

Ross	Stefanik	Webster (FL)
Rothfus	Stewart	Wenstrup
Rouzer	Stivers	Westerman
Royce	Stutzman	Westmoreland
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Salmon	Thornberry	Williams
Sanford	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Tipton	Wittman
Schweikert	Trott	Womack
Scott, Austin	Turner	Woodall
Sensenbrenner	Upton	Yoder
Sessions	Valadao	Yoho
Shimkus	Wagner	Young (AK)
Shuster	Walberg	Young (IA)
Simpson	Walden	Young (IN)
Smith (MO)	Walker	Zeldin
Smith (NE)	Walorski	Zinke
Smith (NJ)	Walters, Mimi	
Smith (TX)	Weber (TX)	

## NOES—182

Adams	Fudge	Nadler
Aguilar	Gabbard	Napolitano
Ashford	Gallego	Neal
Bass	Garamendi	Nolan
Beatty	Gibson	Norcross
Becerra	Graham	O'Rourke
Bera	Grayson	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Pascrall
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Polis
Bustos	Himes	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Hoyer	Rangel
Capuano	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Royal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kilmer	Schiff
Cleaver	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Sinema
DeFazio	Lee	Sires
DeGette	Levin	Slaughter
Delaney	Lewis	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Speier
DelBene	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaullnier	Loebssack	Takano
Deutch	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Lynch	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney,	Torres
Engel	Carolyn	Tsongas
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Esty	Matsui	Vargas
Farr	McCollum	Veasey
Foster	McDermott	Vela
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Velázquez
	McNerney	Visclosky
	Meeks	Walz
	Meng	Wasserman
	Moulton	Wasserman
	Murphy (FL)	Schultz

## NOT VOTING—12

Dingell	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Duffy	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Fattah	Hinojosa	Takai
Forbes	Moore	Wilson (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## □ 1630

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 14, 2016 at 3:45 p.m.:

That the Senate concur in the House amendment to the bill S. 2276.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

## 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 materials on H.R. 5293, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 778 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5293.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

## □ 1633

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCIOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to present the Appropriations Committee recommendation for the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

I would like to begin by paying tribute to those who are not with us today—our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—who serve all across the globe defending our freedom. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines provide the mantle of security that allows us to meet in settings like this every day, and they should never be far from our minds.

Mr. Chairman, they, those who serve in uniform and their families, deserve our heartfelt thanks for their personal sacrifice.

I also want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY for their support during the process, and special thanks to my counterpart, PETE VISCIOSKY, for his partnership in this effort. I thank him for his assistance and collaboration.

Mr. Chairman, our Defense Subcommittee conducted 11 formal hearings and had numerous briefings to help shape this legislation. These meetings allowed us to look in great detail into our national defense posture and the capabilities of our adversaries and our partners, and we are very concerned by what we see.

Over the past several years, we have largely focused on the dangers posed by Islamic terrorist organizations—al Qaeda, barbaric ISIS, al-Nusrah, and others. They remain a clear and present danger. But in recent years, new threats have emerged: a more aggressive and capable Russia, an expansionist China, emboldened states like Iran, and rogue nations like North Korea. At the same time, we are dealing with fiscal constraints imposed by sequestration and budget caps.

So, looking today at our Department of Defense and intelligence community, we note that our readiness levels are alarmingly low for our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen; our decisive technological edge over our adversaries is eroding; and our adversaries' resolve and their capability are only growing.

The bill before you begins to reverse these trends by providing more money for national security.

This measure includes a total of \$575.8 billion for the Department of Defense for functions under our subcommittee's jurisdiction and \$58.6 billion for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism funding.

Our recommendation mirrors the funding structure that the House Armed Services Committee and this House approved a few weeks ago and shifts roughly \$16 billion from the President's request for OCO operations into critical investments in our personnel, training, and equipment, while

providing a bridge fund for our overseas operations through the end of April of 2017.

By that time, our new Commander in Chief will be able to assess our defense posture, reevaluate readiness levels and recapitalization efforts, and request a targeted supplemental to support our troops. Congress did a similar maneuver in 2008.

I am confident that Members of this House will work in a bipartisan way to ensure that this essential supplemental appropriations legislation is passed when that time comes. Rest assured that we will never let our troops down.

By providing a bridge fund to next April, our bill is able to make targeted investments in additional manning for the Army, Marines, and Air Force, more training, as well as the equipment they rely upon—all designed to repair the worrisome readiness gaps we see across our Armed Forces.

We currently have the lowest manning level in the Army since before World War II, and this legislation boosts Army and Marine Corps end strength.

Despite the Secretary's assurances that we are on our way to a 300-ship Navy, we now have 273 in our fleet, which is smaller than at any time since before World War I. This bill funds a significant increase in shipbuilding.

Our Air Force is flying the oldest planes in its entire history, and the bill before you boosts the modernization of our fighters, bombers, tankers, and other aircraft.

We are also able to increase funding by \$9.6 billion for equipment the service chiefs have requested in their unmet needs list.

Our investments will allow our military services to fully meet critical training requirements, such as flying hours, steaming days, depot mainte-

nance, ground training, facilities improvement, and base operations.

I also want to note that our legislation again includes \$500 million to continue improvements for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance for our combatant commanders. They need it; they will welcome it.

Mr. Chairman, as I close, I want to make an observation about this year's debate. The President's spokesman and Secretary of Defense were quick to criticize the funding structure of the National Defense Authorization bill and, indeed, this proposal, and issued a veto threat against our bill this morning.

The White House and Secretary Carter have suggested we are, in their own words, “gambling” with our troops’ mission in the Middle East and that our approach is somehow “irresponsible” or, in their own words, “dangerous.”

But what was really “gambling,” “irresponsible,” and “dangerous” was the administration’s decision to pull all of our troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan—against the advice of our military leadership—and not anticipate that the resulting vacuum would be filled by ISIS, the Taliban, and other terrorist groups.

What was “gambling,” “irresponsible,” and “dangerous” was—and is—the constant changing of the military rules of engagement to meet political objectives.

What was “gambling” and “irresponsible” was ousting Qadhafi in Libya without any plan whatsoever for the aftermath.

Indeed, it is “gambling,” “irresponsible,” and “dangerous” to believe that Iran would not violate any aspects of the Geneva Agreement.

And surely it was a “gamble” to believe that the American people would ignore the capture and provocative

treatment of 10 American sailors seized by the Iranian regime last January; and surely it was a “gamble” that the American people would not pay attention to increased military operations in Syria and Iraq and, yes, the tragic deaths of American service personnel, if the President refused to call them “combat operations.”

There is more happening in the Middle East today than the airstrikes against ISIS, and we need to thank those warfighters on the ground that are there as we gather here this afternoon. They are risking their lives right now—every day—and their families are dispirited because their sons and daughters are in combat and do sustain injuries while the administration hides behind semantics of “no boots on the ground.” There are boots on the ground.

Further, it was “gambling” and “dangerous” to establish a poorly thought-out and poorly executed “train and equip” scheme in Syria, or to conclude that Russia and China would not cease their aggressive challenges to American superiority around the world.

My friends, one thing we can all agree upon is that the last 2 years of budget cuts, constant deployments, and new crises have only eroded our military’s readiness and capabilities.

The bill before you does not gamble. It is highly responsible.

Rather, our proposal wisely invests more money for our troops, more training for our troops, more modern equipment, expanded cybersecurity, more intelligence-gathering capabilities, and better healthcare outcomes for our troops and their families.

