



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2012

No. 109

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 19, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

### AMERICANS HOLD THE KEY TO THE AMERICAN DREAM—NOT GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe my ears last Friday when President Obama made the revealing statement: if you have a business, you didn't build that. Someone else made that happen.

The President's decision to speak as an authority on the private sector, where he has never staked his own live-

lihood, is baffling. The takeaway from his speech may be boiled down to this: it's not your smarts; it's not your work ethic. If not for the government, where would you be?

Ask the entrepreneur who has taken real risk if that rings true. Ask the small business owner who took out a second mortgage to get his company off the ground. Ask those who wakened before dawn to fire up the ovens at their bakery or to tend to the needs on their farm. Was Washington a co-laborer in their work? Should Washington claim any credit for their success? Job creators stake their own money and security on their ventures and most do so without the safety net of a government grant or bailout.

In America, not everyone chooses to take those risks and join the ranks of job creators; and among those who do, not everyone succeeds. But that is the symptom of a choice-driven free market and part of the beauty of our country. That is why our Declaration itemizes as one of our inalienable rights the pursuit of happiness. This is the understanding that the American Dream looks different for everyone and that through hard work, talent, choice, and opportunity, so too will its results.

Inherent in the American psyche is the belief that hard work can change the course of a person's life. I know that to be true in my own life; and 63 percent of Americans share that belief, as opposed to 37 percent of French, 45 percent of Dutch, and 46 percent of Norwegians. That hope in hard work is among our country's greatest assets, and it is a tragedy that the principle was so diminished by our White House.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I have a background as a small businesswoman. Together with my husband, Tom, we built an independent nursery and landscaping business in North Carolina more than 30 years ago, and it's still in our family today. I've seen what it takes to keep a small business afloat.

The hours are long, the strain on the family can be significant, and you live with the knowledge that one sustained economic downturn could spell the end of your life's work.

No one from the government was there when my husband and I worked in the rain and snow to finish jobs so we could get paid, or cut Christmas trees and load them when the temperature was so brutally cold we could hardly tie knots to keep them on a truck. No one from government was there in the wee hours of the morning when we were doing our regular jobs while at the same time working to start our business.

Small businesses operate in a world of bottom lines Washington knows very little about. Unlike Washington, they don't have the luxury to deficit spend, print more money, or profess as "spending cuts" lower-than-anticipated growth.

When the President claimed the American system "allowed" the successful to thrive, he made a dangerous error. Government doesn't allow its citizens to thrive, nor does it "enable" them to thrive or "permit" them to thrive. That language suggests government is a benefactor possessing the authority to give or take the blessings of open commerce as it sees fit. No, government does not "allow" you to thrive. Government, when it operates in its constitutional capacity, does not obstruct your thriving.

Ask small business owners today and they will likely tell you they exist in spite of government's burdens and interference. Government already obligates small businesses to pay more than \$10,000 per employee each year to comply with Federal regulations. That is money they are not directing toward hiring new employees. But even with that knowledge, Washington's regulatory tsunami continues. So do the taxes.

In a faltering economy, job creation is of paramount importance; and when

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5013

you raise taxes in a faltering economy, job creation is thwarted. The President acknowledged as much in 2009, but his policies run to the contrary.

Perhaps the President's lack of familiarity with running a business in a recession is responsible for his insistence on increasing taxes on 940,000 small business tax filers in 2013. Perhaps it's because he doesn't know the ins and outs of private sector creation that he's willing to risk 710,000 American jobs on his tax crusade. We who know the private sector want to spare him that lesson. Taxes will devastate our economy. To grow it, every American should benefit from an extension of tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, Washington didn't buy the American Dream for the millions of small businesses that comprise the backbone of our economy. Nor did Washington show up sick when a shift needed to be covered, miss soccer games because a shipment had to be received, or work graveyard because someone had to do it. Americans did that.

Too quickly we forget that everything the government has it takes from taxpayers; and if taxpayers do poorly, so does the government. So Washington must remain mindful. If the policies it imposes make it harder for small businesses to grow and create jobs, and eliminate their ability to invest, it is Washington that will find itself in crisis as it is now.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. There is a battle under way about the very existence of public broadcasting. We thought we were past this when, 15 months ago, the House Republican leadership targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Luckily, last year, 170 million people—who don't just listen to or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it—unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked back.

One good thing about last year's budget was a requirement to have a study about alternatives to funding public broadcasting so that people would have hard facts for this year's budget discussion. Well, that study is in, and it clearly shows that there is no viable alternative to Federal funding for public broadcasting.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money overall for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, marked up yesterday, would slash funding now, defund NPR Federal support, and end public broadcasting as we know it within 2 years.

I had dinner with Ken Burns last night, and we discussed this. He pointed out that his five or six projects in

the pipeline would never be seen if this budget goes forward. So enjoy his program about the Dust Bowl this November because you will never be able to see the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, Hemingway. All will never be finished or seen if the Republican budget proposal is approved.

The problem is that Governor Romney—who has singled out public broadcasting as one of five projects that he would defund—and the Republicans listened to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show that two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep Federal funding for broadcasting as it is or increase it.

What resonates with Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes. The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time Americans need public broadcasting the most. NPR news, the object of greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media.

PBS shows like "Sesame Street" have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational programming.

□ 1010

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There's no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to serve, not make money.

We must stop this attack on the critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It's time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen.

The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, and terminate public broadcasting as we know it, is a powerful symbol of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they're supposed to represent.

There's no reason to make public broadcasting a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, Independents, and Democrats alike. That's why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and a "excellent" use of taxpayer dollars for the 9th consecutive year.

It's time for people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to protect.

#### MINNESOTA'S 86,000-ACRE PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, for far too long—over 30 years, in fact—Minnesota and its students have been faced with an 86,000-acre problem.

When Minnesota became a State in 1858, sections 16 and 36 of every township were set aside in trust for the benefit of schools. The State could use, lease, or sell the land to raise money for education. Then, in the 1970s, the Federal Government created the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. These State school trust lands within the Boundary Waters cannot be timber harvested, leased, or utilized for their minerals. Thus, they are not generating money for the school trust. As a result, approximately 86,000 acres of State trust lands are currently locked within the borders of the Boundary Waters and unable to produce critical funding for Minnesota public education.

Ultimately, Congress got us into this situation in the first place, and Congress will have to get us out.

On June 8, the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, conducted a comprehensive hearing on this legislation. Our goal: preserve and protect the Boundary Waters and allow State-owned school trust lands to raise revenue for Minnesota education through utilizing our timber and mineral resources.

It is imperative we resolve this longstanding problem. Minnesota law specifies these lands must earn money for the school trust. In fact, the State has a constitutional responsibility to earn a financial return from these lands to fund the education system.

That is why I introduced H.R. 5544, the Minnesota Education Investment and Employment Act, which will give State-owned school trust lands trapped in the Boundary Waters to the Federal Government in exchange for Federal Government-owned land outside the Boundary Waters. This legislation is needed for the Federal Government to execute the bipartisan plan recently agreed upon by the Minnesota Legislature and signed by the Governor.

