



May 23, 2018

Key Vote on Amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 5515

On behalf of FreedomWorks' activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and urge him or her to vote on the amendments that have been offered to the National Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 5515 (NDAA) in the manner prescribed for each amendment below. As is always the case, FreedomWorks reserves the right to key vote any amendment brought to the floor for a vote.

- **NO - Amendment #13:** Sponsored by Rep. David McKinley (R-W.V.), this amendment would create a domestic sourcing requirement for dinnerware products. This is a protectionist amendment that would increase costs of dinnerware, therefore taking money out of the pockets of taxpayers. Sourcing requirements such as these should be used only in the most dire circumstances. Dinnerware does not meet that threshold.
- **NO - Amendment #19:** Sponsored by Rep. Claudia Tenney (R-N.Y.), this amendment would create a domestic sourcing requirement for flatware. Like Amendment #13, this protectionist amendment would cost taxpayers additional money for products that are not vital to national security.
- **YES - Amendment #22:** Sponsored by Rep. Steve King (R-Iowa), this amendment would prevent any funding in the NDAA from going towards enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act, passed in 1931 was intended to prevent any non-union groups from being able to compete for government contracts. This anti-competitive provision prevents private companies from being legally able to underbid unions on prices. This artificially inflates the price of federal construction projects. Money goes into union coffers, and comes out of taxpayers' pockets. Starving the Davis-Bacon Act of federal dollars intended for our national defense will promote the free market, and save the taxpayer millions.
- **YES - Amendment #30:** Sponsored by Rep. Jody Hice (R-Ga.), this amendment would reform pensions to retired presidents and their spouses. The federal government spends millions on its former presidents. Given how many lucrative speaking opportunities

former presidents have, there is no need for this. The Hice amendment would cut back this level of spending and do so even more if a former president takes in more the \$400,00 per year. It would still maintain funding for security purposes.

- **YES - Amendment #44:** Sponsored by Rep. Ralph Norman (R-S.C.), this amendment would create a separate fund for OCO. OCO funds are often spent with little oversight or accountability. Setting up a separate fund would make it clearer to taxpayers exactly how much of their money is going to this fund. OCO also operates outside of sequestration cuts, which has led some experts to call it a “slush fund” for the Pentagon. In the absence of full de-authorization as called for in a separate amendment offered by Rep. Rick Nolan (D-Minn.), this amendment would provide much-needed transparency.
- **YES - Amendment #97:** Sponsored by Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), and a bipartisan group of four other representatives, this amendment requires a report on how OCO funds are used. Given the existing lack of transparency surrounding OCO, this amendment would ensure that OCO funds are actually being dedicated to fighting terror, as the Department of Defense claims. If they are not, passage of this amendment will let the American people know exactly where this money is going, and is another important provision for more government transparency.

FreedomWorks will count the votes for these amendments on our 2018 Congressional Scorecard and reserves the right to score votes for amendments not listed above. The scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Brandon', with a stylized, cursive script.

Adam Brandon
President
FreedomWorks