Mr. Chairman, it deserves your support; it deserves our support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request		Bill Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I</b>					
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>					
Military Personnel, Army.....	41,045,562	40,028,162	39,986,962	-1,058,600	-41,220
Military Personnel, Navy.....	27,835,183	27,951,605	27,774,605	-60,578	-177,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	12,859,152	12,813,412	12,701,412	-157,740	-112,000
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	27,679,066	27,944,615	27,794,615	+115,549	-150,000
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	4,483,164	4,561,703	4,458,963	-4,201	-102,740
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,866,891	1,924,155	1,898,825	+31,934	-26,330
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	702,481	744,995	735,305	+33,824	-8,690
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,682,942	1,742,906	1,718,126	+36,184	-24,780
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	7,892,327	7,910,094	7,827,440	-64,887	-83,254
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	3,201,890	3,280,065	3,271,215	+69,325	-8,850
Total, Title I, Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,902,332	128,168,468	-1,060,190	-733,864
<b>TITLE II</b>					
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	32,399,440	33,809,040	34,436,295	+2,036,855	+627,255
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	39,600,172	39,483,581	40,213,485	+613,313	+729,904
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	5,718,074	5,954,258	6,246,360	+528,292	+292,108
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	35,727,457	37,518,056	38,209,602	+2,482,145	+691,546
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide .....	32,105,040	32,571,590	32,263,224	+158,184	-308,386
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	2,648,911	2,712,331	2,767,471	+120,580	+55,140
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	998,481	927,656	975,724	-22,757	+49,068
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	274,526	270,633	320,056	+45,540	+49,433
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	2,980,768	3,067,929	3,106,066	+125,298	+38,137
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	6,595,483	6,825,370	6,923,595	+328,112	+98,225
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	8,820,569	8,703,578	8,708,200	-112,389	+4,622
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	281,752	289,282	-10,738	+7,500
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	366,131	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	108,125	+4,859	+3,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account.....	358,496	325,604	325,604	-32,892	---
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance.....	167,485,170	171,318,488	173,680,060	+6,194,890	+2,361,572
<b>TITLE III</b>					
<b>PROCUREMENT</b>					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	5,866,367	3,614,787	4,628,897	-1,237,670	+1,013,910
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,600,957	1,519,956	1,502,377	-98,580	-17,589
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,951,646	2,265,177	2,244,547	+292,901	-20,830
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,245,426	1,513,157	1,513,157	+267,731	---
Other Procurement, Army.....	5,718,811	5,873,949	6,081,856	+163,045	+207,907
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	17,521,209	14,109,148	15,900,093	-1,621,116	+1,790,945
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	3,049,542	3,209,262	3,102,544	+53,002	-106,718
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	651,920	664,368	661,563	-50,357	-62,805
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	18,704,539	18,354,874	18,484,524	-220,015	+129,650
Other Procurement, Navy.....	6,484,257	6,338,881	6,099,326	-384,931	-239,535
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,186,812	1,362,769	1,213,872	+27,060	-148,897
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	15,756,853	13,922,917	14,325,117	-1,431,736	+402,200
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	2,912,131	2,426,621	2,288,772	-623,359	-137,849
Space Procurement, Air Force.....	2,812,159	3,055,743	2,538,152	-274,007	-517,591
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	1,744,993	1,677,719	1,609,719	-135,274	-68,000
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	18,311,882	17,438,056	17,342,313	-869,569	-95,743
Procurement, Defense-Wide .....	5,245,443	4,524,918	4,649,876	-595,567	+124,958
Defense Production Act Purchases .....	76,680	44,065	74,065	-2,615	+30,000
Total, Title III, Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	104,200,570	-6,641,057	+2,284,213

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE IV</b>					
<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b>					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	7,585,327	7,515,399	7,884,517	+299,190	+349,118
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	18,117,677	17,276,301	16,831,290	-1,286,387	-445,011
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force....	25,217,148	28,112,251	27,106,851	+1,889,703	+1,005,400
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide .....	18,695,955	18,308,826	18,311,236	-384,719	+2,410
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	188,558	178,994	178,994	-9,564	---
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	69,784,665	71,391,771	70,292,888	+508,223	+1,098,883
<b>TITLE V</b>					
<b>REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS</b>					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,738,768	1,371,613	1,371,613	-367,155	---
National Defense Sealift Fund.....	474,164	---	---	-474,164	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds....	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,371,613	-841,319	---
<b>TITLE VI</b>					
<b>OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS</b>					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance.....	29,842,167	32,231,390	31,698,337	+1,854,170	-635,053
Procurement.....	365,390	413,219	413,219	+47,829	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	2,121,933	822,907	1,467,007	-654,926	+644,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/.....	32,329,490	33,467,516	33,578,563	+1,247,073	+109,047
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance.....	118,198	147,282	147,282	+29,084	---
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/.....	899,821	551,023	551,023	-148,798	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense// Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.....	1,050,598	844,800	908,800	-141,798	+64,000
Office of the Inspector General 1/.....	---	99,300	---	---	-99,300
312,559	322,035	322,035	+9,476	---	---
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,674	35,358,421	+965,953	+73,747
<b>TITLE VII</b>					
<b>RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA).....	505,208	533,596	483,596	-21,610	-50,000
Total, Title VII, Related agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	997,596	-21,610	-50,000

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE VIII</b>					
<b>GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005).....	(4,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-500,000)
FFRDC (Sec. 8023).....	-65,000	---	-126,800	-61,800	-126,800
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec. 8028).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec. 8041).....	-1,768,937	---	-1,283,416	+485,521	-1,283,416
National grants (Sec. 8048).....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec. 8052).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec. 8067).....	5,000	---	5,000	---	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec. 8074).....	-1,500,789	---	-573,400	+927,389	-573,400
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec. 8089).....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec. 8093).....	(121,000)	(122,375)	(122,375)	(+1,375)	---
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority).....	(1,000)	---	---	(-1,000)	---
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. 8117).....	-2,576,000	---	-1,493,000	+1,083,000	-1,493,000
Military pay raise (Sec. 8131).....	---	---	340,000	+340,000	+340,000
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions.....	-6,986,726	---	3,423,816	+3,563,110	-3,423,816

**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	1,271,302	-575,054	-780,278
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	1,154,828	+1,154,828	+1,154,828
Subtotal.....	1,846,356	2,051,578	2,426,130	+579,774	+374,552
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	251,011	330,557	194,001	-57,010	-136,556
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	63,500	+63,500	+63,500
Subtotal.....	251,011	330,557	257,501	+6,490	-73,056
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	171,079	179,733	104,542	-66,537	-75,191
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	349,000	+349,000	+349,000
Subtotal.....	171,079	179,733	453,542	+282,463	+273,809
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	726,126	719,896	446,792	-279,334	-273,104
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	145,000	+145,000	+145,000
Subtotal.....	726,126	719,896	591,792	-134,334	-128,104

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	24,462	42,506	30,812	+6,350	-11,694
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	172,362	+172,362	+172,362
Subtotal.....	24,462	42,506	203,174	+178,712	+160,868
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	12,693	11,929	7,905	-4,788	-4,024
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,393	3,764	3,087	+306	-677
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	18,710	20,535	15,979	-2,731	-4,556
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	166,015	196,472	120,514	+36,501	-75,958
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	316,454	+316,454	+316,454
Subtotal.....	166,015	196,472	436,968	+270,953	+240,496
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	2,828	5,288	4,125	+1,297	-1,163
Total, Military Personnel OCO/GWOT Requirements...	3,222,673	3,562,258	2,189,058	-1,023,614	-1,363,199
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	2,201,144	+2,201,144	+2,201,144
Grand Total, Military Personnel.....	3,222,673	3,562,258	4,400,203	+1,177,530	+837,945
<hr/>					
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	14,994,833	15,310,587	10,396,008	-4,598,825	-4,914,579
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	2,186,672	+2,186,672	+2,186,672
Subtotal.....	14,994,833	15,310,587	12,582,680	-2,412,153	-2,727,907
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	7,169,611	6,827,391	3,947,082	-3,222,529	-2,880,309
(Coast Guard) (by transfer) (GWOT).....	---	(182,692)	(182,692)	(+162,692)	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	1,082,170	+1,082,170	+1,082,170
Subtotal.....	7,169,611	6,827,391	5,029,252	-2,140,359	-1,798,139
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,372,534	1,244,359	749,596	-622,938	-494,763
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	186,900	+166,900	+166,900
Subtotal.....	1,372,534	1,244,359	916,496	-456,038	-327,863
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	11,128,813	9,498,830	5,909,780	-5,219,033	-3,589,050
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	980,626	+980,626	+980,626
Subtotal.....	11,128,813	9,498,830	6,870,406	-4,258,407	-2,628,424
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	5,665,633	5,982,173	3,544,434	-2,121,199	-2,437,739
(Coalition support funds) (GWOT).....	(1,160,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(-60,000)	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	351,000	+351,000	+351,000
Subtotal.....	5,665,633	5,982,173	3,895,434	-1,770,199	-2,086,739

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	99,559	38,679	85,666	-13,893	+46,987
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	186,381	+186,381	+186,381
Subtotal.....	99,559	38,679	272,047	+172,488	+233,368
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	31,643	26,265	25,669	-5,974	-596
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	112,350	+112,350	+112,350
Subtotal.....	31,643	26,265	138,019	+106,376	+111,754
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,455	3,304	5,078	+1,823	+1,774
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	24,550	+24,550	+24,550
Subtotal.....	3,455	3,304	29,628	+26,173	+28,324
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	58,106	57,586	45,173	-12,933	-12,413
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	27,550	+27,550	+27,550
Subtotal.....	58,106	57,586	72,723	+14,617	+15,137
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	135,845	127,035	142,341	+6,498	+15,306
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	237,880	+237,880	+237,880
Subtotal.....	135,845	127,035	380,221	+244,376	+253,186
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	19,900	20,000	31,086	+11,186	+11,086
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	247,950	+247,950	+247,950
Subtotal.....	19,900	20,000	279,036	+259,136	+259,036
<b>Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....</b>	<b>40,679,932</b>	<b>39,136,209</b>	<b>30,485,942</b>	<b>-10,213,990</b>	<b>-8,670,267</b>
<b>Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT).....</b>	<b>1,100,000</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>750,000</b>	<b>-350,000</b>	<b>-250,000</b>
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	3,652,257	3,448,715	3,448,715	-203,542	---
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	715,000	630,000	---	-715,000	-630,000
Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	---	880,000	+880,000	+880,000
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000
<b>Total, Operation and Maintenance OCO/GWOT Requirements.....</b>	<b>46,147,189</b>	<b>44,464,924</b>	<b>29,960,628</b>	<b>-16,186,561</b>	<b>-14,504,296</b>
<b>Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>5,584,029</b>	<b>+5,584,029</b>	<b>+5,584,029</b>
<b>Grand Total, Operation and Maintenance.....</b>	<b>46,147,189</b>	<b>44,464,924</b>	<b>35,544,657</b>	<b>-10,602,532</b>	<b>-8,920,267</b>