Our economy cannot wait, and our kids in the classroom shouldn't either. This legislation will produce new opportunities to create well-paying jobs and additional revenue for our schools.

Minnesota's school trust lands are a 154-year investment in our future. Times are tight, and our schools and teachers could use the help. Currently, some school districts in Minnesota, including mine in North Branch, have classes with up to 40 students and have scaled back to 4-day school weeks.

Just recently, the largest paper in Minnesota, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, penned an opinion piece which stated that enactment of this legislation would be a boon for our economy in the Eighth. Unfortunately, special interests are attempting to derail this broad, bipartisan land swap plan, which

includes jobs for Minnesotans and additional revenue to fund our schools. To swap these lands trapped within the Boundary Waters for lands located outside the Boundary Waters—to simply execute this Federal action—our State, its people, and our students should not endure years of litigation and disingenuous delay.

Importantly, the Minnesota Education Investment Employment Act would not eliminate a single acre of Boundary Waters land. In fact, it would add Federal wilderness acres to the existing boundaries. The Boundary Water Canoe Area wilderness would therefore become whole.

The Boundary Water Canoe Area is an important and vital aspect of the Eighth District of Minnesota, and we will take care of it. As a side benefit—the bill guarantees Minnesotans will retain their existing hunting and fishing rights in the Boundary Waters.

Now, more than ever, it is our duty as Minnesota's leaders to honor the State's obligations owed to Minnesota students and restore the integrity of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness. This is a team effort, and I am ready to work with involved stakeholders and my colleagues to put Minnesota schools first.

#### SUPPORTING PRESIDENT OBAMA'S DECISION TO STOP DEPORTATIONS FOR DREAM ACT-ELIGIBLE IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to announce today that more than 100 of my colleagues have joined me in writing to President Obama to thank him for his action to use prosecutorial discretion to stop deportations for DREAM Act-eligible immigrants.

We are pledging our continued and strong support for this policy. My colleagues and I, 104 of us, are standing together to make clear that we think America is a better place with the immigrants who will be helped by this new policy.

Of course, not everyone agrees. Progress doesn't always mean consensus. My colleague, Mr. KING of Iowa, wants to sue the President, take him to court, because Mr. KING is determined to deport every last young person who is DREAM Act eligible. Mitt Romney says that he would veto the DREAM Act and does not support steps to protect these very young people.

Let's remind ourselves exactly who the Republican candidate for President believes should be deported.

DREAM Act-eligible young people who have lived in America for more than 5 years. Most of them were brought to our Nation as children, many of them as infants, toddlers, yes, babies. They've stayed away from crime. They attended our high schools and colleges. They are no different

from your children or my children. They regularly excel at school. Some are valedictorians. They are athletes and musicians and leaders. Many of them want to serve our Nation in the military. They are leaders in their high school ROTC. They are, in every sense of the word, except for the very narrow, exclusive sense promoted by Mr. KING and Mr. Romney, outstanding young Americans.

Apparently, when Mr. KING and Mr. Romney look at the winner of your high school science fair or a young immigrant eager to become a soldier, they see a threat to our national security.

Sensible Americans see their friends and neighbors, young people who want to make America better. They want these young people to be treated fairly, and they also want our Nation to be safe.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Mr. KING and Mr. Romney a question: In a world where our law enforcement officials have limited time and resources, who should they be focused on investigating, detaining, putting behind bars, rounding up, and deporting—the captain of your high school chess team or a drug smuggler?

I know the answer. I think most of Americans would agree. Immigrants who break the law should face serious consequences. Immigrants who are busy studying for exams should simply be left alone. That's not just my opinion or just the opinion of immigrants or advocates or 104 of my colleagues.

Despite those few who would like to sue the President and force him to kick high school kids out of this country, President Obama's actually legally and responsibly using prosecutorial discretion to leave young people alone and focus instead on actual criminals.

□ 1020

It is the consensus legal opinion among experts. Even the Supreme Court has weighed in. In their Arizona decision last month, the Supreme Court wrote:

A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all.

"Whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all," says the Supreme Court.

If the Supreme Court's opinion is not enough, then I submit the opinions of Members of Congress, including those of Members I don't often agree with when it comes to immigration. These Members include LAMAR SMITH, the chairman of our Judiciary Committee; DAVID DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee; and even BRIAN BILBRAY, chairman of the House anti-immigration caucus.

Just a few years ago, as this letter notes, they weighed in forcefully on prosecutorial discretion. In a letter to a previous President's administration,

these staunch opponents of immigration reform enthusiastically defended prosecutorial discretion, writing: "The principle of prosecutorial discretion is well established." They wrote that legal experts at Immigration Services "apparently well-grounded in case law" show that the Immigration Services has prosecutorial discretion in the initiation—the beginning—and the termination of deportations.

It's simple, really. The Members of Congress who signed this letter with me today, the Supreme Court, President Obama—and yes, even LAMAR SMITH and dozens of his colleagues just a few years ago—get it. It is time to leave hardworking immigrants alone. When we do, our law enforcement officials can focus on catching the actual bad guys.

JULY 18, 2012.

President BARACK OBAMA,  
*The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue,  
Washington, DC*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to thank you and express our appreciation for your recent decision to grant "deferred action," protection from deportation, and work permits to certain young people who call the United States home and who are not an enforcement priority for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

We welcome the opportunity to ensure that our constituents who fit the criteria for relief are among the estimated 800,000 individuals whose lives will forever be changed as a result of your leadership. DREAMers coming forward to apply will mark a new chapter, but not the last chapter, in a long struggle for inclusion in society. The new policy represents an important down payment toward achieving broader reforms in the future.

The implications of your policy are already reverberating well beyond those who are potentially eligible for deferred action. With this announcement, you have changed the public discourse about immigration and immigrants, and our communities are now excited and hopeful. Even those who attack immigrants for political purposes are second guessing their negative posture toward the young immigrants you are protecting. You have opened the door to reform, and people of all political stripes recognize that change is coming and is inevitable.

We recognize that there are those who will want to take the power of discretion away from you and the Executive branch. Like you, we agree that you are on solid moral and legal ground and we will do everything within our power to defend your actions and the authority that you, like past Presidents, can exercise to set enforcement priorities and better protect our neighborhoods and our nation.

Despite this vital reprieve for a deserving group of promising individuals, we also understand that it does not diminish the need for a permanent solution and comprehensive immigration reform. Mr. President, we stand committed to fixing the broken immigration system once and for all, and we are ready to fight for a permanent solution that benefits all children and families, the economy, our national security and our nation.

We thank you again for your actions on behalf of DREAMers. We stand ready to work with you to ensure the policy's success and to use it as a stepping stone for broader relief and future legislative action.

