngstown, Ohio. His wife Suzanne was born September 22, 1970 in Youngstown as well. Both John and Suzanne were 1989 graduates of Boardman High School and high school sweethearts. John graduated magna cum laude from Wake Forest University in 1993 as a CPA and member of Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity. Suzanne graduated from Youngstown State University with a Bachelor's Degree in social work. They were seventeen year residents of Columbus.

John worked for almost 30 years for the Superior Beverage Group in Columbus and the beverage distribution industry. He was incredibly successful, rising to President and Chief Executive Officer. In addition to his influential leadership in his career, he was a leader in his community. He actively volunteered at nearby charities, and was a yearly supporter of the Dublin Irish Festival. Above all, he was known for being a family man.

His wife Suzanne was a devoted mother and passionate supporter of Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, the leading funder of type 1 diabetes research. Their oldest son John was a sophomore at Oletangy Liberty High School where he excelled academically and was an Ohio sports enthusiast. His younger brother Andrew attended the Ohio State School for the Blind in Columbus. Like his brother, he too was an avid supporter of sports, and he also participated in Special Olympics. This family will be greatly missed by their family, friends, colleagues, and their community.

I extend my condolences to their family and friends. These wonderful people will be dearly missed.

REMEMBERING JUSTICE "JAY" SMYTH, III

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and legacy of Mr. Justice "Jay" Smyth, III, who passed away on February 10, 2017 at the age of 62. Jay was a loving father, son, brother, uncle, and husband. To me, he was a dear classmate, colleague, and friend for more than forty years.

Jay attended both undergraduate and law school at the University of Alabama, where he

was involved in the Student Government Association and Theta Chi Fraternity. During his time in school, he was inducted into numerous honor societies such as JASON Senior Men's Honorary and Delta Theta Phi Legal Honorary.

After graduating from law school in 1980, Jay practiced law in Montgomery, Alabama for nineteen years before moving to Tuscaloosa. Jay was a skilled and thoughtful lawyer who earned tremendous respect from his colleagues. As a true testament to his personality and legal knowledge, Jay was also beloved by his clients; an anomaly for most in the legal community.

Jay was a skilled writer who excelled at telling stories and always took great interest in politics and history. He loved spending time outdoors and grilling out at home. He was a dedicated fan of the Alabama Crimson Tide and greatly enjoyed attending games with his family. Jay was delighted in spending time with his wife and children, whom he loved dearly. Most importantly, he was steadfast in his faith to God and served as a pillar of Christ in his family and his community.

So, to his wife, Rushan, and sons, Justice and Jeff, I want to extend my deepest sympathies. May you take comfort in the warm memories of Jay and the lasting impact he had on so many.

TRIBUTE TO THE BURBANK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special recognition to the Burbank Unified School District as it celebrates its Ninetieth Anniversary.

In 1927, the Burbank Union High School District (BUSD) and the Elementary City School District unified to become the Burbank City School District, which served approximately 1,000 students. The name later changed to Burbank Unified School District to reflect state educational standards.

Today, BUSD's total enrollment is approximately 15,000 students, who attend grades K-12 at three high schools, three middle schools, and eleven elementary schools. The District also has an Alternative Education Program, an Adult Education Program which serves more than 5,000 students, and numerous district child care centers serving preschool or school age children.

The Burbank Unified School District's mission statement reflects its purpose by building partnerships with parents, families, students, and the community and promises the effective use of all available resources to create, provide, and support quality instructional programs, services, and environments. The District strives to ensure that every student develops the skills, knowledge, attitude, and behav-

ior in order to be a responsible, productive citizen and lifelong learner in a diverse and changing global society.

BUSD is proud to have had seven of its elementary schools named as 2016 Gold Ribbon recipients as well as all three of its middle schools and its comprehensive high schools recognized as California Distinguished Schools. Five elementary schools have earned the distinction of being named 2016 Academic Achievement Award winning schools and four are designated as having Exemplary Arts programs. In addition, the District's continuation high school, Monterey High, has been selected as a state model school, and the Burbank Adult School has been honored as a Program of Excellence by the State of California.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring the Burbank Unified School District upon the celebration of its Ninetieth Anniversary. The entire community joins me in thanking the past and current School Board Members, Superintendents, Teachers, Administrators and Support Staff of Burbank Unified School District for the outstanding educational opportunities they have provided for the youth of California's 28th Congressional District.

WESTERN NEW YORK COMMUNITY UNITY

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate people in my district coming together to take a stand against bigotry, racism, and acts of hate. On March 7, 2017, members of the Muslim Public Affairs Council met with members of the Jewish community at the Jewish Community Center in Getzville, NY. Both groups sat down together to take a stand against recent threats towards the Jewish community in Western New York.

This act of solidarity is an example of a community coming together despite their different backgrounds and beliefs. This type of collaboration in the face of hate is a model for the rest of the country.

During my recent meeting with the Muslim Public Affairs Council, we discussed the importance of uniting behind our shared American values, such as inclusivity and tolerance. The recent demonstration of unity by members of the Jewish community and the Muslim community demonstrates that despite any differences, we are all Americans and must join together in condemning hateful acts in our community.

For their demonstrated leadership, I commemorate the groups and individuals working to bring unity to Western New York.

● 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.

THE PASSING OF VALERIY
“LARRY” SAVINKIN

HON. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today in recognition of the untimely passing of Valeriy “Larry” Savinkin, a dedicated and well-respected community leader and my congressional field representative who served the residents of the 8th Congressional District of New York with distinction.

Larry Savinkin was born on October 25, 1955, to Igor and Ada Savinkin. He was brother to Viola, husband to Valentina, father to Galina and Vladimir, father-in-law to Vadim and grandfather to Victor.

Before migrating to Brooklyn with his family from Odessa, Ukraine in 1996, Larry was a hardworking business owner where he operated a door-making company and a chain of merchant stores. Larry’s commitment, core values and work ethic allowed him to excel in various positions. He was previously employed as a computer programmer, worked for the United States Census Bureau and served as a Community Liaison for former Congressman Bob Turner. More recently, he was a project manager at the Jewish Association for Serving the Aging (JASA), a local community-based organization that serves older adults of all races, religions and economic backgrounds across New York City.

Larry’s success and impact in the neighborhoods of Southern Brooklyn and Queens was not limited to his work with my congressional office. For over 20 years, he was involved in several prominent organizations including the September 11 Family Group, the Brighton Beach Business Improvement District, The Holocaust Memorial Committee, Odessa Community of New York, and Brooklyn’s Community Planning Board 13. Larry had a magnetic personality and cared about his community immensely, approached his work with urgency, compassion and had a great sense of humor.

I had the privilege of knowing Larry and working with him throughout the years. I recognize that his integrity was above reproach and his competence was extraordinary. I thank his family and friends for sharing him with us all. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in extending gratitude for Larry Savinkin’s public service and his commitment to the people of Brooklyn, he is worthy of the highest praise.

DAY WITHOUT A WOMAN

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, across the nation, from every major city to every small town, women are standing in solidarity, and reminding the world of our contributions. On this Day Without A Woman, women are sending a powerful message about the role we play in local communities, in our nation and throughout the globe.

Yet, sadly, on this very same day that women are standing up to end gender dis-

crimination and economic injustice, defend our bodies from governmental intrusion and to choose our own destiny, Republicans are proceeding with legislation to roll back the clock. Congressional Committees are starting to consider legislation eviscerating the Affordable Care Act. Not only would the Republican plan slash Medicaid, harming working women and children, but it defends Planned Parenthood, ultimately depriving millions of women of life-saving health services.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad irony on this Day Without A Woman, when millions of ordinary Americans are standing for women’s rights and a more just economy, Congressional Republicans are rushing to deprive millions of women and their families of health services they need to survive. This bill was composed behind closed doors, in secret, and now Republicans are rushing it through the Committee process to avoid scrutiny.

On this Day Without A Woman, we are sending a powerful message. I can only hope my Republican colleagues in Congress are listening. Because, today, women everywhere are saying with one collective voice, we will not be silenced.

HONORING CHIEF ALAN BRAGG: 45 YEARS IN EDUCATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Chief Alan Bragg, who is retiring after serving a distinguished 45 years in educational law enforcement. He is a lifetime member of what I referred to as the Poe-leece. It is an informal organization made up of long-time friends in Texas’ law enforcement community. It is an honor to pay tribute to Chief Bragg as he retires on June 30, 2017 as Chief of Police at Cypress-Fairbanks ISD Police Department.

Alan Bragg was born and raised in Wichita Falls, Texas, and was destined to become a Texas Lawman. He attended Midwestern State University and worked for the university’s police department at the beginning of his career. In 1981, Chief Bragg moved to Houston to take a position with the Houston Independent School District Police Department.

He gained nine years’ experience with Houston ISD, all the while his pursuit to build safer schools grew. This passion led him to accept a job, in 1990, as Spring Independent School District’s first ever Chief of Police. He was tasked to create a new police department from scratch. He started his force with 8 officers and it has grown to over 50 sworn officers. He was responsible for nearly 37,000 students, 5,000 employees and 38 campuses. His 21 year leadership and legacy at Spring ISD will not be forgotten.