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Procurement</b>					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	161,987	313,171	313,171	+151,184	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	481,900	+481,900	+481,900
Subtotal.....	161,987	313,171	795,071	+633,084	+481,900
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	37,260	632,817	632,817	+595,557	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	196,100	+196,100	+196,100
Subtotal.....	37,260	632,817	828,917	+791,657	+196,100
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	486,630	153,544	388,544	-88,086	+245,000
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	212,000	+212,000	+212,000
Subtotal.....	486,630	153,544	610,544	+123,914	+457,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	222,040	301,523	301,523	+79,483	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	240,200	+240,200	+240,200
Subtotal.....	222,040	301,523	541,723	+319,683	+240,200
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,175,596	1,373,010	1,373,010	+197,414	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	8,400	+8,400	+8,400
Subtotal.....	1,175,596	1,373,010	1,381,410	+205,814	+8,400
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	210,990	393,030	344,323	+133,333	-48,707
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	626,714	+626,714	+626,714
Subtotal.....	210,990	393,030	971,037	+760,047	+578,007
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	---	8,600	8,600	+8,600	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	175,100	+175,100	+175,100
Subtotal.....	---	8,600	183,700	+183,700	+175,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	117,966	66,229	62,540	-55,428	-3,689
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	58,000	+58,000	+58,000
Subtotal.....	117,966	66,229	120,540	+2,574	+54,311
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	3,086,300	+3,086,300	+3,086,300
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	12,186	124,206	111,551	+98,355	-12,655
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	102,530	+102,530	+102,530
Subtotal.....	12,186	124,206	214,081	+201,895	+89,875
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	56,934	118,939	106,204	+49,270	-12,735
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	107,463	+107,463	+107,463
Subtotal.....	56,934	118,939	213,667	+156,733	+94,728
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	128,900	859,399	709,833	+580,933	-149,566
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	1,295,716	+1,295,716	+1,295,716
Subtotal.....	128,900	859,399	2,005,549	+1,876,649	+1,146,150

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	289,142	339,545	141,375	-147,767	-198,170
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	194,420	+194,420	+194,420
Subtotal.....	289,142	339,545	335,795	+46,653	-3,750
<b>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	228,874	487,406	155,158	-73,716	-332,250
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	323,000	+323,000	+323,000
Subtotal.....	228,874	487,406	478,158	+249,284	-9,250
<b>Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,477,001	3,696,281	3,479,781	+2,780	-216,500
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	173,918	238,434	219,134	+45,216	-19,300
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	170,000	+170,000	+170,000
Subtotal.....	173,918	238,434	389,134	+215,216	+150,700
<b>National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)</b>					
.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	+1,000,000
Total, Procurement OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	7,779,424	9,106,136	8,357,564	+1,578,140	+251,428
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	7,277,843	+7,277,843	+7,277,843
Grand Total, Procurement.....	7,779,424	9,106,136	18,635,407	+8,855,983	+7,529,271

**Research, Development, Test and Evaluation**

<b>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Army (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,500	100,522	100,522	+99,022	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	67,000	+67,000	+67,000
Subtotal.....	1,500	100,522	167,522	+166,022	+67,000
<b>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	35,747	78,323	40,333	+4,586	-37,990
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	65,990	+65,990	+65,990
Subtotal.....	35,747	78,323	106,323	+70,576	+28,000
<b>Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	17,100	32,905	32,905	+15,805	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Subtotal.....	17,100	32,905	42,905	+25,805	+10,000
<b>Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT)</b>					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	177,087	162,419	159,919	-17,168	-2,500
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Subtotal.....	177,087	162,419	179,919	+2,832	+17,500
Total, RDTE OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	231,434	374,169	333,879	+102,245	+40,480
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	162,990	+162,990	+162,990
Grand Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	231,434	374,169	496,669	+265,235	+122,500

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Revolving and Management Funds</b>					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT).....	88,850	140,633	140,633	+51,783	---
<b>Other Department of Defense Programs</b>					
<b>Defense Health Program:</b>					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	272,704	331,764	331,764	+59,060	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	450,000	+450,000	+450,000
Subtotal.....	272,704	331,764	761,764	+509,060	+450,000
<b>Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT).....</b>	<b>186,000</b>	<b>215,333</b>	<b>215,333</b>	<b>+29,333</b>	---
Joint [Improvised Explosive Device] Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund (GWOT).....	349,464	408,272	408,272	+58,808	---
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT).....	10,262	22,062	22,062	+11,800	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs					
OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	818,430	977,431	977,431	+159,001	---
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	450,000	+450,000	+450,000
Grand Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	818,430	977,431	1,427,431	+609,001	+450,000
<b>TITLE IX General Provisions</b>					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec.9002).....	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	---	---
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.9020).....	-400,000	---	-669,000	-269,000	-669,000
Total, General Provisions.....	350,000	---	-19,000	-369,000	-19,000
Total, Title IX OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	58,638,000	58,625,551	42,949,994	-15,686,006	-15,675,557
Total, Title IX OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	15,676,006	+15,676,006	+15,676,006
Grand Total, Title IX.....	58,638,000	58,625,551	58,626,000	-12,000	+449
Grand Total, Bill.....	566,816,000	569,850,382	569,272,000	+2,656,000	-586,382
Appropriations.....	(510,783,937)	(511,232,831)	(511,929,416)	(+1,145,479)	(+696,585)
Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	(59,038,000)	(58,625,551)	(59,295,000)	(+257,000)	(+689,449)
Rescissions.....	(-2,805,937)	---	(-1,263,416)	(+1,522,521)	(-1,283,416)
Rescissions (GWOT).....	(-400,000)	---	(-669,000)	(-269,000)	(-869,000)

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent).....	33,000	37,000	37,000	+4,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent).....	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
DHP, OSM to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent):					
Defense function.....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Non-defense function.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
DHP, OSM to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (Sec. 8098):					
Defense function.....	-120,000	-122,375	-122,375	-2,375	---
Non-defense function.....	120,000	122,375	122,375	+2,375	---
Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (Sec. 8107):					
Defense function.....	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Non-defense function.....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 4/.....	6,631,000	6,953,000	6,953,000	+322,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	<b>6,672,000</b>	<b>6,998,000</b>	<b>6,998,000</b>	<b>+326,000</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,802,332	128,168,468	-1,060,190	-733,884
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	187,485,170	171,318,488	173,680,050	+6,194,890	+2,361,572
Title III - Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	104,200,570	-8,641,057	+2,284,213
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation....	69,784,665	71,391,771	70,292,888	+508,223	-1,098,883
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,371,613	-841,319	---
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,874	35,358,421	+965,953	+73,747
Title VII - Related Agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	997,596	-21,610	-50,000
Title VIII - General Provisions (net).....	-6,986,726	---	-3,423,616	+3,563,110	-3,423,616
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	58,638,000	58,625,551	58,625,000	-12,000	+449
Total, Department of Defense.....	<b>566,616,000</b>	<b>569,858,382</b>	<b>569,272,000</b>	<b>+2,656,000</b>	<b>-586,382</b>
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	<b>6,672,000</b>	<b>6,998,000</b>	<b>6,998,000</b>	<b>+326,000</b>	<b>---</b>
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	<b>573,288,000</b>	<b>576,856,382</b>	<b>576,270,000</b>	<b>+2,982,000</b>	<b>-586,382</b>

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

4/ Contributions to Department of Defense

Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375). Amount does not include Budget proposals to amend TRICARE

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by conveying my deep appreciation, as well, for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's steady leadership of the Defense Subcommittee. His commitment to this subcommittee's tradition of cooperation and bipartisanship is unwavering, and it is a pleasure to be able to work with him.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the other members of the subcommittee for their very good efforts.

Additionally, as we all know, this bill could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, and discerning and thoughtful input of our committee staff and associate staffs.

The chairman has well and clearly articulated the major elements of the bill and report. Under less than ideal circumstances and unsettled conditions, he and the subcommittee staff have, again, demonstrated their talent and acumen in putting together this legislation. There are many highlights to the bill. However, I will use my time during general debate to discuss the circumstances and conditions that led to the proposal to use nearly 27 percent of the overseas contingency operations, OCO, accounts to fund base Department of Defense programs, which gives me pause as an appropriator.

It was as an appropriator that I opposed the Budget Control Act of 2011 and its arbitrary spending caps that only address one-sixth of the Federal budget equation.