Sincerely,  
Luis V. Gutierrez; Joseph Crowley; Xavier Becerra; Steny Hoyer; Howard

Berman; Charles A. Gonzalez; Jared Polis; Susan A. Davis; Zoe Lofgren; Judy Chu; Nancy Pelosi; John Conyers, Jr.; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Michael M. Honda; Barbara Lee; Gene Green; Raúl Grijalva; James P. Moran; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Janice Hahn; Peter Welch; José E. Serrano; Betty McCollum; Ruben Hinojosa; Lois Capps; Yvette D. Clarke; Laura Richardson; Silvestre Reyes; Hansen Clarke; Terri Sewell; Jerrold Nadler; Bob Filner; Dennis Cardoza; Frederica Wilson; Charles B. Rangel; Edolphus "Ed" Towns; Jan Schakowsky; Jackie Speier; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Maxine Waters; Bobby L. Rush; Pedro R. Pierluisi; Carolyn B. Maloney; Gwen Moore; Louise M. Slaughter; Ted Deutch; Chaka Fattah; Rick Larsen; Jim McDermott; George Miller; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.; John Lewis; John W. Oliver; James P. McGovern; Joe Baca; Rush Holt; Robert A. Brady; Eni Faleomavaega; Adam Smith; Al Green; Grace F. Napolitano; Earl Blumenauer; John Garamendi; John B. Larson; Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.; Doris O. Matsui; Keith Ellison; Fortney "Pete" Stark; Dennis J. Kucinich; Lloyd Doggett; Corrine Brown; Linda Sánchez; Gregory Meeks; Sam Farr; Gary C. Peters; Eliot L. Engel; Lynn Woolsey; Ed Pastor; Maurice Hinchey; Albio Sires; Mike Quigley; Loretta Sanchez; Danny K. Davis; Nita Lowey; Mike Thompson; Anna Eshoo; Marcy Kaptur; David Cicilline; Russ Carnahan; Nydia M. Valázquez; Chris Van Hollen; Steve Israel; Diana DeGette; Edward J. Markey; Henry A. Waxman; Karen Bass; Jim Costa; Steve Cohen; Henry Cuellar; Barney Frank; Ben Ray Lujan; Sheila Jackson Lee; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott.

#### HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor once again to reiterate Federal law, a law that was passed in 1982, called the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and the amendments offered in 1987, which said that Yucca Mountain would be the long-term geological repository for our nuclear waste in this country. It's unfortunate that I have to keep coming down on the floor to address this issue because of the administration's position to defund, derail, stop, and to actually break Federal law.

To do that, not only do I just talk about the legal aspects of the Federal law, but I have been going around the country, identifying locations where we currently have high-level nuclear waste, and have been asking the basic question: Would you rather have it at location A or at location B?

So, today, we return to Pennsylvania, to a power plant called Limerick. Limerick has 1,143 metric tons of uranium spent fuel on site. At Limerick, the waste is stored above the ground in pools and in casks. It is 20 feet above the groundwater, and it is on the Schuylkill River, which is 40 miles from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. That is where we currently store high-level nuclear waste.

Now, compare that to where we should by Federal law store high-level nuclear waste—in a place defined in law under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act: Yucca Mountain, in Nevada. This tells you it's a government job. We've only been working on it for about 30 years, and we've only spent about \$15 billion to study, research, and ascertain that Yucca Mountain is a suitable location.

So, at Yucca Mountain, since we've spent approximately 30 years and \$15 billion, how much nuclear waste do we have on site? Zero.

If we had it, where would it be stored? It would be stored 1,000 feet underground. It would be stored 1,000 feet above the water table, and it would be over 100 miles from the Colorado River. There is no safer place in the country, and there is no more studied location than Yucca Mountain. It just makes sense.

What is a better location: next to a major river that feeds into the major metropolitan area of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or underneath a mountain in a desert? I would submit to you that underneath a mountain in a desert is the proper location.

So what is the holdup? Well, the holdup is the Senator from Nevada, HARRY REID. More compelling are the other Senators from his party who are allowing Senator REID to block this, which is a detriment to their own States. We are going to talk about two in particular, but we're looking at four Senators from two States—Senator CASEY, Senator TOOMEY, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator ROCKEFELLER.

Senator TOOMEY is already on record as supporting Yucca Mountain. In fact, I quote him here:

The alternative is what we have now—highly radioactive waste located at 131 sites in 39 States, including nuclear power plants close to the Lehigh Valley. That cannot be as safe and secure as burying this stuff deep in Yucca Mountain.

The other Senator is quoted, but has got question marks here because, in his being a Senator for 5½ years, we don't know his position of whether he thinks storing high-level nuclear waste at Limerick is a better plan than placing it underneath a mountain in a desert. He understands the concern and the need.

He is quoted as saying:

As a Senator from a State with nine commercial reactors—this being one—and 10 million people living within 50 miles of those reactors, I can tell you that nuclear security is extremely important to Pennsylvanians.

So my question is, which is the question posed here: Will you state a position on whether you think Yucca Mountain is that location since it's in Federal law?

Overall, why is this important? As I've been coming down to the floor for the past year and a half, we've done a tally sheet of where Senators stand based upon their votes or their public comments. We have 55 Senators who

say, yes, Yucca Mountain is the place we ought to go. Of course, if you follow closely in the parliamentary processes between the two Chambers, you really need 60 to move a bill in the Senate. It's over five short. We need Senator CASEY to get on record in support of Yucca Mountain.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH CAROLINA STATE REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. WAINWRIGHT

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to North Carolina's State Representative William L. Wainwright, whose earthly journey has ended.

Representative Wainwright died on Tuesday of this week, July 17, 2012, at the age of 64, after a brief illness. Representative Wainwright was a dear personal friend and leader in the First Congressional District.

Representative Wainwright was deputy democratic leader of the North Carolina House of Representatives, and was formerly the speaker pro tempore of the House. In each position, Representative Wainwright was the first African American to hold the position.

In addition to serving the citizens of Craven and Lenoir Counties as their representative for the past 21 years, Representative Wainwright was a tenured pastor and presiding elder of the New Bern District of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. His ministry touched thousands of people in his home communities of New Bern, Havelock, and Harlowe. For more than 40 years, Representative Wainwright taught God's word in pulpits all across America. He counseled those in need. He visited the sick and was a friend to all.

In the general assembly, Representative Wainwright was a leader among leaders. He was chairman of the Legislative Black Caucus. He served as vice chairman of the Finance Committee. He was also a member of the Commerce and Job Development Subcommittee on Business and Labor, the Committees on Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Military and Veterans Affairs, even the Committee on Insurance.

North Carolina Governor Bev Perdue said this of Representative Wainwright:

Whether he was in the pulpit or the legislature, William Wainwright's priorities were without question and his devotion without peer.

□ 1030

He served the Lord and the people of North Carolina with courage, with humility, and with love. He and I arrived at the general assembly about the same time, from neighboring districts. He was wiser in the ways of both politics and the human spirit. Ever since, and up to his last days, I relied on his invaluable counsel, and I will always treasure his friendship. Heaven is a richer place today.

Those were the words of North Carolina Governor Bev Perdue.

County Commissioner Johnnie Sampson in Craven County, North Carolina said:

He worked around the clock for the history education center, and he was able to get things done. He wanted to help people who could not help themselves.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it must be said today that North Carolina is better because of the life and work of William Wainwright. William had endless energy and deep passion for the people he served. We will miss this giant of a man. May God bless his memory and provide comfort to his beloved family and his community.