Chief Bragg obtained additional police training along the way. He is a graduate of the FBI’s National Academy 201 class and holds a Master Peace Officer Certificate. Throughout the years, he has assisted and been recognized by numerous boards and organizations. He is a member and past president of the Houston Area Police Chiefs Association, North Harris County Criminal Justice Association,

and he also served on the board of the Texas Association of School District Police.

For over 20 years, he has coordinated the annual “Salute to Law Enforcement” event, an event that was always held close to National Police Week. It allowed folks to meet local law enforcement officers from different agencies, see the resources used to protect them, and provide an overall positive experience between our law enforcement officers and citizens.

Chief Bragg is a dedicated family man, having been married to his wife Judy for 26 years. He met Judy after the 1979 Terrible Tuesday Tornado that hit Wichita Falls. They were both temporarily homeless, and met at church. They are the proud parents of two children, seven grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. His retirement will provide time for them to serve in their church, travel on mission trips, and spend time with their grandchildren.

During those years with Spring, Chief Bragg distinguished himself as an educational law enforcement leader. He possesses a wealth of knowledge, and the entire law enforcement community views him with esteem and respect. His department served as a model for other school district police departments to follow.

Not surprisingly, Chief Bragg’s impressive leadership and integrity led him to his last career move. In 2012, he accepted the new start up position as Chief of Police for Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District. Again, he created another exemplary police force from scratch. For 45 years, he has put on the badge and a gun to protect and serve the folks and communities he loves.

Chief Bragg has been one of the most prominent and important lawman in the 2nd Congressional District, a true Texas hero. He is a remarkable Texan who has achieved extraordinary things in his law enforcement career and for his community. I extend to him my congratulations on his retirement, and commend him for a job well done. I wish him the best of luck in the future as he enters into this new phase of life.

And that’s just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, I missed votes due to unavoidable flight delays. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on roll call votes no. 127 and 128.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 2017, I missed the vote for H.R. 1362.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 127.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. LYNN JENKINS**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for roll call votes 127 and 128 on the evening of March 7, 2017. I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1362, which names the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'au'a'a Hunkin VA Clinic. I would have also voted in favor of the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 127; and YEA on Roll Call No. 128.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H.R. 1362, a bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'au'a'a Hunkin VA Clinic (Roll Call No. 127), I would have voted Aye.

Had I been present for the vote on Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair (Roll Call No. 128), I would have voted "No."

HONORING THE MEMORY OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR WILLIAM FRANCIS RYAN, U.S. ARMY RETIRED

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 2017, Families of the Shield, Inc. will honor the life and sacrifices of Command Sergeant Major William Francis Ryan (USA, Retired) by raising the United States flag over a Big Red One Statue at Eddie's Sunrise Diner located at 55 E. NASA Blvd. in Melbourne, Florida. On February 28, 2017, at my request, the Architect of the Capitol flew the United States Flag over our Capitol Building to further honor Command Sergeant Major Ryan.

Command Sergeant Major Ryan first joined the Merchant Marines and received six Russian medals. He then enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1943 landing on Omaha Beach June 6, 1944, with the first wave of American soldiers. Ryan was a member of the 1st Inf. Div.'s 16th Infantry Regiment during D-Day and the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. During his 30 plus years of service he also volunteered for numerous tours of duty in Korea and Vietnam.

William Ryan retired from the military in 1973 to enjoy his boat, volunteer at the Honor America Museum. Over the years, made several trips back to Belgium and France to honor our fallen heroes, most recently for the 70th Anniversary of D-Day.

Command Sergeant Major Ryan's awards and decorations include: the Bronze Star Medals with (V) Device, the Army Commendation Medal, the Purple Heart, Distinguished Unit Citation, American Campaign Medal, Good Conduct Medal (1st–9th Awards), European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, WWII Victory Medal, Army of Occupation Medal (GER), National Defense Service Medal (1OLC), Korean Service Medal, Vietnam Services Medal, Belgium Fourragere, In Service Medal, Korean Presidential Unit Citation, Vietnam Campaign Medal w/ 60 Device, Combat Infantry Badge.

William Ryan is survived by his beloved daughter Corrine and her husband Charles; his son Mark, his wife Shannon and their son Paul; his former wife, Lorraine Ryan; pre-deceased by his son, David W. Ryan and his sister, Margaret Christie. He will be remembered by his many grandchildren, great grandchildren, nieces, nephews and dear friends.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Command Sergeant Major William F. Ryan's service to our nation and his commitment to the cause of liberty.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 2017, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted:

NO on Roll Call Vote 116, H. Res. 156, Providing for consideration of H.R. 1004, the Regulatory Integrity Act of 2017; and H.R. 1009, the OIRA Insight, Reform, and Accountability Act.

I would have cast my vote in opposition to this resolution because the Rules Committee rejected a motion by Ms. Slaughter of New York to consider both H.R. 1004 and H.R. 1009 under open Rules. The Rules Committee also rejected a motion by Mr. McGovern of Massachusetts to strike the waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1009 which includes waiver of CUTGO, statutory pay-go, and sections 303 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for roll call votes 127 and 128 on Tuesday, March 7, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on roll call vote 127 and "Nay" on roll call vote 128.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 128 on Tabling the Appeal of the

Ruling of the Chair, I mistakenly recorded my vote as yes when I should have voted no.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, on account of illness, I was not present for votes on March 7, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 127, and YEA on Roll Call No. 128.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 2017, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present, would have voted:

NO on Roll Call Vote 104, H. Res. 150, On Agreeing to the Resolution—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 998) SCRUB Act, and providing for consideration of (H.J. Res. 83) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to Clarification of Employers Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness.

I would have cast my vote in opposition to this resolution because the Rules Committee rejected a motion by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida to strike the waiver of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act for H.J. Res. 83.

IN RECOGNITION OF MUSLIM LAKHANI

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituent, Muslim Lakhani, for his contributions to Virginia's 10th District and the nation. Mr. Lakhani, a Pakistani immigrant and entrepreneur, has long championed efforts to promote tolerance among different faiths, to partake in charitable projects, and to conduct strong, forward-thinking business practices.

Mr. Lakhani grew up in Karachi, Pakistan and later became an entrepreneur. His many business ventures allowed him to travel to countless countries throughout the Middle East and Europe. However, it was the lessons he learned as a young child that have truly shaped his humanitarian and caring mindset that he maintains today.

Growing up in Pakistan, he and his family always place a very strong focus on helping those less fortunate. After moving to the United States in 2006, Mr. Lakhani was regularly reminded of his family's values as he watched organizations like the Salvation Army help the homeless in Washington, D.C. Since 2008, Mr. Lakhani has been a strong supporter, contributor, and advocate for the Grate

Patrol Homeless Outreach Program, which provides professional guidance to homeless people and also feeds 200 people daily in the nation's capital. Additionally, Mr. Lakhani studied both Christian and Muslim texts in grade school, which is where he garnered an interest in diverse beliefs and religious tolerance. Social Vision, the self-funded philanthropic arm of his company, ML Resources LLC., focuses on establishing stronger interfaith relationships, and additionally Mr. Lakhani strongly advocates for defeating terrorism.

Mr. Lakhani's childhood lessons coupled with his work ethic and strong business practices have allowed him to make a great impact on today's society. He has had the opportunity to speak in Rabat, Morocco at the Forum for the Future meeting on behalf of the Arab Business Council, and has received impressive awards, such as the InterFaith Bridge Builders Award at last year's InterFaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Mr. Lakhani. It is a privilege to represent him and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF BEE SWADER MALONE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize the birthday of Bee Swader Malone. She will turn 100 on March 30th.

Jessie Beatrice Swader Malone was born on March 30, 1917 in the Pine Grove community on Sand Mountain in DeKalb County, Alabama. Born to Robert and Addie Swader, she grew up on her parents' farm and attended school in nearby High Point and Valley Head, graduating from Valley Head High School in 1937.

Bee was working at J.C. Penney when she first met Marvin E. Malone, Jr., who worked in the shoe department there. They married and settled in Fort Payne, Alabama where Marvin worked for Southland Sox, Inc. They had three daughters: Kay, Ann, and Susan; and three grandchildren: Shannon, Oliver, and Halle; and now Bee is the great-grandmother of two girls: LizaBanks and Bea.

Bee and Marvin ran Malone Mills, a hosiery finishing mill in Fort Payne, for many years. First Presbyterian Church in Fort Payne honored her with a life membership for her active role there over many decades. Bee is still known in the church and far beyond for her excellent cooking, gardening, sewing, and handwork. She has voted in every single presidential election since she turned the legal voting age, which was then 21, and she was profiled in the Times-Journal last November for being one of the oldest registered voters in DeKalb County.

Bee still lives on her own today, in her house of almost 57 years on a hill overlooking Fort Payne. This month Bee will be celebrating her 100th birthday with a gathering of family and friends. Please join me in wishing this centenarian a very happy birthday.