□ 1645

In each session of Congress, we should be making discrete decisions on how we annually invest our discretionary dollars. Setting inflexible spending targets for 10 years is, in my opinion, nonsensical. I believe we need to invest in our roads, ports, drinking water infrastructure, universities, and our Nation's defense. We need to generate more resources, and we need to have a fulsome discussion of our entitlement programs. My assumption is that there are very few people in Congress who believe that the Federal Government is currently making enough of a long-term investment in our Nation and its interests.

It was as an appropriator that I voted for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, which mitigated the BCA caps on base discretionary funding and capped OCO spending for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. I, obviously, would have rather seen the complete repeal of the act. But, nevertheless, I supported it because it provided some clarity to the appropriations process for the balance of this Congress. As such, we were able to wrap up the fiscal year 2016 process, and with a top line number for fiscal year 2017, I was guardedly optimistic that the House would have predictability this year.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was far along in its 2017 process when the OCO to base strategy—conceived to placate some on other committees—was settled upon as the strategy for the House majority. While this bill technically does not violate the caps established by the BBA for base defense programs and OCO, it is hard to argue that this bill was assembled under what passes for normalcy in this Congress. And there is no doubt that the chairman and the subcommittee members and staff made smart investment decisions in executing the \$15.7 billion in OCO to base funding strategy. However, I am troubled with the circumstances that compelled the subcommittee's action.

First and foremost, the fiscal year begins October 1, 2016, not May 1, 2017, and it is the responsibility of us holding office in the second session of the 114th Congress to execute the 2017 fiscal year appropriations process. In order to make OCO funding available for base programs, our bill only provides enough funding to fully support the warfighter until the end of April 2017, which is 5 months before the end of the fiscal year. This is intended to force the next administration and the next Congress to pass a supplemental in calendar year 2017 to support ongoing combat operations.

It is not the responsibility of the 115th Congress to finish a predetermined fraction of our work, and we should not be dismissive of the difficulties created. To assume that there will be smooth sailing for a supplemental appropriations bill in the spring is very problematic. We do not know who will be in the White House. We do not know who will be the civilian leadership at the Department of Defense. And we do not know the composition in the next Congress. And as we have clearly seen from the Zika virus debate and, before that, Hurricane Sandy, supplemental appropriations bills are not without controversy.

Additionally, in making the \$15.7 billion in cuts to the OCO budget request, the committee has had to make some assumptions on the pace of combat operations between now and May 2017. While Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN exercised great care and caution, there is not much wiggle room in the interim. If the OCO spend rate were to increase for any reason in an uncertain world, Congress and a new administration would have to act quickly to pass a supplemental in early 2017. If that supplemental were not timely, the Department would likely be forced to reprogram or transfer base dollars to OCO, which shortchanges other priorities, negates the committee's funding levels, and still requires a supplemental to backfill both base and OCO while not violating the BCA caps. Will said supplemental be funded by offsets from resources within the other 11 appropriations bills?

Adding to the uncertainty, the House majority is going it alone with this

strategy. To date, it has been rejected by the administration, the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as the full Senate. While those institutions are not infallible, I fear that if the House majority insists upon heading down this path, we are looking at an impossible conference process.

Putting concerns about uncertainty aside, I further believe that the OCO to base strategy abdicates our discretion—Congress' discretion—to the Department of Defense in executing the remaining OCO funding. In order to free \$15.7 billion, certain appropriations in OCO were subject to reductions. These reductions were done at the account level, not at the program level. For example, Navy O&M in the OCO title was reduced by \$2.9 billion from its requested level. The Department has discretion on how to apply that \$2.9 billion reduction across 10 programs under that account. I believe that should be our discretion.

A final concern I have—and one expressed in prior years—is that we should eliminate the reliance on OCO funding in the first instance and shift activities to the base budget. It is increasingly difficult after 15 years of war to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our Nation and our interests. This subcommittee has correctly begun to limit what is an eligible expense in OCO, but under the act and this latest proposal, we could take a step back. For example, this bill proposes to increase end strength by 52,000 troops above planned reductions for the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The chairman alluded to it in his opening remarks. I absolutely agree with him that we need new personnel, but this additional force structure costs \$3 billion in 2017. What remains unsaid is if you look out for the next 5 years, it will also increase spending by \$30 billion that is not budgeted for.

In closing, I have taken some time describing my concerns with the circumstances that impact less than 3 percent of the total bill. But the manufactured uncertainty introduced by these circumstances diminishes the likelihood that this committee and the Congress will complete its work on time. It is a mark of the talent of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and our staff, their commitment to our troops and our Nation's defense, and their seriousness of purpose, that they have done so much good to ameliorate the problems caused and highlighted in my remarks. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the Members of this House as we advance the process over the next several days and complete the task before us. I also look forward to the debate on amendments.

Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by conveying my deep appreciation for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's steady leadership of the Defense Subcommittee. His commitment to this

subcommittee's tradition of cooperative bipartisanship is unwavering and it is a pleasure working with him.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the other Members of the Subcommittee for their efforts.

Additionally, this bill could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I want to thank Rob Blair, Sherry Young, Walter Hearne, BG Wright, Brooke Boyer, Adrienne Ramsay, Allison Deters, Megan Milam, Colin Lee, Cornell Teague, Matthew Bower, Rebecca Leggieri, Chris Bigelow, Steve Wilson, Joe DeVooght, and Luke Wood.

The Chairman has well and clearly articulated the major elements of the bill and report. Under less than ideal circumstances and unsettled conditions, he and the Subcommittee staff have again demonstrated their talent and acumen in putting together this legislation. There are many highlights to the bill. However, I will use my time during general debate to discuss the circumstances and conditions that led to the proposal to use nearly 27 percent of the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) accounts to fund base Department of Defense programs, which gives me pause as an Appropriator.

It was as an Appropriator that I opposed the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and its arbitrary spending caps that only address one-sixth of the federal budget equation. In each session of Congress we should be making discrete decisions on how we annually invest our discretionary dollars. Setting inflexible spending targets for 10 years is nonsensical. I believe we need to invest more in our roads, ports, drinking water infrastructure, universities, and our defense. We need to generate more resources, and the need to have a fulsome discussion of our entitlement programs. My assumption is that there are very few people in Congress who believe that the federal government is currently making enough of a long-term investment in our nation and its interests.

And it was as an Appropriator, that I voted for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA), which mitigated the BCA caps on base discretionary funding and capped OCO spending for Fiscal Years (FY) 2016 and 2017. I obviously would have rather seen the complete repeal of the BCA, but nonetheless, I supported the BBA, because it provided some clarity to the Appropriations process for the balance of the 114th Congress. As such, we were able to wrap up the FY 2016 process and, with a number for FY 2017, I was guardedly optimistic that the House would have predictability this year.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was far along in its FY 2017 process, when the OCO to Base strategy—conceived to placate some on other Committees—was settled upon as the strategy for the House Majority.

While this bill technically does not violate the caps established by the BBA for base defense programs and OCO, it is hard to argue that this bill was assembled under what passes for normalcy in this Congress. And there is no doubt that the Chairman and Subcommittee staff made smart investment decisions in executing the \$15.7 billion in OCO to Base funding strategy. However, I am troubled with the circumstances that compelled the subcommittee's action.

First and foremost, the fiscal year begins on October 1, 2016, not May 1, 2017, and it is the responsibility of those of us holding office in the 2nd session of the 114th Congress to execute the FY 2017 appropriations process. In order to make OCO funding available for base programs, our bill only provides enough funding to fully support the warfighter until the end of April 2017, which is five months before the end of the fiscal year. This is intended to force the next administration and the next Congress to pass a supplemental in calendar year 2017 to support ongoing combat operations.

It is not the responsibility of the 115th Congress to finish a predetermined fraction of our work, and we should not be dismissive of the difficulties we created. To assume there will be smooth sailing for a supplemental appropriations bill in the spring is problematic. We do not know who will be in the White House, who will be the civilian leadership at DoD, nor the composition of the next Congress. And as we can clearly see from the Zika Virus debate, and before that Hurricane Sandy, supplemental appropriations bills are not without controversy.

Additionally, in making the \$15.7 billion in cuts to the OCO budget request, the Committee had to make some assumptions on the pace of combat operations between now and May 2017. While Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN exercised care and caution, there is not much wiggle room in the interim. If the OCO spend rate were to increase for any reason, Congress and a new Administration would have to act quickly to pass a supplemental early in 2017. If that supplemental were not timely, the Department would likely be forced to reprogram or transfer base dollars to OCO, which shortchanges other priorities, negates the committee's funding levels, and still requires a supplemental to backfill both base and OCO while not violating the BCA caps. Will said supplemental be funded by offsets from resources within the other 11 Appropriations bills?

Adding to the uncertainty, the House Majority is going it alone with this strategy. To date, it has been rejected by the Administration, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the full Senate. While those three are not infallible, I fear that if the House Majority insists upon heading down this path, we are looking at an impossible conference process.

Putting concerns over uncertainty aside, I further believe the OCO to Base strategy abdi-

cates our discretion to the Department of Defense in executing the remaining OCO funding. In order to free up \$15.7 billion, certain appropriations in OCO were subject to reductions. These reductions were done at the account level, not at the program level. For example, Navy O&M in the OCO Title was reduced by \$2.9 billion, from its requested level of \$6.8 billion. The Department has discretion on how it will apply that \$2.9 billion reduction across the tens of programs under that account.