---

IN HONOR OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS BRANDON D. GOODINE

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today with a great sadness, but with a sense of pride to honor one of Georgia's own heroes, Private First Class Brandon D. Goodine. On June 7, Brandon gave the ultimate sacrifice when his unit was attacked with an improvised explosive device by enemy forces in Maiwand district of Kandahar province in Afghanistan while he was supporting Operation Enduring Freedom.

Brandon was a beloved father. He was a husband, a brother, and a son. He was taken from us much too soon, but not without accomplishing some great things. He believed that his greatest accomplishment was his 3-year-old daughter, Kathryn.

Brandon became a father at a young age, but devoted his life to making sure Kathryn had everything she needed. In fact, his reason for joining the Army was so that he could be sure that she was going to be taken care of. Her birth gave him direction and purpose in life, helping him believe he could accomplish anything. Everything that Brandon did was for Kathryn.

Giving everything 110 percent is what Brandon did. He was just an all-around great guy striving to make something of himself. Brandon attended Henry County High School and later joined the Navy ROTC at Greenville High School.

On May 2, 2011, he joined the Army and proudly served as a scout with Bravo Troop, Fourth Battalion, 73rd Calvary Regiment of the 82nd Airborne Division from Fort Bragg, North Carolina. In his unit, he was a brother to his fellow paratroopers. They remember not only laughing and having fun with him, but his kindness and generosity that he showed them.

Going out of his way to volunteer or help someone was not unusual for Brandon. On June 7, he was assigned to a mission to prevent the enemy from freely attacking peaceful communities in Afghanistan. He bravely gave his life

doing what he did best—helping others and giving them a chance for a better life.

His commitment to his daughter, his family, and our country inspired his older brother, Christopher, to enlist in the Army 3 months later. Brandon's mother, Mandy, said she was not only proud to be his mother, but a friend. He was a hero to his family, a role model for his three sisters, a beloved son, a brother, a loving father, and a dedicated husband to his wife, Nicole.

One of the biggest tributes to Brandon's life has been the support from the community. When Brandon was being transported home for the last time, flags were placed along the road to honor him in his sacrifice. He was laid to rest on June 18 by his close friends and family in McDonough, Georgia.

I'm proud to stand here before you to honor the life of Brandon C. Goodine and to thank him for his service to our country. Brandon has left a lasting impression on those he has touched, and his bravery will never be forgotten.

Joan and I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Mandy, Dwayne, Kathryn, Nicole, and all of Brandon's family and friends. We will never forget his great sacrifice for his Nation so that we may all live free.

---

GLOBAL WARMING IS REAL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if anecdotal evidence were science, I would be standing here proclaiming that global warming is real, just step outside. It is severely hot, oppressive, simply unenjoyable. Often, I feel as if I'm standing behind an 18-wheeler blowing heat and exhaust in my face. But no, I'm just walking my dogs in Chicago no less. Chicago, the city of snow. Yes, snow, the stuff that emboldened those who said that global warming was a farce. "Just think about that snow piled up against your door," they said.

But global warming is part of a larger climate crisis—climate change. It is something the Union of Concerned Scientists say includes such events as more extreme storms, more severe droughts, deadly heat waves, rising sea levels, and more acidic oceans, to name a few. You might have noticed I'm citing the Union of Concerned Scientists, not the group of folks who notice anecdotally that the weather was extreme. It would do us good to heed the words of science and not the remarks of a few casual observers.

I don't make my case that global warming is real because it's hot, just as it doesn't follow that global warming isn't real when it's cold. Extreme weather is climate change. Over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have concluded that global warming is real and potentially catastrophic. No scientific peer-reviewed studies have found the opposite—none.

As of July 3, 56 percent of the continental United States was experiencing

drought conditions. This marks the largest area affected by drought in the 12-year record kept by the U.S. Drought Monitor. Scientists note that temperature records reveal a long-term trend for warming that has been picking up speed. The first decade of this century was the warmest on record, according to NOAA's State of Climate in a 2010 report. It is real because science tells us so.

We have sustained 1,644 record heat days from January to June of 2012. We have endured 631 days of record rainfall. We have shoveled our way out of 98 days of record snowfall. The prolonged heat wave this past spring included the hottest March since record-keeping began in 1894. There were 671 records that were broken, according to the National Weather Service. April marked the end of the warmest 12-month stretch ever in the United States.

What does all this snow, rain, heat, drought, ocean acidity, and raging forest fires mean? Scientists say it's global warming. Scientists say that our warming climate is causing more and more extreme weather events, and they can and will get worse by our inaction.

Several weeks of snowmageddon, which prompted taunts of Al Gore by Congress, do not disprove scientific fact. At the same time, the brutality of today's untenable heat does not solidify my stance any more than the snow disproves Al Gore. Local temperatures taken as individual data points have nothing to do with the long-term trend of global warming.

To get a real hand on global reading, scientists rely on changes in weather over a long period of time. Looking at high- and low-temperature data from recent decades shows that new record highs occur nearly twice as often as new record lows.

So, no, my belief in global warming isn't sprung from a conversation with my neighbor nor a straw poll of people I'm sitting and sweating with at a Cubs game. My belief in global warming is borne of a respected acknowledgement of sound science that tells us that global warming is real.

As Winston Churchill said, "I never worry about action, but only about inaction." My concern—my fear—is that we have gone too far to save the planet we've neglected to protect because we've traded science for reading the wind.

Global warming is real, and the extreme weather and sound science demonstrate that this is so. Let us know the crippling fear of inaction no longer.

---

□ 1040

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of this esteemed body, but also as a member of

the House Foreign Affairs Committee and as a cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues.

I stand before you today to recall a somber anniversary that has pained the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for the past 38 years. Mr. Speaker, even though the tragic events of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus took place long ago on July 20, 1974, the suffering of the victims has not subsided.

This anniversary is a time for America to respectfully remember the brutal Turkish military invasion of Cyprus, to mourn those who lost their lives, and to condemn the continued occupation. Over 5,000 Cypriots were killed in 1974, and more than 1,400 Greek Cypriots, including four Americans of Greek Cypriot descent, still remain missing. Since the invasion, Turkey has established a heavily armed military occupation that continues to control over 30 percent of Cyprus.

Forced expulsions of Greek Cypriots on the occupied land have left nearly 200,000 people displaced. These Cypriots were kicked out of their homes, making them refugees in their own country. Mr. Speaker. These properties have been unlawfully distributed and are currently being used by tens of thousands of illegal settlers from Turkey. To this day, Greek Cypriots are prevented by Turkey from returning to their homes and properties.

Another tragic result of this 38-year occupation is a division among Greek and Turkish Cypriots who have been forcibly separated along ethnic lines. This unnatural division of the island nation is a crime against society and a crime against the people of Cyprus that can only be resolved by ending Turkey's illegal occupation.

Mr. Speaker, 38 years is too long. On the occasion of this anniversary, we need to take a long, hard look at our own commitment toward helping Cyprus reach a lasting and enduring peace free from occupation, division, and oppression.