REMEMBERING ENI F. H.
FALEOMAVAEGA

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of our friend and colleague, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega of American Samoa, who passed away on Wednesday, February 22, 2017. He was the longest serving delegate to the House of Representatives, and I had the honor of serving with him over the past few years and when I was first in Congress from 1995 to 2001. It was at the beginning of that chapter that we, freshman members of the class of 1994, soon realized what a wise man he was, and we often looked to him for wisdom and institutional knowledge throughout the years we served together. I will miss that, and I know all of us here in the House extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, Hinanui Hunkin, their 10 children, and their 15 grandchildren. Know that you remain in our thoughts and prayers and that we grieve with you.

CONGRATULATING ERNEST AND JOAN RISTER ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while January 1967 brought record-breaking snowstorms to Chicago, Texas had temperatures in the mid-70s. This was perfect for Ernest and Joan Rister of Round Rock, Texas, who joined hands on January 22, 1967 at St. Cyril Methodist Catholic Church in Granger, Texas to become husband and wife.

Decades have passed and the Risters are as devoted to one another as the day they wed. They recently celebrated their 50th anniversary with over 400 guests honoring their Czech and German roots. All in attendance celebrated the Risters' longevity and deep love for one another.

They met in grade school while living in Granger, TX and started dating their freshman year. These two high school sweethearts have been inseparable ever since. Following their wedding, Ernest graduated from Southwestern University in Georgetown and served in the United States Marine Corps. They returned to Texas and moved to Round Rock in 1975, living in the same house ever since.

Ernest currently works as a research chemist and Joan is a retired real estate appraiser. They love the outdoors, gardening, hunting, and fishing. They especially enjoy spending time with their son Ernest Lee Rister, III and his wife Annie, daughter Shelley and her husband Malcolm Middlebrook, and two grandchildren Camryn and Zachary Middlebrook. There's no doubt the Risters have built a happy life together.

Marriages like the Risters are the foundations of one of our most cherished institutions and give us all an ideal to which we can aspire. Their undying love for one another makes both Texas and our nation strong. I congratulate Joan and Ernest on 50 years to-

gether and wish them the best in the years to come.

IN MEMORY OF THE HON. ENI F.H.
FALEOMAVAEGA

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD an official statement and tribute written by the family and staff of our former colleague, Congressman Eni F.H. Faleomavaega of American Samoa. Congressman Faleomavaega was a good friend, an outstanding colleague, and a fighter for the people of American Samoa.

IN LOVING MEMORY OF CONGRESSMAN ENI F.H.
FALEOMAVAEGA OF AMERICAN SAMOA BY HIS
FAMILY AND STAFF

The Honorable Eni F.H. Faleomavaega was American Samoa's longest-serving Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, and the first Asian-Pacific American to serve as Chairman of the influential House Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment. He held the matai, or chieftain, orator title of Faleomavaega.

Eni Hunkin, Jr. was born in the village of Vailoatai, American Samoa on August 15, 1943. He was raised in lovely Laie, Hawaii where the skies are blue and "the rainbows spread their shining wings." He played full-back for the Red Raiders at Kahuku High School, graduating in 1962. At the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC), he was a canoe paddler and a dancer. In 1964, he graduated from the Church College of Hawaii (BYU-Hawaii) with an Associate of Arts (AA) Degree. He earned a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Political Science from Brigham Young University (1966); a Juris Doctor (JD) from the University of Houston Law School (1972); and a Master of Laws (LLM) from the University of California, Berkeley Boalt Hall School of Law (1973). English was his second language.

From 1973-1975, Eni Hunkin, Jr. served as Administrative Assistant to Paramount Chief A.U. Fuimaono, American Samoa's first elected Representative to Washington, DC. From 1975-1981, he served as Staff Counsel to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, chaired by Congressman Phillip Burton who entrusted Eni with drafting legislation to provide American Samoa with an elected Governor and an elected Delegate. At the advice of late Senate President Paramount Chief Letuli Toloa, Eni returned home to American Samoa to "eat the dust and walk on the rocks" so that he could feel more directly the pains of the people in order to serve them more completely. From 1981-1984, Eni Hunkin, Jr. served as American Samoa's Deputy Attorney General and, from 1985-1988, he served as Lieutenant Governor of American Samoa. In 1988, Eni was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives where he served the people of American Samoa for some 26 years (1989-2015), and would still be serving today if not for illness.

Congressman Faleomavaega wore out his life in the service of his fellow beings and, by extension, he wore out his life in the service of our God. Faleomavaega's works brought American Samoa a Veterans Affairs (VA) clinic, a new Army Reserve Center, more funding per capita than any other State or Territory across many sectors (including education),

over \$4 billion in federal funding from 1995–2012 (with over \$2 billion as a direct result of his advocacy), Medicaid increases, computer labs, dialysis machines, village road improvements, ferries, fire trucks, ambulances, a hotel, funding for an airport tower and other capital improvement projects totaling over \$200 million, assistance for American Samoa's tuna canneries that extended the life of the industry in the Territory, WIC, food stamps, improved water systems, and military academy nominations and scholarships.

Congressman Faleomavaega also guaranteed the voting rights of American Samoa's military men and women, protected and expanded American Samoa's National Park, saw to it that American Samoa was included in the Commemorative Coin Program with a circulating quarter dollar honoring American Samoa's long and proud commitment to the United States, and made sure a postage stamp was issued in honor of American Samoa's Centennial. He was responsible for implementing a law that authorized free medical flights for American Samoa's veterans. He established an American Samoa Economic Development Commission. He obtained money to build high school gymnasiums, renovate and construct a harbor facility in Manu'a, and improve American Samoa's weather station. He also extended direct home loans to American Samoa's veterans.

When American Samoa was hit by a tsunami in 2009, Congressman Faleomavaega turned to his long-time friend, Chairman Kim Seung Youn of the Hanwha Group, to provide funding to bury American Samoa's dead. Chairman Li Ka-shing of Hutchinson Whampoa also came to Faleomavaega's aid and provided significant private sector funding.

Congressman Faleomavaega also served his constituents individually—handling hundreds of veterans, visa, immigration, Social Security and military cases per year. He sponsored and cosponsored thousands of Bills and Resolutions during his service in the U.S. Congress. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), during the 101st–113th Congress, Faleomavaega participated in more than 1,100 U.S. Congressional full committee and subcommittee hearings of the Foreign Affairs and Resource Committees—and chaired and/or spoke in more than 800 hearings. His Floor statements, recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for historical purposes, are too numerous to count.

Still, this is only a small and known part of the great work he did. From American Samoa to Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, South Korea, India, China, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Chile, Taiwan, West Papua, Vatican City, Greece, Norway, Australia, New Zealand, Tonga, Western Samoa, the Marshall Islands, Fiji, Tahiti, Palau, Kiribati, Vanuatu, Micronesia, the Cook Islands, Rapa Nui, and so on and so forth, Congressman Faleomavaega was a statesman like no other. He was a trailblazer, a peacemaker, and a skilled and respected world leader.

He was also a hero, especially to those known to the world as "comfort women"—to those who as young women were coerced into sexual slavery during Japan's colonial and wartime occupation of Asia and the Pacific Islands from the 1930s through the duration of World War II. Congressman Faleomavaega

referred to these victorious survivors as his "grandmothers" and, every time he was in South Korea, he visited and danced with those who lived at the House of Sharing. He cared deeply for them. He dared to hold a hearing for them. He invited them to testify on House Resolution 121, introduced by Congressman Mike Honda and cosponsored by Faleomavaega and others, which called for Japan to formally acknowledge, apologize, and accept responsibility for its Imperial Armed Forces' atrocities. While Resolutions had been offered before, no hearing had ever been held in the U.S. Congress for these women until Faleomavaega held his first hearing as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment. The hearing was historic. It lit the world on fire—and changed the outcome for the surviving "grandmothers," who finally got an apology from Japan. Congressman Faleomavaega was conferred an Honorary Doctorate Degree by Chonbuk National University in South Korea and was named an Honorary Citizen of Jeollabuk-do.

For Vietnam, Faleomavaega also stood strong and immovable—calling for the U.S. to clean up the mess it left behind after the Vietnam War. As a young soldier in the United States Army, Faleomavaega served in Vietnam from 1966–1969 where he, too, was exposed to Agent Orange—complications from which eventually claimed his life. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, he returned to Vietnam for the first time after 40 years. He returned to Nha Trang where once he was a soldier, and was so moved by the experience that he held historic hearings about Agent Orange remediation, which included testimony from Vietnamese victims and briefings by Vietnam government officials. Although only a Delegate representing the smallest constituency in the U.S. Congress, Faleomavaega was given the high honor by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam of hosting President Truong Tan Sang during his historic visit to Washington, DC in 2013. And while in Vietnam, Faleomavaega and his wife, Hinanui Bambridge Cave Hunkin, were hosted by Prime Minister Nguyen Tan Dung and members of the National Assembly, including Vice Chairwoman Madam Tong Thi Phong, also a Politburo member. Faleomavaega praised Vietnam for great strides in religious freedom, and remained forever grateful for Vietnam's official recognition of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint, of which he was a member.