A final concern I have, and one expressed in prior years, is that we should eliminate the reliance on OCO funding in the first instance and shift activities to the base budget. It is increasingly difficult after fifteen years of war to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our nation and our interests. This Subcommittee had correctly begun to limit what is an eligible expense in OCO, but under the BBA and this latest proposal we would take a step back. For example, this bill proposes to increase end strength by 52,000 above planned reductions for the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force. And I agree that we need more personnel, but this additional force structure costs \$3 billion in FY 2017 and is paid for with OCO to Base dollars. But, we defer the tough decisions. This is particularly true when recognizing the fact that BCA caps are scheduled to lower defense spending by \$2 billion in FY 2018. An increase in end strength creates a tail of spending in future years. The DoD estimates that the troop levels funded in the bill will increase spending by \$30 billion over five years. That is \$30 billion that is not budgeted for, but \$30 billion that our Committee will be expected to pay for.

In closing, I have taken some time describing my concerns with the circumstances that impact less than three percent of the total bill. But the manufactured uncertainty introduced by these circumstances diminishes the likelihood that this Committee and the Congress will complete its work. It is a mark of the talent of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and our staff, their commitment to our troops and our nation's defense, and their seriousness of purpose, that they have done so much good to ameliorate the problems caused by this approach. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the members of the House to advance the process and complete the task before us.

I look forward to the debate on amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the full committee chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

I rise in support of this fine bill. This bill provides critical funding to uphold our defense posture, maintain our military readiness, and protect our Nation from those who would seek to do us harm. The world, of course, is changing rapidly. We are reminded regularly that we are still a Nation at war, and new threats arise daily. It is clear that a strong national defense is of the highest priority.

In total, as has been said, the bill contains \$575.8 billion in base and Overseas Contingency Operations funding for critical national security needs, and the health and well-being of our troops.

The use of OCO funds in this bill is in line with the National Defense Authorization Act that the House passed on a bipartisan basis last month. This funding will provide the resources that our military needs to be successful in the fight right now, and that will improve our readiness for the future.

This includes over \$209 billion for operations and maintenance, the programs that help prepare our troops, like flight time and battle training, as well as base operations. The bill also includes \$120.8 billion for equipment and upgrades, providing the weapons and platforms needed to fight and win in the field.

And to improve this equipment, develop and test new technologies, and meet future security threats, the bill contains \$70.8 billion for research and development. This will help keep our Nation on the cutting edge, ensuring that we will remain the most superior military power in the entire world.

This legislation prioritizes a robust, healthy, and well-cared-for force. In total, \$132.6 billion is provided to support over 1.3 million Active Duty troops and over 826,000 Guard and Reserve troops. This wholly rejects the administration's proposed troop reductions by providing an additional \$3 billion to maintain our troop strength and fully funds the authorized 2.1 percent pay raise for our soldiers.

It is also critically important that we adequately fund the quality-of-life programs for our troops and military families need and deserve. The bill contains \$34 billion for defense headline programs—targeting increases to cancer research, facility upgrades, traumatic brain injury, psychological health research, and sexual assault prevention.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his care and consideration in drafting this big bill. He, as well as the members of his subcommittee, have put the security of the Nation and the welfare of our warfighters above all else. I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for their expert work and dedication on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill fulfills the Congress' most important responsibility—providing for the common defense. And it does so responsibly—funding those military needs that must be addressed now, planning and preparing

for the future, and respecting the taxpayer by making commonsense budgeting decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill to continue to protect our Nation from threats to our freedom, democracy, and way of life.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, with only the fourth appropriations bill of the year on the floor, we should not be patting ourselves on the back.

Today's bill blows up last year's budget agreement through a gimmick that needlessly creates a funding cliff next spring. It forces the new President, as one of her or his first actions in office, to request emergency supplemental funding.

The difference here is about more than bookkeeping. Sending our military men and women into some of the most dangerous places on Earth—Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria—without ensuring mission support, including to combat ISIL, or their salaries for a full year, is the height of irresponsibility.

Here are some of the things that Secretary Carter has said about the Republican OCO budget gimmick: deeply troubling, flawed, gambling with warfighting money, creating a hollow force structure, working against our efforts to restore readiness, a road to nowhere, a high probability of leading to more gridlock, undercuts stable planning and efficient use of taxpayer dollars, dispirits troops and their families, baffles friends, and emboldens foes.

Additionally, President Obama issued a veto threat due to this harmful gimmick.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the President's Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 5293.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5293—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—REP. ROGERS, R-KY

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 5293, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year (FY) ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

While the Administration appreciates the Committee's support for certain investments in our national defense, H.R. 5293 fails to provide our troops with the resources needed to keep our Nation safe. At a time when ISIL continues to threaten the homeland and our allies, the bill does not fully fund wartime operations such as INHERENT RESOLVE. Instead the bill would redirect \$16 billion of Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds toward base budget programs that the Department of Defense (DOD) did not request, shortchanging funding for ongoing wartime operations midway through the year. Not only is this approach dangerous but it is also wasteful. The bill would buy excess force structure without the money to sustain it, effectively creating a hollow force structure that would undermine DOD's efforts to restore readiness. Furthermore, the bill's funding approach attempts to unravel the dollar-for-dollar balance of defense and non-defense funding increases provided by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA),

threatening future steps needed to reverse over \$100 billion of future sequestration cuts to DOD. By gambling with warfighting funds, the bill risks the safety of our men and women fighting to keep America safe, undercuts stable planning and efficient use of taxpayer dollars, dispirits troops and their families, baffles our allies, and emboldens our enemies.

In addition, H.R. 5293 would impose other unneeded costs, constraining DOD's ability to balance military capability, capacity, and readiness. The Administration's defense strategy depends on investing every dollar where it will have the greatest effect. The Administration's FY 2017 proposals would accomplish this by continuing and expanding critical reforms that divest unneeded force structure, balance growth in military compensation, modernize military health care, and reduce wasteful overhead. The bill fails to adopt many of these reforms, including through measures prohibiting the use of funds to propose or plan for a new Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The bill also continues unwarranted restrictions regarding detainees at Guantanamo Bay that threaten to interfere with the Executive Branch's ability to determine the appropriate disposition of detainees and its flexibility to determine when and where to prosecute Guantanamo detainees based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests.

In October 2015, the President worked with congressional leaders from both parties to secure the BBA, which partially reversed harmful sequestration cuts slated for FY 2017. By providing fully-paid-for equal dollar increases for defense and non-defense spending, the BBA allows for investments in FY 2017 that create jobs, support middle-class families, contribute to long-term growth, and safeguard national security. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to enact appropriations that are consistent with that agreement, and fully support economic growth, opportunity, and our national security priorities. However, the bill is inconsistent with the BBA, and the Administration strongly objects to the inclusion of problematic ideological provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation. *If the President were presented with H.R. 5293, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.*

The Administration would like to take this opportunity to share additional views regarding the Committee's version of the bill. *Department of Defense (DOD)*

*Reduction and Misuse of OCO Funds.* The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's proposal to substitute \$16 billion of DOD's OCO request in the FY 2017 Budget with \$16 billion of unsustainable base budget programs that do not reflect the Department's highest joint priorities. This approach creates a hollow force structure and risks the loss of funding for critical overseas contingency operations. This gimmick is inconsistent with the BBA, which provided equal increases for defense and non-defense spending as well as the certainty needed to prosecute the counter-ISIL campaign, protect readiness recovery, modernize the force for future conflicts, and keep faith with servicemembers and their families. Short-changing wartime operations by \$16 billion would deplete essential funding for ongoing operations by the middle of the year, introducing a dangerous level of uncertainty for our men and women in uniform carrying out missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere. Our troops need and deserve guaranteed, predictable support as they execute their missions year round, particularly in light of the dangers they face in executing

the Nation's ongoing overseas contingency operations.

**Guantanamo Detainee Restrictions.** The Administration strongly objects to sections 8097, 8098, 8099, and 8130 of the bill, which would restrict the Executive Branch's ability to manage the detainee population at the Guantanamo Bay, Cuba detention facility. Section 8098 would prohibit the use of funds for the construction, acquisition, or modification of any facility to house Guantanamo detainees in the United States. Sections 8097 and 8099 would continue prohibitions and restrictions relating to transfers of detainees abroad. In addition, section 8130 would restrict the Department's ability to transfer U.S. Naval Station functions in support of national security. The President has repeatedly objected to the inclusion of these and similar provisions in prior legislation and has called upon the Congress to lift the restrictions. Operating the detention facility at Guantanamo weakens our national security by draining resources, damaging our relationships with key allies and partners, and emboldening violent extremists. These provisions are unwarranted and threaten to interfere with the Executive Branch's ability to determine the appropriate disposition of detainees and its flexibility to determine when and where to prosecute Guantanamo detainees based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests. Sections 8097 and 8099 would, moreover, violate constitutional separation-of-powers principles in certain circumstances.