A few years ago, the U.S. House had the wisdom and foresight to unanimously pass H. Res. 405, a measure I introduced which expressed strong support from this body for the implementation of the July 8 agreement.

Last month Mr. ENGEL and I introduced H. Res. 676 to expose and halt the Republic of Turkey's illegal colonization of the Republic of Cyprus with non-Cypriot populations, to support Cyprus in its efforts to control all of its territories, to end Turkey's illegal occupation of Cyprus, and to allow Cyprus to exploit its energy resources without illegal interference from Turkey.

The Republic of Cyprus has also worked alongside its European neighbors to bring about a stronger integration of Turkish and Greek Cypriot interests for the good of the island and its people. This has included a partial lifting on the restriction of movement across the cease-fire line that continues to forcibly divide Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that because of this continued integration between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and the economic and political successes that the Republic of Cyprus so readily wants to share with its neighbors, it is possible to bring closure to this 38-year occupation now as Cyprus takes over the EU presidency, the first time since its accession to the union in 2004.

Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States. It continues to work with us in the global war on terrorism and has supported our efforts in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Mr. Speaker, 38 years is too long. It's long enough. It is time to have Cyprus, a Cyprus that is once again unified without Turkish occupation troops, foreign illegal settlers, where human rights is fundamental for all Cypriots.

Every legal citizen of the republic of Cyprus, irrespective of national or religious background, is eligible currently to enjoy all rights provided for by the constitution and international convention signed by Cyprus. The only obstacle, Mr. Speaker, is the Government of Turkey.

We Americans, as friends of the Cypriot people, owe it to them to do everything in our power to support peace and an end to Turkey's 38-year illegal occupation of Cyprus.

#### HONORING REVEREND JACOB N. UNDERWOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize Reverend Jacob N. Underwood, the founder of the Grace Baptist Church in east New York's section of Brooklyn. He is a very unusual person and has done some great things.

For instance, when the people in east New York were complaining about the lack of housing, Reverend Underwood pulled the group together and started building houses. He established the Grace Towers because people were complaining about not having housing. Then they came to talk about the inadequate schools. Then, of course, at that point in time he pulled some folks together and started a school.

Then, when they were talking about jobs, he also provided jobs. I recall recently talking to Brother Lee in the east New York section, who indicated that Reverend Underwood gave him a job and that as a result now he has a house and family, and he went on to say how excited he was about that job that Reverend Underwood provided.

Reverend Underwood did so much in the community. He was the kind of person who didn't believe in just complaining, sitting around and talking about what needs to be done. He was the kind of person that would go and get it done. We need more people like him today because Reverend Underwood was a very progressive person, had an agenda, promoted human wel-

fare and social reform in the church and in the community.

When people would say you can't do that, he would just say watch me because all things are possible with God. He is a very strong man of faith, and he just felt that with a little support that he could accomplish anything that he wanted to do.

Pastor Underwood also established a soup kitchen and one of the first day care centers in the east New York section Brooklyn. He really believed in helping others. What I liked about him is that he was not the kind of person, if you asked him for help, that he would call a press conference. You know, some people, if you asked them for help, the first thing they want to do is call a press conference and let the world know that you've asked them for help.

He was not that kind of person. He would make a decision to help and very quietly would just do it and was happy that he was in a position to do it for you.

Pastor Underwood served on the local school board, and he was very big on voter registration. A lot of people in the area were not registered, but he sort of talked to them, called meetings together and encouraged us to get involved in terms of registering people. As a result, a lot of folks were registered in that community.

He was also on the civil rights committee. He was the first elected chairman of the East New York Community Corporation back in those days and president of the New York Progressive State Congress. He served twice as the moderator of the New York Missionary Baptist Association. What a great man.

He was the chairman of the Brownsville East New York Clergy Association and president of the New York Progressive State Convention and corresponding secretary of the Presidents Department of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, the president of the African American Clergy and Elected Officials Association of Brooklyn, and he currently serves as the chairman of the Churches United for Worldwide Action. At the age of 84, he decided to start another church, not in New York, but in the State of his birth, South Carolina.

Let me conclude and thank Reverend Underwood for his inspiration and commitment to making the world a better place for all of us to live. He is a great teacher, he is a great innovator, a great educator; and, of course, he believed that he has an obligation and responsibility to help others. That is what it's all about.

Now, at the age of 86, on his 86th birthday, he indicated that he was not through organizing and doing things. I would say to Reverend Underwood and to those who actually know him, the world is a better place because of the fact that this man has been here for 86 years making a difference, doing things on behalf of people. He can surely say that this world is better because of his involvement.

□ 1050

## CBO TRANSPARENCY ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Remember back in school when your math teacher expected you to show your work when solving a problem? It made sense. A number on a page, even if it was the correct answer, didn't suffice because your teacher wanted you to demonstrate you knew how to solve the problem. There, the outcome was a grade on a quiz or a test. But what about when we're talking about hundreds of billions or trillions of dollars? Why is it we take on blind faith the cost estimates produced by one of the most influential accounting firms in the United States, the Congressional Budget Office.

In 1974, the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, was formed to give Congress independent, nonpartisan, objective analysis of legislation. In addition, the CBO is required by law to produce a cost estimate—or "score"—for every bill coming out of committee of either Chamber of Congress. It sounds good in theory, but the problem is no one knows how CBO arrives at their numbers—and they won't tell us. They don't have to. CBO is not required to "show their work," like we were required in school, when announcing economic impact results.

Members of Congress rely on the CBO score. A favorable or a budget-neutral score makes a difference for a bill's success or failure. If there are savings, chances are better that the bill will get a vote on the floor. If it's budget-neutral, it may still get a vote. But what happens if the analysis was wrong and turns out to lead to big deficits, or what if Congress failed to call up a bill for a vote because CBO scored it as deficit spending when really it could lead to substantial savings?

The price of an inaccurate estimate right now is extremely high. Our national debt is closing in on \$16 trillion. Major safety net programs like Medicare and Medicaid are heading for bankruptcy. Congress has to act to bring our country back from the brink of a fiscal cliff. It is crucial for policymakers to have all available information about the true cost of legislation. And that's why I introduced H.R. 6136, the CBO Transparency Act, so lawmakers and the public have an opportunity to review CBO's work.

Today, you can access information on hospital visits, crop yields, and air quality levels, which are used to produce major regulation by the EPA and others. But you can't find out how the CBO scored things. Like any scientific study, opening up the details of a CBO analysis for greater inspection and peer review will enable us to better understand how decisions are made.

This bill isn't about pointing out inaccuracies in CBO's estimates. What

we're doing here is using transparency to enhance the credibility of the Congressional Budget Office. Once the information is out there, it can be reviewed by Congress and all Americans. Is the information correct? Do they consider all the facts? Was something left out? Was their analysis done right?

In 2009, a University of Chicago researcher revealed a CBO office had grossly underestimated potential savings from changes to Medicare and Medicaid. For instance, CBO overestimated the cost of Medicare part D by 40 percent. In the 1980s, CBO predicted spending on hospitals stays under new law would be \$19 million more expensive than the actual cost. Congress changed Medicare to pay hospitals a fixed amount per admission. This encouraged shorter stays, led to fewer diagnostic services, and lowered administrative costs. But CBO didn't predict that, and by 1986 actual spending for hospital payments was 18 percent lower than estimated.