Beyond Vietnam, Faleomavaega was a hero to Native Americans, to people in Cambodia whose families were killed by the Khmer Rouge, to the people of West Papua, to the people of Laos whose lands were destroyed by cluster bombs. He was a friend to Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India at a time when Shri Modi needed a friend. Congressman Faleomavaega helped Myanmar, Bahrain, Pakistan and Afghanistan. President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan awarded Faleomavaega the country's highest civilian honor for championing the cause of nuclear nonproliferation and drawing the world's attention to the people of Semipalatinsk and those in the Pacific Islands who had been subjected to Cold War nuclear testing. Although Congressman Faleomavaega was arrested by French commandos when he sailed on the Rainbow Warrior to protest French nuclear testing in Polynesia, he was not deterred. Faleomavaega was a warrior and voyager at

heart—and served as a crew member aboard the Polynesian voyaging canoe, the *Hokule'a*, which sailed from Tahiti to Hawaii in 1987 with Native Hawaiian navigator Nainoa Thompson at the helm. Faleomavaega was the author of *Navigating the Future: A Samoan Perspective on U.S.-Pacific Relations* (1995). Before his passing, he was writing his second book, which may be printed in memoriam.

He also proudly served in the United States Army Reserve as a Captain, U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps Member, 100 Battalion 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit from 1982–1989, and he always went for broke. Congressman Faleomavaega served on the House Committee on Resources and the Subcommittees on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife (which had broad jurisdiction for matters affecting American Samoa); Indian and Alaska Native Affairs; Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans; and National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands. He also served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs (previously known as International Relations) and the Subcommittees on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment (known as Asia and the Pacific); and the Western Hemisphere. He was a member of the Small Business Committee. Faleomavaega established the Congressional Caucus on U.S.-India Trade and Investment, the Friends of Vietnam Caucus, and the Congressional Caucus on Central Asia.

He was loved both by Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. Upon his passing, many of his colleagues as well as leaders from around the world paid tribute to Congressman Faleomavaega for his extraordinary service and powerful contributions at home and abroad.

At home, Congressman Faleomavaega built American Samoa on a foundation of solid rock so that those who follow might be successful. Around the globe, he met with Heads of State—with kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates—but in all his doings, he never forgot the poor and needy. He was a friend to all to the end. He was noble, kind and true.

When interviewed by the United States Capitol Historical Society, Congressman Faleomavaega said he wanted to be remembered for doing his best, that's it. He succeeded. From Tutuila to Manu'a, from one far corner of the earth to another, he will be remembered for doing and being his best. He will be remembered because we hold him dear. We have lost a treasure. We have lost a father, brother, papa, uncle, friend. Surely, the sun has fallen from the sky.

As one pioneer put it, "The journey home ain't always easy. We'll have a hard time getting there. But along the way, we'll see things we've never before seen—great herds of buffalo and big cedar trees on the hills, and maybe even vast expanses of sunflowers in bloom." For many of us, Eni was like a vast expanse of sunflowers in bloom. We miss him, and love him.

Surrounded by his loved ones, Eni Hunkin, Jr. passed away peacefully on February 22, 2017. He is survived by his wife of 45 years, Mrs. Hinanui Bambridge Cave Hunkin and their five children—Temanuata (Mike Laussen), Taulai (Kolotau Vaitu'ulala), Ra'imana (Malia Rivera), Vaimoana, and Leonne (Taufui-e-valu Vakapuna)—ten grandchildren (Leonne, Eni, Kolotau, Kenzo, Dexter,

Taimana, Taiatea, Tutehau, Maiana, and Robbie)—his sisters (Vaitinasa Salu Hunkin-Finau, Ed.D. and Mrs. Masinaatoa Magalei)—his brother, Mr. Albert Hunkin—and his adopted, or hanai sisters, Mrs. Diane Sauer and the late Mrs. Susie Osborn. His siblings, Mrs. Tuilua'ai Vanisi, Mrs. Arlene McBraun and Mr. Taulaunu Hunkin, as well as his parents, Mr. Eni Hunkin, Sr. and Mrs. Taulalai Manu Hunkin, preceded him.

Leone High Chief Senator Faiivae Iuli Alex Godinet of the American Samoa Legislature (Fono), who formerly served as Faileomavaega's Chief of Staff in American Samoa, and Dr. Lisa Williams, Faileomavaega's Chief of Staff in Washington, DC and his Staff Director for the House Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment, joined with the family in preparing and issuing this statement so as to honor their great mentor who shaped their lives and careers in untold ways. They did so on behalf of the many other staff members who also faithfully served with Congressman Faileomavaega both in American Samoa and Washington, DC, including but not limited to Tavita Richmond, Vili Le'i and Leilani Pimentel.

Mr. and Mrs. Don and Linda Saaga, Major General Robert G. Lee, and many other individuals and organizations too numerous to name, have also paid tribute, including BYU-Hawaii. Noting that one of its most notable alumni has passed away, the university stated, “Eni’s life embodies President David O. McKay’s prophecy about BYU-Hawaii educating ‘men and women whose influence will be felt for good toward the establishment of peace internationally.’”

Although Congressman Eni F.H. Faileomavaega has returned home to the God who made him and now rejoices with his many friends and loved ones on the other side of the veil, his influence remains with us. And so, we take comfort knowing that Jesus Christ is the Light of the world (John 8:12). He is the Promised Messiah. He is our Savior and our King. “He is risen” (Matthew 28:6). As Elder Joseph B. Wirthlin testified, “The Resurrection is not a fable.” “On Sunday, the resurrected Lord burst the bonds of death.” And because He lives, we will live again. We will meet again. Until then, Jesus Christ “will wipe away all tears from [our] eyes” (Revelation 7:17). Tell it out with joyful voice. All is well.

**IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF
COLONEL BILL JENRETTE**

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House’s attention today to recognize the life of Colonel Albert W. “Bill” Jenrette who passed away on February 27th.

Colonel Jenrette was born on November 6, 1937 in Conway, SC. He attended the Citadel, and upon graduation, he became a career Army officer.

While he was stationed in Germany for the first time, Colonel Jenrette married Ursula Klauer. Together they had two children, Jennifer and Kevin. Tragically, Kevin was killed in combat in Afghanistan in 2009.

Colonel Jenrette served two tours in Vietnam. After his second tour, he became the JROTC Senior Army Instructor at Lyman Ward Military Academy in Camp Hill, Alabama.

Colonel Jenrette received the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star.

After retiring from the Army, Colonel Jenrette returned to Lyman Ward Academy as Commandant of Cadets. In 2007, after a brief stint in the private sector, he returned to Lyman Ward as President. Upon his retirement as President, Colonel Jenrette became Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor of the Academy at Lyman Ward.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the life and achievements of Colonel Bill Jenrette.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY AND CELEBRATING THE IMPORTANCE AND IMPACT OF WOMEN ON AMERICAN SOCIETY AND ECONOMY

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the occasion of International Women’s Day. You may also notice that I am wearing red, a symbol of solidarity with the A Day Without Women campaign. This is an important occasion for us to recognize the economic power and impact that women have in our economy and in our lives.

It is long past time that we as a nation provide for fairness in the workplace by ensuring equal pay for equal work, defend the right to choose, end violence against women, secure access to affordable childcare and healthcare for working families, and strengthen paid family leave.

I was proud to march with thousands of my constituents and millions of women all across the country during the Women’s March. We showed that we are united and that together we will stand up for one another and speak out for anyone being trampled over, run through or pushed aside. Women are not objects to be owned, objectified or treated as second class citizens. Women’s rights are human rights and human rights are women’s rights.

The Women’s March was an important moment to secure our rights to speak and be heard. Today, on International Women’s Day, as many observe the Day Without a Woman Strike, remember that women’s voices are the voices of our coworkers, our mothers, sisters, daughters, leaders, community members, consumers, and major economic players.

I stand with the many women today taking part in the Day Without a Woman strike, and the millions more in New York State and throughout the nation who share these values.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT STRINGER

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication of Robert Stringer of Gainesville, Georgia. Mr. Stringer exemplifies the hardworking, persevering spirit of the people of Northeast Georgia.

Mr. Stringer retired from his job of 55 years at Oakwood-based Clipper Petroleum on his 80th birthday, February 22nd. He worked as a service technician and construction worker, and, through the years, Mr. Stringer helped maintain gas pumps and tanks at Clipper stores across Georgia and South Carolina.

During his long career, he also raised a beautiful family. Married at 27, he and his wife had two sons and one daughter. He is now a grandfather to six. In his family room at home, Mr. Stringer displays the plaques that he’s earned throughout his career next to his many family photographs. His daughter, Betsy Ross, says she is “so proud and thankful that my dad was able to retire when he felt the time was right for him. He is a true inspiration to me and my brothers.”

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the diligence and dedication of our own Robert Stringer. He has set an example for Hall County and northeast Georgia with his hard work. I wish him a relaxing and restful retirement—he has earned it.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOODBURY, MINNESOTA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of Woodbury, Minnesota. Located east of Saint Paul on the picturesque high ground between the Mississippi and St. Croix River Valleys, Woodbury has quickly grown from a small farming community to a bustling suburb of 68,000 residents. The city of Woodbury enters its 50th year as a thriving community for all ages, with excellent schools, vibrant businesses and beautiful neighborhoods, lakes and parks.