**Military End Strength.** The Administration strongly objects to the unnecessary funding for end strength levels above the FY 2017 Budget request. The bill would force the Department to take additional risk in the training and readiness of the current force, as well as investment in and procurement of future capabilities. Adding unnecessary end strength in the manner proposed in the bill would increase military personnel and operation and maintenance support costs by approximately \$30 billion (FY 2017 through FY 2021). This would also invite a significant, unacceptable risk of creating a future hollow force, in which force structure exists, but the resources to make it ready do not follow. The Administration urges support of the Department's plan, which reflects sound strategy and responsible choices among capacity, capabilities, and current and future readiness.

**Military Compensation Reform.** The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has rejected the pay raise proposal and most of the health care reform proposals included in the FY 2017 Budget request. The FY 2017 Budget request includes a set of common-sense reforms that would allow the Department to achieve a proper balance between DOD's obligation to provide competitive pay and benefits to servicemembers and its responsibility to provide troops the finest training and equipment possible. The Administration strongly encourages the Congress to support these reforms, which would save \$500 million in FY 2017 and \$11 billion through FY 2021.

**Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga-Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships.** The Administration strongly objects to section 8124 of the bill, which would prohibit the Navy from executing its phased modernization approach for maintaining an effective cruiser and dock landing ship force structure while balancing scarce operating and maintenance funding. It also would significantly reduce planned savings and accelerate the retirement of all Ticonderoga-Class cruisers. The Navy's current requirement for active large surface combatants includes 11 Air Defense Commander ships, one assigned to each of the active car-

rier strike groups. This requirement is met by the modernization plan proposed in the FY 2017 Budget request. Furthermore, section 8124 would require an additional \$3.2 billion across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) to fund manpower, maintenance, modernization, and operations when compared to the FY 2017 Budget request.

**Restoration of Tenth Navy Carrier Air Wing.** The Administration strongly objects to restoration of the Carrier Air Wing in Title IX of the bill. The tenth Carrier Air Wing is no longer needed, and results in ineffective use of the aircraft and pilot inventory in the Navy. The plan proposed in the FY 2017 Budget request optimizes Carrier Air Wing force structure to meet the Global Force Management Allocation Plan demand in a sustainable way. As an additional benefit, the plan also generates \$926 million in FYDP savings. Furthermore, if forced to retain the tenth Carrier Air Wing, the bill's current military personnel funding levels are insufficient. The Navy would require an additional \$48 million in FY 2017 for military personnel above the levels already in the bill, as well as an end strength increase of 1,167 above the Navy end strength in the bill.

**Restoration of Third Littoral Combat Ship.** The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's proposal to increase the purchase of Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) in FY 2017 from two to three. The FY 2017 Budget request reduced from 52 to 40 the total number of LCS and Frigates (FF) the Navy would purchase over the life of the program. A combined program of 40 LCS and FF would allow DOD to invest in advanced capabilities across the fleet and would provide sufficient capacity to meet the Department's warfighting needs and to exceed recent presence levels with a more modern and capable ship than legacy mine sweepers, frigates, and coastal patrol craft they would replace. By funding two LCS in FY 2017, the Budget request ensures that both shipyards are on equal footing and have robust production leading up to the competition to select the shipyard that would continue the program. This competitive environment ensures the best price for the taxpayer on the remaining ships, while also achieving savings by down-selecting to one shipyard. The bill prevents the use of resources for higher priorities to improve DOD's warfighting capability, such as undersea, other surface, and aviation investments.

**Prohibition on Proposing Planning or Conducting an Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round.** The Administration strongly objects to section 8121 of the bill and the proposed \$3.5 million reduction to funds that would support a 2019 BRAC round. By forcing the Department to spread its resources more thinly, excess infrastructure is one of the principal drains on the Department's readiness, which the Committee recognizes as a major concern. In addition to addressing every previous congressional objection to BRAC authorization, the Department recently conducted a DOD-wide parametric capacity analysis, which demonstrates that the Department has 22 percent excess capacity. In addition, the Administration's BRAC legislative proposal includes several changes that respond to congressional concerns regarding cost. Specifically, the revised BRAC legislation requires the Secretary to certify that BRAC would have the primary objective of eliminating excess capacity and reducing costs, emphasizes recommendations that yield net savings within five years (subject to military value), and limits recommendations that take longer than 20 years to pay back. The Administration strongly urges the Congress to provide BRAC authorization as requested so that DOD can make better use of scarce resources to maintain readiness.

**Asia-Pacific Rebalance Infrastructure.** The Administration strongly objects to the exclusion of a general provision requested in the FY 2017 Budget that would allow for \$86.7 million of the amounts appropriated for the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account to be available for the Secretary of Defense to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds. This critical provision addresses the need to provide assistance for civilian water and wastewater improvements to support the military build-up on Guam, as well as critical existing and enduring military installations and missions on Guam. A key aspect of the Asia-Pacific rebalance is to create a more operationally resilient Marine Corps presence in the Pacific and invest in Guam as a joint strategic hub. This funding supports the ability and flexibility of the President to execute our foreign and defense policies in coordination with our ally, Japan. In addition, it calls into question among regional states our commitment to implement the realignment plan and our ability to execute our defense strategy.

**Prohibition of Funds to Enforce Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.** The Administration strongly objects to section 8132 of the bill, which would prohibit DOD from using FY 2017 funds to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Section 526 provides an environmentally sound framework for the development of future alternative fuels.

**Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle.** The Administration objects to the reductions to both the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle and the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Infrastructure requested in the FY 2017 Budget. The Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle reduction would eliminate three launch service procurements, instead of the two procurements the Committee intended. Further, the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Infrastructure reduction exceeds the amount ascribed to these two procurements, and would cause the Government to default on the current contract and the block buy, unnecessarily introducing costs and schedule risk for national security space payloads.

**Missile Defense Programs.** The Administration objects to the reduction of \$324 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for U.S. ballistic missile defense programs, including \$49 million to homeland defense programs, \$91 million to U.S. regional missile defense programs, \$44 million to missile defense testing efforts, and \$140 million to missile defense advanced technology programs. These programs are required to improve the reliability of missile defense system and ensure the United States stays ahead of the future ballistic missile threat. Furthermore, the Administration opposes the addition of \$455 million above the FY 2017 Budget request for Israeli missile defense procurement and cooperative development programs.

**Coalition Support Fund (CSF).** The Administration objects to section 9020 of the bill, which would rescind funds available for CSF by \$300 million. Reducing CSF would limit DOD's ability to reimburse key allies in the fight against ISIL and other extremist groups in the region. The rescission is especially harmful because it would reduce funds available for programs that are already underway and would limit DOD's flexibility to continue to program these funds for critical needs. The Administration urges the Congress to retain the authority to make certain funds available to support stability activities in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas as provided in section 1212(f) of the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

**Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF).** The Administration objects to the reduction of \$250 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for CTPF because it would restrict the

resources required to empower and enable partners in responding to shared terrorist threats around the world. The Administration also objects to the \$200 million rescission in FY 2016 CTPF resources in the bill. Both of these reductions would preclude DOD from continuing important security assistance programs begun in FY 2016. The Administration strongly encourages the Congress to provide the \$1 billion originally requested to continue support for CTPF activities in FY 2017 and restore the rescinded FY 2016 funding.

*Elimination of Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (JUONF) Funding.* The Administration objects to the elimination of the \$99 million JUONF base funding requested in the FY 2017 Budget. This funding is vital to the Department's ability to quickly respond to urgent operational needs. Eliminating this funding may increase life-threatening risks to servicemembers and contribute to critical mission failures.

*Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation and Demonstration.* The Administration objects to the reduction of \$42 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the Navy's research and development funding to support the Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation and Demonstration (RPED) initiative. RPED is an essential element in the Navy's strategy to employ successful innovation technologies to help pace the dynamic threat of our adversaries, more quickly address urgent capability needs, accelerate our speed of innovation, and rapidly develop and deliver advanced warfighting capability to naval forces. This reduction would render the initiative ineffective in promoting rapid acquisition, hindering the Navy's ability to determine the technical feasibility and operational utility of advanced technologies before committing billions of dollars toward development. This reduction hinders the Department-wide goal of employing new techniques to make the acquisition process more agile and efficient.

*Innovation and Access to Non-Traditional Suppliers.* The Administration objects to the reduction of \$30 million for programs that seek to broaden DOD's access to innovative companies and technologies. Specifically, the Administration is concerned about the elimination of the investment funding associated with the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx), as well as the reduction in funding for In-Q-Tel's efforts to explore innovative technologies that enable the efficient incorporation into weapons systems and operations capabilities. These investments would enable the development of leading-edge, primarily asymmetric capabilities and help spur development of new ways of warfighting to counter advanced adversaries.