The CBO also estimated that if hospitals reported infection rates, it would cost about \$30 million over 5 years. It turns out when they report infection rates, they pay attention to it. And the savings has been billions of dollars over 5 years and tens of thousands of lives. When the CBO says the stimulus saved 3.3 million jobs or tax rates don't impact decisions by individuals or businesses or that cutting spending will slow economic growth, we currently have no way of understanding the conclusions CBO has reached because we can't get information on how they got there.

Ultimately, the decisions we make in Congress are only as good as the data upon which they are based. I hope all my colleagues will join me in this effort. Transparency is a cornerstone of sound government. I urge Democrats and Republicans to sign on to this bipartisan good government bill, H.R. 6136, the CBO Transparency Act.

## STOP MILITARY RAPE

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

Ms. SPEIER. I rise again today to talk about military sexual trauma. It's a cancer, it's ubiquitous, it's unabated, and regretfully, unaddressed.

There was Tailhook in 1991. There was Aberdeen in 1996. There were scandals at the military academies. There were hearings, there were reports, there were toothless recommendations. So here we are, again, with yet another scandal.

At this very moment, military training instructor Luis Walker stands before a court martial for raping and assaulting recruits at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas. Walker's job is to train freshly minted new Air Force recruits, many of them still in their teens. In all, there are 28 charges against him and 10 victims. Walker is a sexual predator.

On Tuesday, a victim testified that right after graduating from boot camp, Walker approached her while she sat outside on a bench waiting for a bus that would take her to technical training school. Walker came up and ordered her to get some bleach from a supply room, and then he followed her. Once inside, he closed the door and took off his training instructor's hat. "I'm not here for bleach, am I," she asked. While Walker had intercourse with her on a couch, she wondered, "My God, I hope he has a condom on."

On Wednesday, another victim testified that while on laundry detail one day, Walker showed up and told her to follow him to get some towels, but to wait 5 minutes so the surveillance cameras would not capture them going up together. Once inside a dorm, he pulled her into a flight office, kissed her, and told her to perform oral sex on him. She said she did what she was told.

Walker's defense attorneys argue that because the women never forcefully resisted, the sex was consensual. The defense also argues that because the women never came forward to report the incidents, they must not have felt victimized.

If this happens in any high school in this country—if the prized English teacher, band instructor, or football instructor had sex with his student, we would be outraged and we would demand action. That teacher would be fired. Yet at Lackland, where some of the recruits are just 18 or 19 years old, we rationalize the behavior of the perpetrator and we blame the victim. Apparently, we have a different definition of zero tolerance for sex offenders in the military world than we do for them in the civilian world. What does zero tolerance mean in the military? Is that just a catchphrase?

The 35,000 Air Force recruits who funnel through Lackland each year are mostly confined to the base for 6½ weeks of training. They get one 3-minute phone call once a week. Recruits live and breathe basic training and follow each and every order of their instructor. One rape victim at Lackland said, "Nothing a military training instructor says ends with a question mark."

Walker is not the only predator charged at Lackland. Seven additional training instructors have been charged with sexual misconduct with trainees. At least another five are under investigation. One instructor, Staff Sergeant Craig LeBlanc, bragged about his conquests to his colleague, who waited a month before he reported the incidents. Out of loyalty, the colleague stayed quiet. Once he finally reported LeBlanc's misconduct with recruits, that instructor was ostracized by fellow training instructors for being a tattletale. Is this really a culture of zero tolerance?

Congress needs to investigate and to hold an independent hearing on the widespread sex abuse at Lackland Air Force Base. In the last 3 years since

Luis Walker started working at Lackland, roughly 21,000 female airmen have cycled through basic training. Have they been interviewed by investigators to determine if they, too, have been raped and sexually assaulted at Lackland? How widespread is this epidemic?

At Lackland, out of the 31 identified victims, only one has reported the crime. Why are victims scared to come forward? Internal investigations will not get to the bottom of this. Congress needs to act. I called for a hearing in June, and received no response. Last week, I was joined by a bipartisan group of 77 Members of Congress calling for a hearing. We've received no response. I'm sick of waiting for action. The 19,000 members of our military who are raped each and every year deserve better than catchphrases. They deserve justice.

#### COOL BLAST LEMONADE STAND, CYPRESS, TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. There's a new small business in my district in southeast Texas: Cool Blast Lemonade Stand, run by the Sutton sisters of Cypress, Texas. Clara is 7 and Eliza is 4. Their newest employee is little brother Eirik, who recently was hired to join the team. They even have their own Facebook page with 867 followers.

□ 1100

On their Facebook page, they say this about their business:

We are entrepreneurs who started a lemonade stand for Lemonade Day. We are going to continue working to earn money to spend on things we would like, save and also to share with our two chosen charities, Meals on Wheels and Paws of Texas Rescue.

Mr. Speaker, they learned all of these lessons without any interference from the Federal Government.

Their father, Andrew, said this:

They did it all on their own. Nobody helped them except us. My wife and I both run our own businesses, so running a lemonade stand with them was showing them what they could do. They were curious how we got money for things.

Mr. Speaker, the girls stood out in 100-degree Texas humid heat serving customers instead of being like many other kids going to the local swimming pool. Each day they are open for business, the girls learn valuable lessons—lessons about budgets, lessons about capitalism, and lessons about life.

Clara says:

You learn how to make change. We learned about customer service—that we should always be nice to customers. We learned how to advertise. We donate some of the money to charity to help other people out. We might buy a gift for our brother since he's our new employee.

After one Lemonade Day in Houston, the girls said that they made enough money to "pay their investors back in full." Mr. Speaker, when was the last

time you heard of a 7-year-old using those business terms?

These kids are getting on-the-job business training that no government—especially the Federal Government—gave them. They are practicing Americanism. In the America I know, we teach our kids the value of hard work and entrepreneurship. We teach our kids from a young age that success does not come without sacrifice. Perseverance and responsibility pay off.

These are the lessons that our children need to learn, not the lessons of trying to depend on government. You see, these kids made it without government doing anything except getting out of their way.

So, Mr. Speaker, the next time you see the President, tell him that successful businesses in America come from businessowners—even kids—and not the Federal Government.

And that's just the way it is.

#### THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the founder and cochair of the Hellenic Caucus to speak on the 38th anniversary of the 1974 illegal Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus. We must ensure that the passage of time does not allow us to forget that the Cyprus issue is the result of an illegal invasion and ongoing occupation.

It is long overdue for Turkey to withdraw its troops from Cyprus so that the island can move forward as one nation. Turkey continues to forcibly occupy more than one-third of Cyprus with more than 48,000 troops. In addition, to date, Turkey has repeatedly ignored many of the United Nations resolutions pertaining to Cyprus and has continued to occupy the island in complete violation of international law.