In the 1840s, settlers primarily from the eastern U.S. and Germany arrived to the area, then called Red Rock by the native Dakota. Settlers soon incorporated the area as a township and named it after former U.S. Senator, Secretary of the Navy and Treasury, and Supreme Court Justice, Levi Woodbury. Much of the wooded land was converted into farmland, and agriculture dominated the area over the course of the next century. As development pressures increased, in 1967 residents chose to incorporate as the city of Woodbury to retain local control over rapid development of the community.

Today, Woodbury is one of the fastest growing Minnesota communities and is currently the state’s ninth largest city. Twenty-thousand new residents flocked to the city between 2000–2016 and many more are expected to arrive in the coming years, attracted by its tremendous amenities and easy access to freeways and planned transit connections. Woodbury is home to a flourishing health and wellness industry, and has also drawn countless other businesses to the area, which benefits from one of the most highly educated workforces in the nation. It is no surprise that Woodbury is regularly rated one of the “Best Places to Live” in national rankings.

Since its founding, residents of Woodbury have always demonstrated a giving spirit to improve their community and welcome newcomers. As Woodbury grows and thrives, new residents are bringing diversity, creativity and energy that ensure the city will be an even better place in the next 50 years. I encourage all residents to recognize this special anniversary year and share their memories and their vision for the next half century.

Mr. Speaker, as residents of Woodbury prepare to gather on March 27, 2017 to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the city, please join me in honoring this milestone.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE
AND LEGACY OF CALIFORNIA
SENATOR LUCY KILLEA**

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a beloved and widely respected public servant who died at the age of 94. Through her visionary and inspirational leadership she brought forward generations of leaders dedicated to the public good and the growth of the City of San Diego, and the State of California.

It is fitting that at this time, as we celebrate the history of the contributions of women throughout the month of March that I should rise to speak of Senator Lucy Killea.

Lucy's life of public service began during WWII, working as a military intelligence officer with the Central Intelligence Agency, and as an aide to First Lady, Eleanor Roosevelt, in 1946, during the first General Assembly of the United Nations.

She and her husband John Killea, served ten years as U.S. diplomats in Mexico, which no doubt influenced Lucy's commitment to foster dialogue and collaboration between the United States and Mexico. After their diplomatic service Lucy, and her husband, moved to San Diego, where she completed a doctorate in Latin American History from the University of California, San Diego. Lucy had a full career prior to running for political office.

In 1978, San Diego Mayor Pete Wilson, appointed Lucy, to an empty seat on the City Council. In 1982 she was elected to the California State Assembly, where she established the first bipartisan women's caucus in the legislature, and won election to the California State Senate in 1989. She championed the environment, women's health, and ethical governmental practices. She honored her constituents and placed their interests above her own.

As I remember Lucy, I think of her not only as a dynamic and committed public servant but as a mentor, a role model and a friend. She worked tirelessly to support women and young people in their efforts to win public office. I count myself among the many Californians involved in public service, who, when confronted with tough political situations, often ask themselves, "What would Lucy do?" We recall how she left the Democratic Party and ran as an independent when she no longer believed that she could serve her constituents with a party label.

The word trailblazer is often used to describe her political leadership and it is in many

ways inadequate to describe how much she has contributed to San Diego, her adopted city, and the great State of California.

Lucy's honesty, integrity and respect for civil discourse made her a remarkable leader and a dear friend to many. She truly represents the "best of us," and is dearly missed.

**HONORING INTERNATIONAL
WOMEN'S DAY**

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of International Women's Day. While there are many issues that women face, including equal pay for equal work, affordable child care, access to affordable and quality healthcare, paid family leave, and the general rights of women of color and lesbian, bisexual, and transgender women, I would like to focus today on reproductive rights.

Roe v. Wade became the law of the land in 1973 when the Supreme Court of the United States deemed abortion to be a fundamental right. In recent years, that fundamental right to make a private choice about one's own body has been challenged by legislation and in the court system. Anti-choice legislation that places a ban on abortion care after a certain number of weeks of pregnancy, challenges to the contraception mandate in the Affordable Care Act, and most recently, passing a Congressional Review Act regarding changes to the Title X program are just a few of the tactics the House Republicans have used to undermine reproductive care for women in this country.

Along with reproductive care, we must educate our youth about sexual health. Instead of using evidence-based sexual education programs, many Republicans have instead advocated for abstinence-only education. These programs promote the false notion that "sexual risk avoidance education" is effective, but they are harmful and stigmatizing. Young people deserve real information about sexual health and well-being. Research shows that when young people have the necessary information about contraception as well as abstinence, they will delay initiation, reduce sexual activity, and increase use of condoms and contraception while seeing a reduction in unintended pregnancy and STD rates. Sexual health and education and reproductive health go hand-in-hand, but the GOP continues to ignore the evidence and add unnecessary barriers which ultimately increase rates of unintended pregnancy and decrease access to family planning care.

Within days of his inauguration, President Trump signed an executive order enacting the Global Gag Rule, which forces any foreign organization that receives U.S. foreign aid dollars to certify that they do not use their own funds to pay for abortion services, counsel patients about the option of abortion, or advocate for the liberalization of abortion laws. This policy is a change and an expansion from previous law which has banned U.S. foreign aid dollars from being used for abortion related activities since 1973. Advocates have called this new policy the "Global Gage Rule on

steroids." This expansion delivers a devastating blow to NGOs and is dangerous for reproductive health internationally.

At a time when the current administration seems to be more against women than with us, we must stand up for ourselves. We must continue to bring forward evidence-based and sensible policies that are good for women and good for our population. Whether we are discussing reproductive health, economic equality, civil rights, or the many other issues that women face, we must face them together.

**IN RECOGNITION OF CELEBRATING
150 YEARS OF THE SENTINEL-
TRIBUNE**

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate a treasured institution in my hometown of Bowling Green, Ohio, the Sentinel-Tribune Newspaper. The Sentinel-Tribune, a staple of Wood County has provided news coverage for the local community for 150 years and continues to be a must-read six days a week.

The Sentinel-Tribune began as just the Sentinel when it was originally established in 1867. The Sentinel served the people of Bowling Green and southern Wood County who sought to change the county seat from Perrysburg to Bowling Green. In 1906, a merger with the Tribune was initiated, becoming the publication we recognize today.

While the newspaper business has changed drastically since the 1800's, the Sentinel-Tribune has kept pace. Advances in technology have allowed anyone to share information at the push of a button and news travels quicker than ever. The Sentinel-Tribune continues to adapt to serve its readership through daily circulations and a growing digital presence.

The Sentinel-Tribune has proven that it is an indispensable source for its readers that want to know what is happening in their community, their state, and their country. It's a testament to the leadership, the reporters, and the staff at the newspaper that they have been so successful for a century and a half.

Mr. Speaker, a news publication that continues to serve the public interest as well as the Sentinel-Tribune deserves to be celebrated and honored. The paper remains a trusted and valued news publication that has served the people of Ohio for 150 years. I want to recognize the Sentinel-Tribune for its years of service to the people of Ohio and the local community.

**GRATITUDE FOR THE WORK OF
THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF MINNESOTA**

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today is International Women's Day and I am proud to be a strong advocate for equity, opportunity, and full rights for women and girls both in the United States and around the world. Over my

tenure in Congress, I have fought to improve women's healthcare, advance pay equity, and make sure girls have access to every educational opportunity that is available to boys.

With the Trump administration now in the White House, I am very concerned that the significant progress made to improve women's lives are under threat of being diminished, rolled back or extinguished. I remain fully committed to standing up, speaking out and championing the rights of women and girls.

This past weekend I attended an event hosted by the International Institute of Minnesota (IIM) to celebrate International Women's Day. It was a tremendous honor to receive IIM's 2017 Olga Zoltai Award for Service to New Americans. Special thanks to Jane Graupman, IIM's amazing executive director, and Kitty Gogins, IIM's board chair and daughter of Olga Zoltai. IIM's staff works hard doing the important work of resettling refugees. Their work builds a strong foundation for new American families that helps them achieve success and self-sufficiency.

Unfortunately, the anti-immigrant executive orders issued by the Trump administration, especially the refugee ban, can only be called a betrayal of our values as Americans and the core beliefs that make this a great country.

As I said in my remarks upon receiving this special award, "There is amazing strength and perseverance in each and every refugee story. The millions of women, men and children who have found their way to America have made this country better. Their courage must now be our courage as we resist isolationism, bigotry, and the scapegoating of good people seeking freedom and a new life in America."

I include in the RECORD my full remarks and a brief biography of Olga Zoltai who was truly an amazing woman.

Throughout my career in Congress I have made the rights of women and girls a priority.

We want a more peaceful, prosperous world, a world where children are healthy and families are strong, then let us invest in women and girls.

The United States is the wealthiest nation on Earth. We must be investing in women and girls, not cutting funding and assistance that saves lives, protects the vulnerable and builds better futures.

Empowering women and girls is not controversial, it is essential. It means giving every girl the opportunity she deserves—the right—to go to school and receive an education. It means eliminating discrimination, exploitation and violence against women and girls—whether it be trafficking, forced marriage of girls, or pay discrimination right here in the United States.