*Reduction of Funds for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) Situational Awareness System.* The Administration objects to the reduction of \$27 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the development of a CWMD situational awareness information system, known as "Constellation." The Department is developing and fielding this system in response to requirements articulated by all Combatant Commands and validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. This capability is critical to anticipating WMD threats from both nation-state and non-state actors and sharing information between DOD and its U.S. interagency and international partners. Funds were appropriated in FY 2014–2016 specifically to develop and field the Constellation system, which would be deployed in July 2016 as an initial prototype. A reduction of \$27 million would effectively terminate this initiative and prevent DOD from developing a high priority capability needed to counter WMD threats.

*Navy High Energy Lasers.* The Administration objects to the reduction of \$20 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the Power Projection Advanced Technology program, which would delay by one year fielding of the High Energy Laser (HEL) program laser and demonstration of its technology maturation. The HEL technology is a means of countering low-cost unmanned aerial vehicles and small surface vessels.

*Limitation on Intelligence Community General Transfer Authority (GTA).* The Administration objects to section 8096 of the bill, which reduces the Intelligence Community's (IC's) FY 2016 enacted GTA cap from \$1.5 billion to \$1.0 billion for FY 2017. This proposed cap would place severe limits on the IC's flexibility to manage resources and could compromise the ability to meet critical intelligence priorities at a time of shifting and dynamic worldwide threats, especially in urgent circumstances. This flexibility is especially important given the broad applicability of the GTA constraints to the appropriation accounts that fund IC.

*Availability of Funds for Improvement of IC Financial Management.* The Administration objects to section 8066 of the bill, which places limits on the ability of IC to review and take action on financial management improvement measures. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and DOD are engaged in a comprehensive review of financial management practices that may result in recommendations for changes to financial management or appropriations structures.

#### *Constitutional Concerns*

Several other provisions in the bill raise constitutional concerns. For instance, sections 8055, 8071, 8121, and provisions under the headings "Operations and Maintenance—Defense-wide" and "Joint Improvised Threat Defeat Fund" may interfere with the President's authority as Commander in Chief.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the FY 2017 appropriations process moves forward.

**Mrs. LOWEY.** Mr. Chairman, using OCO for base funds detracts from the true purpose of OCO, which is to fund wartime efforts. This prevents our Armed Forces from using these funds to counter ISIL and other threats.

A great deal of good elsewhere in the bill is overshadowed by this failure. I thank the chairman for his work to increase cybersecurity operations by nearly \$1 billion; invest in the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance resources combat commanders clamor for; provide strong, bipartisan support for our allies in the Middle East; and finance important health initiatives that help warfighters and their families.

□ 1700

All of that could have been done while providing certainty for troops in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** Mr. Chair, how much time remains on both sides?

**The CHAIR.** The gentleman from New Jersey has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 18 minutes remaining.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the vice chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

**Ms. GRANGER.** Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill.

This very important bill provides for our national security by supporting our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, on whom we rely to provide that security. During very dangerous times, we must ensure that the United States remains not only the greatest country in the world, but also the strongest.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN takes the constitutional responsibility of providing for the common defense very seriously, and he deserves all of our thanks for drafting such a significant and meaningful bill.

This is not an easy bill to draft. With increased threats and reduced budgets, the Department of Defense is being forced to make decisions it should never have to make. It is making decisions to align with the budget crisis instead of making decisions to protect the homeland and defeat our enemies. The military readiness accounts are an example of the shocking consequence of this budget environment. Already stretched thin by more than a decade of war, Marine aviation squadrons actually have to salvage aircraft parts from museums in order to keep planes flying. This is unconscionable. Our national security needs more. Our troops deserve better.

The bill Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN drafted takes a responsible approach in addressing these and other pressing issues. Rather than just throwing money at these crises, he exercises the subcommittee's oversight responsibilities by reducing funding for programs with unjustified cost increases or subpar performance. This allows the chairman to redirect those critical dollars in order to increase the number of troops, to increase funding for training, and to address many of the service chiefs' priorities.

The U.S. and our allies continue to face threats from countries such as Iran, Russia, China, and North Korea. Radical Islamist terrorists, such as ISIS, continue to threaten everything we stand for. As the chair of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, and as vice chair of Defense Appropriations, I am very proud of what this bill does to ensure resources are available to counter all of these threats.

The passage of this bill ensures the United States will lead in this very dangerous world. I urge a "yes" vote.

**Mr. VISCOSKY.** Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Defense Subcommittee.

**Ms. KAPTUR.** I thank Ranking Member VISCOSKY for the time.

Mr. Chair, I, regretfully, rise in opposition to this defense bill—a bill I certainly would prefer to support. Surely, this decision is difficult because of the deep respect I hold for the chairman, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, and for Ranking Member VISCOSKY of Indiana; but like this year's National Defense Authorization Act, this bill recklessly endangers our servicemembers by severely restricting the

financial stability, certainty, and budgeting predictability that commanders need to plan beyond next April.

Over and over, our service chiefs and secretaries have requested one thing from Congress—stability and predictability in the budget so they can properly train and equip their troops for war. “Do your job,” they say, “so we can do ours.” This bill does not fulfill our responsibilities as a Congress nor does it uphold our end of the bargain with our servicemembers and their families.

Instead, this bill replaces predictability with political posturing, and it replaces stability with budget shortsightedness. It places our national defense in a position of uncertainty after April 30 of 2017, and it proclaims neither strength nor vision. Thus, it shortchanges our troops who need it most—those engaged in the battlefield. This bill creates a funding cliff that sends a message of hesitation to both our allies and our enemies during a time when steadfast resolve is vital to our success.

Throughout my career, I have always supported our troops and our national defense. Whether honoring veterans with the World War II Memorial or pushing for energy independence to increase security at home and abroad, our commitment to protect and defend the American people has always been my top priority as a Member of Congress. However, I can’t support a bill that causes a soldier who is deployed in Afghanistan or in any theater to wonder whether or not he or she is going to be paid on May 1 of 2017. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed and incomplete bill.

Finally, in closing, let me extend special regards to my brother, Steve, who is as courageous a fighter as I have ever known.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, almost a year ago today, I stood on this floor to state my disgust at this administration’s plans to slash the Army by 40,000 troops and make a large, non-proportional cut to Fort Hood, in my district, which is known as the Great Place and as the home of the heavy armor of the United States Army.

These cuts would have a disastrous effect on our national security and would lead to putting our Army, in the words of Chief of Staff General Mark Milley, at high risk. This is unacceptable. As Members of Congress, it is our sworn, constitutional duty to raise and support Armies. This is why I am proud to support the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, which pays for an increase of 45,000 active, guard, and reserve soldiers, including their training and equipping for war.

I thank the committee for its continued support for Operation Phalanx, which is a proven program that is aimed at protecting our southern bor-

der—of which Texas has a lot—that remains in high demand. The DOD has received a request to execute the additional FY16 hours, and I would urge the Department to immediately take action on the FY17 hours.

Mr. Chair, from the years 2011–2014, the United States cut its budget for defense by 19 percent while Russia and China increased theirs by 31 and 30 percent. Given world events and the Director of National Intelligence’s assessment that he could not recall a more diverse array of challenges and crises, it is clear that the Obama administration has failed to adequately address our national security needs.

This bill before us recognizes the military’s shortfalls in modernization and force readiness. It makes targeted investments to ensure that the military has the tools, training, and manpower that is necessary to maintain peace and, if necessary, to defeat any potential enemy.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their hard work, and I urge the adoption of this year’s Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I do, indeed, rise to engage the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chair, I express my profound gratitude to the committee for the inclusion of report language on the bill, an inclusion which notes the contributions made to our Nation’s defense against digital threats by National Guard Cyber Protection Teams. The report language also expressed support for partnerships with Federal agencies, universities, and the private sector to achieve more effective training for missions like protecting the industrial control systems of critical infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, the report language refers specifically to Army National Guard Cyber Protection Teams, but as the chairman is likely aware, the Air National Guard is also leading efforts in this area. For example, the 194th Wing of the Air National Guard, which is based in the 10th Congressional District of Washington State, at Camp Murray, has several Cyber Protection Teams with demonstrated expertise in industrial control system assessment, cybersecurity remediation, and cyber mission planning.

I ask the chairman whether the language in the report that expresses support for collaborative training efforts for Army National Guard Cyber Protection Teams would also apply to the Air National Guard.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, the committee recognizes the important role of the Reserve, including the Army National Guard, as well as the Air National Guard, as a flexible and ready force that contributes to our cyber preparedness.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for raising this important issue, and I look forward to working with him as we move forward with this bill.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the chairman for agreeing to work with me on this critically important issue as well as for his and the ranking member’s leadership on this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), a vital member of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chair, we are considering this critical legislation in the wake of the horrific terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, during which 49 innocent Americans were killed and 53 were wounded by a terrorist who pledged loyalty to the Islamic State. Make no mistake—we are a Nation at war with militant Islamic terrorism, and that is why this legislation is so important. It provides our brave men and women in uniform with the resources they need to defeat the enemy.