The destruction of religious and cultural sites and artifacts continues unabated, in a long list of Turkish actions that flagrantly disrespect the rights and religious freedoms of the Cypriot people. In the last Congress, the Hellenic Caucus passed a resolution in the House calling for the protection of these religious sites and artifacts in Turkish-occupied areas. We have also worked on a resolution that has been introduced by Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. ENGEL, H. Res. 676, which calls for the halt of the Republic of Turkey's illegal colonization of the Republic of Cyprus with non-Cypriot populations. They are moving people onto the island. It is reported there are 500,000 Cypriot phones in the Turkish area. So the population—no one knows how many more people they're moving in. Cyprus is endeavoring to control all of its territory to end Turkey's occupation and to exploit its energy resources without illegal interference by Turkey.

In 2011, they discovered gas in the Cypriot area. The Noble Energy Com-

pany, a private energy company from Texas, discovered that a field off the coast of Cyprus may hold as much as 8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, the first discovery off the divided island nation. This is tremendously important for energy independence and for an ally to be able to support America and our energy needs. The beginning of drilling by Noble prompted Turkey in September to send a vessel accompanied by warships and fighter jets to the area.

Cyprus is divided after Turkey invaded the northern third of the island in 1974. Turkey does not recognize the Greek Cypriot Government. So this is yet another development that the Turkish country has brought to the island of Cyprus.

There have been some successes for Cyprus. In May of 2004, Cyprus, with the support of the United States, joined the European Union. And during the second half of this year, Cyprus took over the very important and prestigious position of presidency of the Council of the European Union. This is the first time Cyprus presided over the Council of the EU since it became a member of it in 2004.

Yesterday, a group of Hellenic Caucus members met with a group of leaders from the district that I am honored to represent. They included Phil Christopher, Peter Papanicolaou and other national leaders of the Cypriot American community and other Greek American leaders. They came to participate in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the confirmation hearing of Mr. Koeing. John Koeing was nominated by President Obama to be the next U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus, and we are hopeful that the confirmation will move forward.

We are also very concerned about a bill that has been put forward that gives preferential treatment to Turkey over other countries on contracts and activities that take place on American Indian areas. This has caused a great deal of concern with the members of the caucus.

I now want to express my opposition to the Indian Tribal Trade and Investment Demonstration Project Act. This bill would give preferential treatment to Turkish businesses to engage in investment activities on Indian tribal lands. And I question why they are being singled out for this consideration, given the illegal occupation that continues.

I express my strong support for Cyprus and the vital role it is playing in European affairs and the strong ally they have been to the United States.

#### THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, July 20 marks the 38th anniversary of the

Turkish invasion of the island of Cyprus. That invasion claimed the lives of about 5,000 Cypriots. In the neighborhood of 200,000 people were forcibly expelled from their homes during that time period. To put that in perspective, that was one-third of the population of the country. If this were to happen in the United States, it would be the equivalent of about 100,000 people becoming refugees in their own land.

As we stand here today, that occupation continues. There are over 30,000 Turkish troops on the island. They are stationed on over one-third of Cyprus. Sadly, that occupied area of this beautiful land is one of the most militarized areas in the world. I have seen this on both sides of that divide. It is truly tragic that despite the wishes of Cypriots on both sides of that line that this cannot be resolved. And the Cyprus-Turkey issue, unlike many others, is one that the international community has been able to agree on.

There have been 75 resolutions adopted in the Security Council—more than 13 by the General Assembly—calling for the return of the refugees to their homes and to their properties and for the withdrawal of those Turkish troops from Cyprus.

□ 1110

President Demetris Christofias has followed through on his promise to make the solution of that problem his top priority. I met with him when I was in Nicosia 3 years ago, and his commitment to finding a solution greatly impressed me in that he had reached out to Turkish Cypriots.

I had my own opportunity, when I was in northern Cyprus, to talk to Turkish Cypriots, and they confirmed that their desire was to find a resolution to this problem, to find a way to have Turkish troops leave the island. And there's certainly no lack of good will, I think, in terms of the Cypriot community.

So, since 2008, there have been these full-fledged negotiations with leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community. I think that the problem here is that that effort needs a reliable partner, a reasonable partner, and I question whether Turkey is listening in that process. From everything I've seen, they're not listening yet.

I would point out that Cyprus and the United States share a deep and abiding commitment to upholding the ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, human rights, and the international rule of law. After the Lebanon crisis in 2006, if you'll recall, Cyprus served as the principal transit location for people evacuating Lebanon, including our U.S. citizens. I had constituents that went through Cyprus at that time. In the '83 Beirut barracks bombing, it was Cyprus that provided the staging ground for the U.S. evacuation and rescue efforts after that bombing.

But I point out also that since the discovery of gas reserves in the eastern Mediterranean, the U.S. has advocated

including revenue sharing from energy resources in those Cyprus settlement talks, urging that they be shared with the Cypriot community on both sides of that line.

It's important to note that there are concrete efforts underway by the heads of the respective communities to reunify. Greek and Turkish Cypriots, alike, want to see that solution. Again, in my view, what stands in the way here is Turkey at the present time, and I wish they would reconsider their position.

You can see the extent to which Cyprus is willing to compromise with these newly discovered energy resources. Greek Cypriot leaders are willing, in principle, to share the benefits of future gas production with Turkish Cypriots. Their only request is that revenues not be shared with those 30,000-plus Turkish soldiers on the island, and that's still not good enough for Turkey.

You know, Mr. Speaker, 38 years of occupation, needless militarization in this part of the world, this divide should have ended long, long ago. There is still time to right this wrong. I hope Turkey reconsiders.

#### HONORING MARCEL DEON JACKSON

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced a resolution in this House calling the illiteracy of our African American and Hispanic men in this country to be a national crisis. By teaching our young men how to read, we can help build their character, we can save their lives. We can also reduce violent crime, because many of our young men will no longer be on the streets. They will be in schools, and they will also have the skills that they need to get good-paying jobs.

Today, I wish to offer that resolution in recognition of the memory of a great man of honor, Marcel Deon Jackson. We need more men like Mr. Jackson.

Marcel Jackson recently gave his life in defense of another. He was a courageous member of Detroit 300, which is a community organization committed to deter crime in the streets of Detroit.

If we help give our young men hope—hope through education, hope by building their character, by reading inspiring books, hope that they can have a better life, raise a family—that will save lives and make Metro Detroit and our country a better place to live.

Marcel Jackson lived and died so that we who live in Detroit could have a better life there. Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to recognize the memory of the life of Marcel Deon Jackson, a great man of honor.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MEL FELDMAN

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

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise and say just a few words to honor the remarkable life and note the passing of a constituent of mine and an accomplished small business man from central Illinois, a businessman named Mel Feldman.

I had the privilege of meeting Mr. Feldman in 2010, when he shared with me the story of his life and times. I'd like to share some of that with you, for it encapsulates much of what we all love about our country and what I love about central Illinois.

Mel was born in Poland in 1913, which he and his family fled soon thereafter to escape the pogroms that arose during the First World War. The family eventually settled in St. Louis, where Mel studied engineering. He began a career in the radio business, hustling a job as a remote engineer with KMOX during the 1930s, where he courted his wife, Ruth, while doing remote broadcasts of big band concerts on Saturday nights. Later, he was an engineer and sidekick of a young broadcaster named Harry Carey, of who we're very familiar with.