Empowering women means access to employment, healthcare, and safe childcare. And, empowering women means asking a room full of women to think about standing up and be leaders—maybe running for elected office one day—for school board, city council, mayor, the state legislature, or even the U.S. Congress.

I am sure that each of us here today is very concerned about new policies that are coming out of this White House that impact refugees. In my view, these policies are a betrayal of America's values and the core beliefs that make this a great country.

We must resist these close minded and harmful policies. We must resist in Congress, in the courts, and in our communities. But it is

also critical to continue to be welcoming, caring and embracing of all New Americans. It is more important than ever.

There is amazing strength and perseverance in each and every refugee story. The millions of women, men and children who have found their way to America have made this country better. Their courage must now be our courage as we resist isolationism, bigotry, and the scapegoating of good people seeking freedom and a new life in America.

Olga Zoltai was a refugee who dedicated her life to welcoming refugees. Olga's work is now our work and must continue this important work the same passion and commitment.

Thank you for this very special award—I will treasure it. And, I will carry Olga in my heart as we fight to keep America a country that welcomes refugees and strives to offer hope, opportunity and freedom to all people.

Thank you, Kitty. Thank you, Jane. And, thank you to everyone here today.

OLGA ZOLTAI, PATRON SAINT OF IMMIGRANTS

On Thursday, June 9, 2016, former Institute staff member Olga Zoltai passed away. Olga was a tireless advocate for refugees and immigrants. Her tenacity and dedication improved the lives of thousands of New Americans in our community. A refugee herself—at the age of 13, Olga and her family fled her hometown of Sopron, Hungary as Soviet forces invaded—Olga worked at the International Institute of Minnesota from 1971 to 1993. During her years at the Institute, Olga designed innovative programs that responded to the needs of New Americans, transforming and strengthening our community.

When Olga heard that a new federal program to resettle refugees was beginning in 1974, she knew the Institute had to do this work. The Institute's Executive Director was on his honeymoon in Thailand when Olga heard about this opportunity. No one knew exactly where in Thailand he was honeymooning, but they did know he would not be back until after the application deadline had passed. Not to be deterred, Olga began calling hotels to see if a guest matching his description was staying there. She eventually found him, received his approval, and applied. Thanks to Olga, the Institute has welcomed more than 25,000 refugees to our community.

Olga was the caseworker who welcomed the first Hmong refugees to Minnesota in February 1976. She got the call of their arrival the night before the family's 6 a.m. arrival. The youngest child arrived wearing just a t-shirt, but Olga and the church sponsoring the family brought blankets to the airport.

Olga Zoltai with her three children Kitty, Lili, and Peter (left to right).

It is now common for refugee resettlement agencies to have caseworkers who are from the communities they serve, and it was Olga who hired the first bi-lingual case manager in Minnesota.

Olga founded the Nursing Assistant Training Program in 1991 to provide New Americans access to entry-level jobs in healthcare. In the program's 25 years, more than 1,900 nursing assistants have been employed. At a recent Nursing Assistant graduation, the class speaker declared: "Today is the greatest accomplishment of our lives. Today, we begin our lives as caregivers. You are changing not just our lives, but our family's lives as well."

Additionally, Olga worked on hundreds of political asylum cases and was known to be a unwavering advocate for those the most complex cases.

"I was so lucky, you know?" Olga said when she reflected on her life's story. When her chance came, "I was able to help."

Olga was awarded the eponymous "Olga Zoltai Award for Outstanding Service to New Americans" at the Institute's International Women's Day Tea in March 2016.

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE L. "MAURI" WILLIAMSON

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a prominent Hoosier leader and my dear friend, Mr. Maurice L. (Mauri) Williamson who passed away on January 30, 2017 surrounded by his loving family.

Mauri was born in Economy, Indiana and spent his childhood participating in 4-H. He served in the Navy Medical Corps until 1946, after which he received his undergraduate degree from Purdue University in 1950. He was known throughout the state as the executive secretary of the Purdue University Ag Alumni Association, a position he held for 37 years. During his Purdue career, Mauri helped found the National Ag Alumni Development Association (NAADA) and started the Ag Alumni Fish Fry.

Mauri put a lot of care and dedication into his work. After graduating from Purdue, he returned to the family farm, but he soon found he was better suited spending his time with people rather than with plants and animals. In 1961, he founded the Pioneer Village at the Indiana State Fair to preserve and display the history of Indiana agriculture. Mauri held court there each summer, visiting with his ever-expanding legion of friends acquired through his lifetime commitment to Purdue and to agriculture. He had a deep love for the Indiana State Fair and only missed attending while serving in the Navy during World War II.

I was first introduced to Mauri when I served as Indiana's Secretary of State. He made it clear to me, in the way only he could do, the importance of farming and agriculture community to the past, present and future of Indiana. Even today, my family, and especially my two young sons, enjoys the fruit of his labor each August when we visit the Pioneer Village at the best State Fair in the nation. As a member of Congress, I continue to keep our past conversations in mind when voting on agriculture issues.

Mauri leaves June, his beloved wife of 68 years, two children, three grandchildren and five great grandchildren to carry on his legacy of service to fellow Hoosiers. I believe this world is a better place because of his compassionate service to our community, state and nation. Rest in peace, Mauri. He will not be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MICHIGAN STATE POLICE

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Michigan State Police as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary. We

Michiganders are so grateful for Michigan State Police's century of law enforcement excellence, selfless service, and tireless dedication to communities across Michigan.

Originally organized as a temporary, wartime emergency force to provide domestic security during World War I, the force was formally reorganized two years later as the Michigan State Police. In April of 1917, a small band of 300 mounted men became the first Michigan State Police troopers, and over the last 100 years, they have become a world-class, professional law enforcement agency with over 2,900 members. In the First District, we are grateful to have ten Michigan State Police posts serving men and women in every community.

From Alpena to Iron Mountain and Traverse City to the Soo, each Michigan State Police trooper takes on the sacred oath to serve and protect our families and homes when he or she puts on the uniform. You do more than protect, you inspire and build relationships in our communities through creative partnerships and programs ranging from direct engagement with Community Service Troopers to Teen Safe Driving programs that keep our most precious resource, our children, safe. It's your commitment to integrity, excellence, and courtesy that has led to real results in Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Michigan State Police for 100 years of service. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing that Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula are better and safer places thanks to the work and dedication of the Michigan State Police. On behalf of my constituents and residents across the State of Michigan, congratulations, Michigan State Police, on 100 years of exceptional service.

SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS COLLEGE'S MIG TEAM WINS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP 4 YEARS IN A ROW

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Southeastern Illinois College's Model Illinois Government team's success at the 2017 Model Illinois Government competition. Southeastern's team won the Outstanding Large Delegation Award, earning its tenth Outstanding Delegation Award in 14 years, and fourth in a row.

Southeastern is the smallest school in terms of enrollment at the simulation and not only defeated much larger community colleges, but also Universities including the University of Illinois at Springfield, Eastern, and Western Universities. Southeastern led all schools in total points, leadership positions, and controlled both the House Democrat and Senate Republican caucuses. Southeastern set new school records for floor leadership positions (six) and total points (sixteen). Tracy Stokich and Casper Johns won the Award for Outstanding Original Legislation, while William Tippett was named Outstanding First Year Delegate, and Morgan Denbo won the Outstanding Member of the House of Representatives Award.

Team members were elected to 4 committee spokesperson positions, two committee

chairs, while Evan Doughty was elected House Majority Leader, and Ryan Dennison was elected Senate Minority Leader. William Tippett and Grant Loudy were also elected as Assistant Leaders in their respective chambers, while Dana Hooven and Chloe Brandon were elected as floor whips.

The Southeastern Model Illinois Government team, coached by Matt Lees, consists of Chloe Brandon, Ryan Dennison, Morgan Denbo, Evan Doughty, Reagan Gray, Dana Hooven, Stephanie (Casper) Johns, William Johnson, Granton Loudy, Braden Scroggins, Tracy Stokich, Nolan Sutton, and William Tippett.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the continued success of the Southeastern Model Illinois Government team, and I extend my best wishes to them for another outstanding season next year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on H.R. 1362, To name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Pago Pago, American Samoa, the Faleomavaega Eni Fa'au'a Hunkin VA Clinic, on Tuesday, March 7, 2017. I had intended to vote "yes" on Roll Call vote 127, and "no" on Roll Call vote 128.

HONORING JUDY TABAR, PRESIDENT & CEO OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND, ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered in extending my deepest thanks and appreciation to my good friend, Judy Tabar, as she marks her retirement as President and CEO of Planned Parenthood of Southern New England. Under her leadership over the last two decades, PPSNE has stood at the forefront of every major effort to expand the organization's role in health care and education. Though she will most certainly be missed, she leaves a strong foundation on which PPSNE can continue to build.

Nearly five decades ago, Judy first joined Planned Parenthood as a physician assistant, providing direct patient care. Through her work with patients, she developed a deeper understanding of their needs and how Planned Parenthood could better meet. She soon became Associate Director of Planned Parenthood New England and twenty years ago took on the mantle of President and CEO of Planned Parenthood of Southern New England. In addition to her work throughout Southern New England, Judy has served in numerous leadership roles within the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA), and currently serves on the PPFA Board of Directors.