For example, this bill includes my provision to speed the replacement of a critical radar system and aircraft known as the JSTARS. The technology which is stationed at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia significantly enhances the ability of our warplanes and other military assets to target enemy combatants while helping, at the same time, to protect our soldiers on the ground by detecting threats and allowing for better coordinated and more effective support. This bill also prevents the retirement of the A-10 Warthog aircraft, which is the most potent close air support platform in our arsenal and is a key tool in fighting the Islamic State.

Now, with more than 100,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in Georgia—the fourth largest military population in the Nation—I am proud to support our men and women in uniform by supporting this legislation.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his great work on this bill.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I have long supported the Iron Dome weapons system to defend Israel from short-range missile attacks. I voted to authorize the United States to assist Israel in procuring the weapons. I voted for massive increases in funding for the Iron Dome during the summer of 2014 when Israel was under a daily barrage of missiles, and I spoke out repeatedly on the House floor in favor of fully funding the Iron Dome. I have been lucky enough to have visited Israel many times. Four years ago, I visited an Iron Dome battery in Israel. A single Iron Dome launcher can protect a medium-sized city. I am pleased that this bill includes \$62 million for the program.

I have offered an amendment to provide an increase in funding of \$10 million, which would be sufficient for the

procurement of an additional 500 interceptors. My amendment is designed to ensure that Israel has the means to defend itself against an increase in rocket attacks.

As we all know, Israel lives in a dangerous part of the world. Since Israel withdrew from the Gaza Strip in 2005, terrorists have fired more than 11,000 rockets into Israel. Over 5 million Israelis currently live under the threat of rocket attacks, and more than a half a million Israelis have less than 60 seconds to find shelter after a rocket is launched from Gaza into Israel.

Therefore, I offer this amendment in defense of the civilian population of Israel. I am pleased to hear that the amendment will be accepted. I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, today, the Army celebrates its 241st birthday and a long, proud history of defending our great Nation. The Army and all of our military branches make up the finest fighting force in the world because of our extraordinary men and women who serve in them and because they have the tools that are necessary to carry out their missions.

□ 1715

Just days ago, we saw a tragic and horrific reminder in Orlando that we are a Nation very much at war with radical Islamic extremists. While there may be differing opinions on what steps our country can and should do to stop attacks on our homeland, there should be no daylight between all Members of this body in our commitment to ensuring our soldiers have the resources necessary to win this war.

I want to thank my friend and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, and all of my Appropriations Committee colleagues for putting together a good bill that deserves all our support.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill and continue to support our men and women in uniform as they defend our great Nation.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a great member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill.

In a world that is more dangerous and more complex than ever before, it is critically important that we ensure our military remains the best trained, the best equipped, and the best supported on the planet. This bill takes the next step toward fulfilling these necessary goals.

After years of budget cuts and sequestration, we are at a point now where we can no longer ask our mili-

tary to keep meeting the needs of our Nation without providing the right amount of resources.

Mr. Chairman, if we are unable to provide our troops with proper funding, I fear that very soon we will find ourselves at risk of sending our men and women in uniform into conflict without the training, equipment, or support that they need. Our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deserve better. And this Defense bill does better by helping our military return to full spectrum readiness in order to properly meet the challenges our Nation is facing on all fronts and across the globe.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right by America by doing what is right for the men and women who sacrifice so much to ensure the freedoms that we enjoy today.

Vote "yes" on the bill. Vote "yes" for a strong American military. Vote "yes" to send a message to all our enemies that the American military is as strong as ever and that the United States remains steadfast and capable of defending herself and her allies against those who wish to do us harm.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCOSKY for their tireless work on behalf of our Congress and on behalf of the American public.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a key member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, since I first was elected to Congress, one of the things that I talked most directly about was the fact that if there is one thing that is so important in the Federal Government to do, it is the duty to provide for national security. The legislation that we have before us now may be the most important document that we will take up this entire year.

My colleague on the Republican side, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and my colleague on the Democratic side, Mr. VISCOSKY, both take their job very seriously. As they work on this bill, they work with great dedication and care, and it is a privilege to work with both of them, along with the committee staff, as they work forward to move this bill.

Our men and women in uniform carry out a broad spectrum of missions. Some missions are directly combat related. Some are related to rescue. And some are humanitarian missions. Health research to help our soldiers also benefits civilians of all ages and all backgrounds. This bill specifies both the base funding and also overseas contingency operations funding in a way that meets the needs to carry out all of those missions.

So I would encourage my colleagues, as we vote on this bill and as we move forward on this, to vote "yes" on it. We owe it to our men and women in uni-

form and our dedicated civil servant workforce to provide that stability and continuity and also to continue making sure that we stay the greatest and the strongest nation on the Earth.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to join with Ranking Member VISCOSKY in taking a moment to thank the hardworking and effective staff of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. These are truly professional men and women who work on behalf of our national security and do remarkable things for our military that serve around the world and look after the needs of our intelligence community throughout the country and throughout the world.

Led by our clerk, Rob Blair, and our minority staff member, Becky Leggieri, the House owes both of these individuals a deep debt of gratitude for their hard work.

Along with Mr. VISCOSKY, I also want to recognize, the work of others on the staff: Walter Hearne; Brooke Boyer; B.G. Wright; Adrienne Ramsay; Megan Milam; Allison Deters; Collin Lee; Cornell Teague; Matt Bower; the indispensable Sherry Young, who has been upstairs and downstairs at various points doing some incredible work on behalf of the committee; and Chris Bigelow.

I recognize my own staff: Nancy Fox, Steve Wilson, and Katie Hazlett. And I know that we give a shout-out to Joe DeVoeught, who is dedicated to the whole process and works very closely with the ranking member.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the chairman's remarks and would also recognize Lucas Wood, who is on our staff as a fellow from the Department of Defense this year. Also, the chairman and I express our gratitude to the associate members of our subcommittee for each of the members of the subcommittee.

I do join with the chairman. I appreciate him enumerating the names of all of the staff.

I would suggest, given the difficult circumstances I alluded to in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, they legislated this year with elegance, under very difficult circumstances and the country owes them a debt of gratitude. I appreciate the chairman recognizing them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a key member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill. I would start, by the way, by thanking and commending the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, not only for putting together a great bill

that recognizes the dangers that exist in this world, whether it is China and their expanding aggression around that part of the world, whether it is ISIS in the Middle East, or whether it is Russia with their aggressive nature. Whenever you look, Mr. Chairman, the world has gotten a lot more dangerous in the last number of years.

So I want to thank the chairman for putting together a bill which will increase readiness, increase the number of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I will close with this: All of those things are hugely important, and it is about time that we address them in an aggressive way like this bill does.

To the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, we all owe a great bit of gratitude for the way that he is treating and continues to treat the men and women in uniform, the men and women of the Armed Forces. This bill is a reflection of his passion for them.

Again, this is a great bill. We can all be very proud of what this bill does. It is about time, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I would ask for your favorable consideration of this bill.

The CHAIR. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Indiana has yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), a member of the authorizing committee, the Armed Services Committee. We thank him for joining us this evening.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, which is another example of the Appropriations Committee's hard work to provide the funding needed to keep our country safe and to take care of our soldiers and their families.

As a veteran, as my wife is a veteran, and as somebody who has a lot of friends who are still wearing the uniform and serving, we need to take care of our soldiers, our troops, our sailors, our airmen, and marines. And this bill makes sure that we do just that. It gives them the equipment that they need to complete their mission while also providing them the peace of mind that their families will have the support that they need; that when they are also veterans, they will be taken care of.

As the Islamic State continues to grow, the constant threat of global terrorism, the nuclear-ambitious Iran, the dangers our Nation faces continues to grow, and we must stand ready to defeat them.

This bill meets our defense needs for the next year. We do need a long-term plan to ensure that the men and women in our Armed Forces have the capability to protect our Nation in this increasingly dangerous world, and this bill goes very far and is the first step in doing that.

I thank the committee and I especially thank the chairman for allowing me to speak in its favor.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, H.R. 5293 is key to funding our country's national security programs and provides for the essential needs of our military.

Just as our military service members answer the call to defend the United States, so too should Americans always prioritize the funding they need to be successful in whatever mission they are tasked with. I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides for our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

This bill makes difficult budgetary choices but includes funding for safety, security, and the ongoing success of our service members and their families. Our armed forces will stay prepared, safe and trained to fight.

The legislation addresses not only current threats but instability in the Middle East, Russian aggression in the Ukraine and Baltic, and changing relationships in the Pacific.

Specifically, the bill provides \$517.1 billion, an increase of \$3 billion above last year's level, and \$58.6 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) funding—the level allowed under current law.

\$219 billion is included for operations and maintenance, which provides for readiness programs that prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions.

An effective military, one that is well equipped and well trained, is indispensable to the common defense of our country and is in the best interest of all Americans.

I thank the Chairman for his outstanding leadership, appreciate the Ranking member's common commitment to work in a bipartisan manner and fund our military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to instability abroad.

I has perhaps never been more urgent to invest in the future of our military and renew our ability to project power.

The funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-142)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the proposed Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of Norway's export control system with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the non-proliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement contains all the provisions required by section 123 a. of the Act, and provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with Norway based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of unclassified information,