

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-623.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount, in-sert “(reduced by \$75,802,000)”.

Page 170, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,802,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 783, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force plans to acquire 1,000 next-generation air-launched cruise missiles, otherwise known as the long-range standoff weapon. This is double the size of the existing nuclear-armed cruise missile arsenal. However, many experts have already told us there is no need for nuclear-armed cruise missiles. We already have the most advanced bomber ever created in our arsenal, the B-2 Stealth bomber, and the Air Force will be acquiring new B-21 Stealth bombers. These bombers are capable of penetrating enemy airspace and dropping a nuclear bomb directly above a target, making nuclear-armed cruise missiles redundant. If we decide we want to shoot nuclear missiles from thousands of miles away, we still have very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs capable of doing just that. Instead of investing more dollars into our outdated and oversized nuclear arsenal, we must make smart investments on other priorities that actually keep us safe, or on reducing our unsustainable debt and deficits. Yet, last year's budget doubled down and accelerated production of the missile by 2 years to 2025. The accelerated procurement schedule will cost taxpayers an additional \$75.8 million more in 2017 than originally planned in the fiscal year 2015 acquisition schedule, but that makes little sense when there is so much uncertainty about whether this missile is affordable or even necessary. That is why my amendment will put \$75.8 million towards deficit reduction by placing funding for the long-range standoff weapon back on its 2015 acquisition schedule. There is no need to rush development when as little as 2 years ago the Air Force had requested a delay in procurement to pay for higher priorities before changing its mind a year later. On top of that, the existing air-launched cruise missile and warhead isn't being phased out until the 2030s. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, I am deeply familiar with our nuclear forces. I want to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment. Two successive Secretaries of Defense have said that nuclear deterrence is the most important mission the Department has. Secretary Hagel said: “Our nuclear deterrent plays a critical role in assuring U.S. national security, and it is DOD's highest priority mission. No other capability we have is more important.” Secretary Carter said: “The nuclear mission is the bedrock of our security. It is what stands in the background and looms over every action this country takes on the world stage. It is the foundation

for everything we do.” The LRSO program is critical to the mission, and it must remain on schedule. The fleet of existing air-launched cruise missiles that the LRSO will replace is over 30 years old, and their reliability is rapidly declining. Projected improvements in adversary air defense will impact its effectiveness even more. Simply put, our nuclear deterrent will not be credible unless it is modernized. The funding this amendment seeks to eliminate is necessary to modernize and keep this aspect of our nuclear deterrent on schedule. There is a clear military requirement for the LRSO, and it is a national security imperative. This requirement has been identified and documented by the military and the Obama administration. We should not be supporting the unilateral nuclear disarmament, and we should not be supporting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.” Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment today is being offered by my colleague, Mr. QUIGLEY, along with Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ranking Member SMITH, and myself. It would take the first step toward right-sizing a project in the U.S. military. The U.S. military is in the midst of a major modernization program to sustain the strategic nuclear triad. The program will generate a massive wave of spending requirements into the 2020s, but the Pentagon does not know how to pay for it. Well, look, we have at least a partial idea for how to pay for the security needs of our country. The United States, in the next decade, will build a new ballistic missile submarine, a new strategic bomber, a replacement for the Minuteman III, and the cruise missile discussed today. Now, one might ask why a Stealth bomber needs a nuclear long-range standoff weapon, and that is exactly what many military experts are already asking. Slowing the spending on the LRSO would slow spending on a redundant weapon, one that many military commanders agree is simply not needed. It would save \$75 million and help start us on a road towards making smart decisions about our Nation’s security, and save dollars down the road as well. I am very pleased to be supporting this amendment. The Pentagon comptroller recently called the strategic force modernization “the biggest acquisition problem that we don’t know how to solve yet.” The cruise missile alone is estimated to cost \$20 billion to \$30 billion over its life cycle. Let’s make some commonsense decisions to make our country economically stronger, economically more secure, as well as our military stronger.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chair, it is a pleasure to stand with the chairman of the committee that has oversight of this important, critical program. The bottom line is that this amendment would unilaterally disarm our country by undermining the development of this new cruise missile, which would, in turn, weaken the airborne leg of our nuclear triad, which we depend on for a deterrent. You can be darn sure that the Russians and Chinese are not sitting back. For the record, our committee has taken fiscally prudent minor reductions in the Standoff Weapon program when justified. This cut, which is nearly 80 percent of the funds requested, would be crippling, which, of course, is the apparent intention of this amendment. We don’t support that. The Air Force remains on track to issue a request for a proposal to industry for the technology maturation and risk reduction phase of the program before the end of the fiscal year, with a contract award to be made in fiscal year 2017. This amendment, if adopted, would radically slash funding and bring this effort to a halt. Therefore, I join with the chairman in urging strong op-position to this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. The chairman mentioned that the reduction that is called for in this amendment would certainly impact the cruise missile program; however, I would point out that there is funding in the legislation, and we are developing a B-21, a new penetrating bomber. Also, moneys are being set aside by the United States Congress to extend the life of the B-61 nuclear weapon. Congress will likely continue to provide robust funding for both of these very costly systems. I do not think we need a third redundancy, and we ought to pull back and support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair-man, I would like to close by saying that it is essential that we keep this modernization pace that we have got in place. Vote "no" on this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have, this doesn't gut the program. It brings it back to its 2015 acquisition schedule. Folks, we have to prioritize. We can't have three redundancies when we have cut homeland security money by 50 percent in the last 5 years. After Orlando, we should learn to reprioritize what really keeps Americans safe. I encourage a "yes" vote. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY). The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

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

HR 5293: FINAL VOTE RESULTS FOR ROLL CALL 309

06/16/2016 On agreeing to the Quigley amendment (A013). Failed by recorded vote: 159 - 261 ([Roll no. 309](#)).