As President and CEO, Judy has overseen PPSNE's eighteen health centers, managed its \$30 million annual budget, and guided it through a 42 percent patient increase over the course of her tenure. It has been through Judy's vision and unwavering dedication that PPSNE has expanded its services to include primary care as well as a clinical research program. Under her leadership, PPSNE has focused on reducing teen birth rates and reducing racial and ethnic health disparities by removing barriers to services and information. Today, PPSNE serves nearly 70,000 patients with preventative care making up 90 percent of the services provided. A visionary by any definition, Judy has placed PPSNE on the cutting edge of reproductive health care service expansion.

I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to extend a special note of thanks to Judy for her friendship and support over the years. She has been an invaluable resource to both myself and my staff. I am confident that I speak for everyone who has had the opportunity to work with Judy over the years when I say her passion, compassion, tenacity, and commitment will be deeply missed.

Planned Parenthood of Southern New England stands as a model for affiliates across the country and that is in large part because of Judy Tabar. She has left an indelible mark on this outstanding organization and a legacy that will continue to inspire others to ensure that everyone has access to the affordable, quality reproductive health care they need and deserve. I am honored to stand today to extend my heartfelt thanks and congratulations to Judy Tabar, for her outstanding leadership and good work, as well as my very best wishes for many more years of health and happiness as she enjoys her retirement.

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 information, 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, March 9, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
MARCH 14

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on information surrounding the Marines United website.

SR-222

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program.	SD-538	rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, S. 317, to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, S. 500, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, S. 218, to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on documents sent by mail by the Federal Government, S. 188, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, H.R. 274, to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, H.R. 366, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, an original bill entitled, "Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act", an original bill entitled, "Office of Special Counsel Reauthorization Act", an original bill entitled, "Follow the Rules Act", an original bill entitled, "Regulatory Accountability Act", and the nomination of Elaine C. Duke, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.	11 a.m. Committee on Foreign Relations To hold hearings to examine six years of war in Syria, focusing on the human toll.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings to examine opportunities to improve American energy infrastructure.	SD-366		SD-419
Committee on Finance To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.	SD-215		SD-430
2:30 p.m. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security To hold hearings to examine continuing to improve truck safety on our nation's highways.	SR-253		SD-226
MARCH 15			
10 a.m. Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To hold hearings to examine assessing U.S. sanctions on Russia, focusing on the next steps.	SD-538		SR-418
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation To hold hearings to examine unmanned aircraft systems, focusing on innovation, integration, successes, and challenges.	SD-106		SD-562
Committee on Environment and Public Works To hold hearings to examine innovative solutions to control invasive species and promote wildlife conservation.	SD-406		SR-428A
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Business meeting to consider S. 34, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", S. 21, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major	SVC-217		SR-232A
Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Defense To hold closed hearings to examine a ballistic missile defense program update.	SD-342		
Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies To hold hearings to examine STEM education, focusing on preparing students for the careers of today and the future.	SD-226		
10:30 a.m.	SD-138		
MARCH 22			
10 a.m. Committee on Veterans' Affairs To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.	SD-G50		

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1649–S1702

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 563–585, S.J. Res. 35–36, and S. Res. 83–84. **Pages S1689–90**

Measures Passed:

Department of Education Rule: By 59 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 83), Senate passed H.J. Res. 58, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues. **Pages S1651–66**

Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 496, to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform”, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1695**

Operation Desert Storm and Operation Desert Shield Memorial: Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 1, approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield, and the resolution was then passed. **Page S1695**

International Women’s Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 84, supporting the goals of International Women’s Day. **Pages S1695–96**

Measures Considered:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Rule—Agreement: Senate began consideration of H.J. Res. 57, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elemen-

tary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, after agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Pages S1666–86, S1697–S1702

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Thursday, March 9, 2017, Senate continue consideration of the joint resolution, with the time equally divided in the usual form until 12 noon, and that at 12 noon, Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution with no intervening action or debate; and that Senate then resume executive session for the consideration of Seema Verma, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 1:45 p.m. **Page S1686**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, March 9, 2017; and that 30 minutes of the Majority time on the joint resolution be under the control of Senator Blunt, or his designee. **Page S1696**

Messages from the House:

Page S1689

Measures Referred:

Page S1689

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S1690–91

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S1691–94

Additional Statements:

Pages S1688–89

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S1694–95

Privileges of the Floor:

Page 1695

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—83) **Page S1666**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:34 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 9, 2017. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1696.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FUNDING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine investing in America, focusing on funding our nation's transportation infrastructure needs, after receiving testimony from David Bernhardt, Maine Department of Transportation Commissioner, Augusta, on behalf of the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials; Jim Tymon, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, Ed Mortimer, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Beth Osborne, Transportation for America, all of Washington, D.C.; and Todd Hauptli, American Association of Airport Executives, Alexandria, Virginia.

SAVING LIVES THROUGH MEDICAL RESEARCH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine saving lives through medical research, after receiving testimony from Timothy J. Eberlein, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri; Thomas J Grabowski Jr., University of Washington Memory and Brain Wellness Center, Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Integrated Brain Imaging Center, Seattle; Stacey Schultz-Cherry, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital Department of Infectious Diseases, Memphis, Tennessee; and Jennifer M. Sasser, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson.

CYBERSECURITY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity received a closed briefing on cybersecurity from the Defense Science Board from Craig I. Fields, Chairman, Defense Science Board; David S. C. Chu, Institute for Defense Analyses; Christine H. Fox, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory; Paul J. Hoeper, OnPoint Technologies, Inc.; John L. Manferdelli, Google; James N. Miller, Adaptive Strategies LLC; and Robert F. Nesbit, MITRE Corporation's Center for Integrated Intelligence System.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine the global nuclear weapons environment, after receiving testimony from General C. Robert Kehler, USAF (Ret.), former Commander, United States Strategic Command, Department of Defense; Keith B. Payne, Missouri State University Defense Strategic Studies; and Gary S. Samore, Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.

FCC OVERSIGHT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission, after receiving testimony from Ajit Pai, Chairman, and Mignon L. Clyburn, and Michael O'Rielly, both a Commissioner, all of the Federal Communications Commission.

NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION AND MODERNIZATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 512, to modernize the regulation of nuclear energy, after receiving testimony from Allison Bawden, Acting Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Maria G. Korsnick, Nuclear Energy Institute, Washington, D.C.; Ashley E. Finan, Nuclear Innovation Alliance, Boston, Massachusetts; Christina Back, General Atomics, San Diego, California; and Edwin Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine nomination of Elaine C. Duke, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Portman, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

INDIAN AFFAIRS PRIORITIES

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine Indian affairs priorities for the Trump Administration, after receiving testimony from Ryan K. Zinke, Secretary of the Interior; Alvin Not Afraid, Jr., Crow Nation, Crow Agency, Montana; Keith B. Anderson, Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community, Prior Lake, Minnesota; Jefferson Keel, Chicksaw Nation, Ada, Oklahoma; and Paul Torres, All Pueblo Council of Governors, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

CORRECTION

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R.1420–1441; and 7 rosolutions, H.J. Res. 86; and H. Res. 178–183, were introduced.

Pages H1947–48

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H1949–50

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 111, a resolution of inquiry directing the Attorney General to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the financial practices of the President, with an amendment; adversely (H. Rept. 115–28); and

H. Res. 180, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 985) to amend the procedures used in Federal court class actions and multidistrict litigation proceedings to assure fairer, more efficient outcomes for claimants and defendants, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–29).

Page H1947

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ros-Lehtinen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H1597

Recess: The House recessed at 10:39 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H1601

Amending title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 175, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 725) to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder, by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 130, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 129.

Pages H1611–18

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Hoyer motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 127 ayes to 295 noes with 1 answering “present”, Roll No. 132.

Pages H1618–19

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the McGovern motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 107 ayes to 277 noes, Roll No. 134.

Page H1620

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Takano motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 114 ayes to 290 noes, Roll No. 135.

Pages H1940–41

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2017: The House passed H.R. 1301, making appro-

priations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, by a yea-and-nay vote of 371 yeas to 48 nays, Roll No. 136.

Pages H1621–H1942

H. Res. 174, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1301) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 133, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 131.

Pages H1604–11, H1618, H1619–20

Suspensions: The House considered the following measure under suspension of the Rules:

Arbuckle Project Maintenance Complex and District Office Conveyance Act of 2017: H.R. 132, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and appurtenances of the Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma, to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District.

Pages H1942–43

Motion to Adjourn: Agreed to the Raskin motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 314 yeas to 98 nays, Roll No. 137.

Pages H1943–44

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1616–17, H1617, H1618, H1618–19, H1619–20, H1620, H1940–41, H1941–42, and H1943–44. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MEMBERS' DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Members’ Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Barragán, Carter of Georgia, Comer, Crawford, Crist, Foster, Gosar, Gene Green of Texas, Huizenga, Jackson Lee, Johnson of Louisiana, Mast, Nolan, Panetta, Polis, Francis Rooney of Florida, Tipton, Watson Coleman, and Wilson of South Carolina.

PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing for public witnesses. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MILITARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on quality of life in the military. Testimony was heard from Daniel A. Dailey, Sergeant Major, U.S. Army; Steven S. Giordano, Master Chief Petty Officer, U.S. Navy; Ronald L. Green, Sergeant Major, U.S. Marine Corps; and Kaleth O. Wright, Chief Master Sergeant, U.S. Air Force.

MILITARY ASSESSMENT OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE REQUIREMENTS

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Military Assessment of Nuclear Deterrence Requirements”. Testimony was heard from General John Hyten, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command; Admiral Bill Moran, U.S. Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; General Paul Selva, U.S. Air Force, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and General Stephen Wilson, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

THE CURRENT STATE OF U.S. ARMY READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “The Current State of U.S. Army Readiness”. Testimony was heard from the following U.S. Army officials: Lieutenant General Joseph Anderson, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7; Lieutenant General Gwendolyn Bingham, Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management; and Lieutenant General Aundre F. Piggee, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-4.

AN INDEPENDENT FLEET ASSESSMENT OF THE U.S. NAVY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled “An Independent Fleet Assessment of the U.S. Navy”. Testimony was heard from Charles Werchado, Deputy Director, Assessment Division (N81B), U.S. Navy; Rear Admiral Lower Half Jesse Wilson, Jr., Director, Assessment Division (OPNAV N81), U.S. Navy; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1304, the “Self-Insurance Protection Act”; H.R. 1101, the “Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2017”; and H.R. 1313, the “Preserving Employee Wellness Programs Act”. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1101, H.R. 1313, and H.R. 1304.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee began a markup on a committee print of Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Repeal and Replace of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and H. Res. 154, of inquiry requesting the President of the United States and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives relating to plans to repeal or replace the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health-related measures of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 876, the “Aviation Employee Screening and Security Enhancement Act of 2017”; H.R. 1238, the “Securing our Agriculture and Food Act”; H.R. 1249, the “DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017”; H.R. 1252, the “DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017”; H.R. 1258, the “HSA Technical Corrections Act”; H.R. 1282, the “DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2017”; H.R. 1294, the “Reducing DHS Acquisition Cost Growth Act”; H.R. 1297, the “Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2017”; H.R. 1302, the “Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel Exercise Act of 2017”; H.R. 1309, the “TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017”; H.R. 1353, the “Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act of 2017”; H.R. 1370, the “Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017”; H.R. 1372, the “Homeland Security for Children Act”; and H.R. 1365, the “Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Innovation Act”. The following legislation was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1294, H.R. 1297, H.R. 1302, H.R. 1309, H.R. 1353, H.R. 1238, H.R. 1249, and H.R. 1258. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 876, H.R. 1252, H.R. 1282, H.R. 1370, H.R. 1372, and H.R. 1365.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 173, a committee funding resolution. H. Res. 173 was ordered reported, without amendment.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY'S PROPOSED REGULATIONS REFORMING THE INVESTOR VISA PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Department of Homeland Security’s Proposed Regulations Reforming the Investor Visa Program”. Testimony was heard from Senators Grassley and Leahy; Rebecca Gambler, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 1293, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; H.R. 1364, the “Official Time Reform Act of 2017”; H.R. 653, the “Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 680, the “Eliminating Pornography from Agencies Act”; H. Res. 38, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that offices attached to the seat of Government should not be required to exercise their offices in the District of Columbia; the “SOAR Reauthorization Act”; H.R. 745, the “Federal Records Modernization Act of 2017”; and the “Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017”.

EXAMINING IRS CUSTOMER SERVICE CHALLENGES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits, and Administrative Rules held a joint hearing entitled “Examining IRS Customer Service Challenges”. Testimony was heard from John Dalrymple, Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service; Russell Martin, Assistant Inspector General, Returns Processing and Account Services, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; and Jessica Lucas-Judy, Acting Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office.

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2017; FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 720, the “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2017”; H.R. 985, the “Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2017”. The committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule for H.R. 720. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against

consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in part A of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Additionally, the rule grants a structured rule for H.R. 985. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule Makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–5 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered 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. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte and Representatives Cohen and Johnson of Georgia.

REGULATING SPACE: INNOVATION, LIBERTY, AND INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled “Regulating Space: Innovation, Liberty, and International Obligations”. Testimony was heard from Henry B. Hogue, Specialist in American National Government, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS CYBERSECURITY: FEDERAL RESOURCES AND COORDINATION

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Small Business Cybersecurity: Federal Resources and Coordination”. Testimony was heard from Maureen K. Ohlhausen, Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Chuck Romine, Director Information Technology Lab, National Institute of Standards and Technology; and public witnesses.

BUILDING A 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AMERICA: AIR TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Air Transportation in the United States in the 21st Century”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee began a markup on Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Remuneration from Certain Insurers; Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Repeal of Tanning Tax; Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Repeal of Certain Consumer Taxes; Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Repeal of Net Investment Income Tax; Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations Relating to Repeal and Replace of Health-Related Tax Policy.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 369, to eliminate the sunset of the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 1181, the “Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act”; H.R. 1259, the “VA Accountability First Act of 2017”; H.R. 1367, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire and retain physician and other employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and H.R. 1379, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the entitlement to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs for members of the Armed Forces awarded the Purple Heart. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 369 and H.R. 1379. The following legislation was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1181, H.R. 1259, and H.R. 1367.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine U.S. Central Command and U.S. Africa Command, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 327, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, S. 444, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company, S. 462, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to refund or credit certain excess payments made to the Commission, S. 484, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to terminate an exemption for companies located in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and any other possession of the United States, and S. 488, to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nomination of David Friedman, of New York, to be Ambassador to Israel; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine resolving the conflict in Yemen, focusing on U.S. interests, risks, and policy, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold hearings to examine agency use of science in the rulemaking process, focusing on proposals for improving transparency and accountability, 10:15 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 419, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, and the nominations of Danny C. Reeves, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2019, and Charles R. Breyer, of California, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission for a term expiring October 31, 2021, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider the nomination of Daniel Coats, of Indiana, to be Director of National Intelligence, 2 p.m., SH-219.

Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:10 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, hearing entitled “The Next Farm Bill: Rural Development and Energy Programs”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, hearing entitled “The Next Farm Bill: Specialty Crops”, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Members’ Day”, 2 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “Members’ Day”, 9:30 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Management Challenges at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and the Social Security Administration: Views from the Inspectors General”, 10 a.m., 2358-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, oversight hearing on Department of State and Foreign Operations Programs, 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Members’ Day”, 10 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled “Nuclear Deterrence—the Defense Science Board’s Perspective”, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Ethics, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 2 p.m., 1015 Longworth.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled “Flood Insurance Reform: FEMA’s Perspective”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 910, the “Fair Access to Investment Research Act of 2017”; H.R. 1219, the “Supporting America’s Innovators Act of 2017”; H.R. 1257, the “Securities and Exchange Commission Overpayment Credit Act”; the “US Territories Investor Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 1343, the “Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2017”; and H.R. 1312, the “Small Business Capital Formation Enhancement Act”, 1:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Undermining Democratic Institutions and Splintering NATO: Russian Disinformation Aims”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled “Democracy Under Threat in Ethiopia”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection, hearing entitled “The Current State of DHS Private Sector Engagement for Cybersecurity”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing entitled “Improving and Expanding Infrastructure in Tribal and Insular Communities”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Reviewing ATF’s Failures in the Death of ICE Agent Jaime Zapata”; markup on H.R. 1293, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; the “Official Time Reform Act of 2017”; H.R. 653, the “Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017”; H.R. 680, the “Eliminating Pornography from Agencies Act”; H. Res. 38, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that offices attached to the seat of Government should not be required to exercise their offices in the District of Columbia; the “SOAR Reauthorization Act”; H.R. 745, the “Federal Records Modernization Act of 2017”; and the “Electronic Message Preservation Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “National Science Foundation Part I: Overview and Oversight”, 11 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on the “Honest and Open New EPA Science Treatment Act of 2017”; and the “EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2017”, 9:30 a.m., 2321 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations titled, hearing entitled “An Overview of SBA’s 7(a) Loan Program”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: The Role of Federal Agencies in Water Infrastructure”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, March 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 57, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Rule, with a vote on passage of the joint resolution at approximately 12 noon. Following which, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Seema Verma, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon, at approximately 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Thursday, March 9

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 725—Innocent Party Protection Act. Consideration of H.R. 985—Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E294
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E289
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E287
Carter, John R., Tex., E290
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E295
Collins, Chris, N.Y., E287
Collins, Doug, Ga., E292
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E289
Culberson, John Abney, Tex., E289
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E293

DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E295
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E289
Hill, J. French, Ark., E288
Jeffries, Hakeem S., N.Y., E288
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E289
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E293
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E293
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E292, E293
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E289, E289
Poe, Ted, Tex., E288
Posey, Bill, Fla., E289
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E290, E292

Rokita, Todd, Ind., E294
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E287
Sanford, Mark, S.C., E290
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E287
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E290
Shimkus, John, Ill., E295
Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E289
Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E292
Valadao, David G., Calif., E288
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E288



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 Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.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 Publishing 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 Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.