Mel fought in World War II, and upon returning home, he and a friend bought a radio station in Springfield, Illinois. Operating on a shoestring budget, they worked day and night for years to get established, eventually buying two other radio stations in Peoria and coming to employ nearly 100 workers.

He and his wife, Ruth, became pillars of the community at the synagogue there in the central Illinois area, where she helped run the preschool. In the 1980s, they sold their stations and retired, choosing to remain in the area to be near their family.

To go from the streets of Eastern Europe to the prosperity and stability of central Illinois in the 21st century is a journey that is difficult for many of us to fathom. It is to the enormous benefit of our community that people like Mel came to the United States and braved war and oppression and poverty and all kinds of other tribulations for the chance to settle down and raise their families amongst us. They are one of the things that make Illinois such a great and rewarding place to live and raise our families.

America owes much to immigrants, and central Illinois owes much to the contributions of Mel and Ruth Feldman, whose legacy goes beyond the radio stations he established, the synagogue they served, and the family they raised. Their lives touched and bettered so many friends and neighbors in Peoria, who I know are mourning Mel's passing but, at the same time, celebrating his life.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

Reverend Jeffery Bayhi, St. John the Baptist Catholic Church, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God and Father, we humbly ask that You bestow upon us the gift of humility. Humble us in Your sight, our Creator. It's only from You, our God, that the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are derived, not from any king, government or congress. Let us always see ourselves as stewards of these rights and the servants of the people created in Your image and likeness, like our Founding Fathers. We are to protect, ensure, and safeguard those rights.

Guard us from the evils of pride and power that place self-interest before the common good. Give us the courage of our convictions and not simply a belief based on convenience. Never let a wishbone replace our backbone, for it is You alone to whom one day we will all be accountable. Give us courage and strength to serve and care for Your people. We ask this through our God and Father.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. JENKINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WELCOMING REVEREND M. JEFFERY BAYHI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to invite Father Bayhi here today to speak. Father Bayhi is a na-

tive of Baton Rouge and was ordained at St. Patrick's Church in 1979.

He has many academic achievements, but he is actually best known for spiritual stewardship of his parishioners. You can see this both in how his calling and ministry manifest in the opportunities that he has sought and the activities he currently does.

Among these he has worked with Mother Teresa's church in Calcutta. He currently is the director of Closer Walk Ministries. He has written several books, such as "Paved With Souls," speaking about his experience with Mother Teresa and the Missionaries of Charity in Calcutta, as well as produced videos of his experiences on mission trips. He has worked in prison systems for the criminally insane. He works with youth, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

I was struck that his prayer for us reflected his life, one of humility, courage, accountability to God, calling us to service.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### DODD-FRANK

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, despite my strenuous objections, 2 years ago this week Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act. Two years have passed, and only one-third of nearly 400 rules are written today, and we have already added nearly 9,000 pages of new regulations and \$7 billion in compliance costs.

By trying to solve a poorly understood financial crisis, Washington created a regulatory nightmare. New agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have slowed the credit lifeline that is vital to the creation and survival of American small businesses.

By impeding borrowing, experts predict Dodd-Frank will reduce annual job creation by 4.3 percent, hindering economic growth. Instead of using crises as excuses to expand our already overreaching government, we should target regulation at the root of the problem and work to protect both consumers and our innovating entrepreneurs.

#### SUPPORTING MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of the Make

It in America plan, a series of bills set forth by House Democrats to put America back to work.

In the 29th District of Texas, we hold job fairs throughout the year to help our constituents find a job and make better lives for themselves and their families. The American public continually cites job creation and economic growth as the top concerns in the Nation.

The Make It in America plan aims to strengthen the economy and boost the middle class through continuing to grow our manufacturing and energy production sectors and creating jobs in America. Make It in America focuses on competition, investing in infrastructure, clean energy jobs, increased education, smart tax policies, and smart regulations.

Unfortunately, the majority in the 112th Congress has failed to bring these job-creating plans to the floor for a vote and continually refuses to put forward a comprehensive jobs plan. Congress must focus our legislative priorities, invest in our future, create good middle class jobs and increase America's competitiveness around the globe. By creating these jobs for hardworking Americans, the other areas of our economy will be stimulated.

I urge the majority to take up these bipartisan bills and help the American people get back to work.

□ 1210

#### PERMITTING ISSUES

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

Mrs. CAPITO. I rise today to support the jobs of hundreds of hardworking coal miners in West Virginia and to highlight the misguided actions of the EPA in objecting to permits for coal mining activity.

On April 1, 2010, the EPA issued guidance under the Clean Water Act that bypasses the normal process for promulgating water quality standards. It nullifies the water quality standards put into place by our State regulators and our State legislatures. In other words, the EPA has taken over the States' prerogative on water quality.

Despite a 2011 Federal court decision that rejected the EPA's interpretation of its authority, the regulatory permitting process for surface mining has essentially been halted in the Appalachian region. Hundreds of permits will expire within the next 18 months in West Virginia alone. Failure to act on these permits will lead to the loss of thousands of jobs in West Virginia, and just recently we have experienced a loss of 1,000 coal mining jobs.

The EPA should exercise its permitting and regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act in a manner that considers the impacts on jobs and the economy in West Virginia and other coal mining States.

## DISCLOSE ACT

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

Ms. CHU. Thanks to the Supreme Court decision on Citizens United, corporations can now make unlimited donations without disclosing who they are. The result is a government for hire to the highest bidder.

Think about it. Are you a corrupt oil company that hates those annoying safeguards that protect Americans' health, but restrict your ability to drill, baby, drill? No problem. Find a candidate that will turn a blind eye and donate until they win. Or maybe you're a billionaire on Wall Street who leveraged away the savings of the American people for a big paycheck in 2008, but now you're being held back by Wall Street reform. Not to worry. Buy a candidate with a super PAC. Nobody needs to know who you even are.

Twice this week, the DISCLOSE Act, which would end this madness and provide transparency to who's contributing in elections, has come up in the Senate. And twice this week, Republicans blocked it on a party-line vote. Americans should ask the GOP: Why?

## TAXES

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, massive tax increases loom on our horizon. If Congress doesn't act before January 1, middle class families will see a return of the marriage penalty, the AMT, higher rates on capital gains, dividends, estates, and painful tax hikes on incomes. According to a new study, the President's tax plan would cost us more than 700,000 American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we all hear from our neighborhood businesses back home who say Congress can't raise taxes during a recession and expect the economy to generate new jobs. Yet some of my colleagues seem content to tax anyone who might have enough revenue to hire and then hope the voters blame someone else when it hurts the middle class.

Well, I don't care about the blame game. I care about jobs and the economy. Let's stop the tax hikes, extend current rates, and work immediately on effective reforms to lower rates, close loopholes, and promote growth.

## LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

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

Mr. FARR. I rise today to express my shocking disappointment with some Republican Members of the other body in opposing the Senate ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty. The Law of the Sea Treaty ratification is essential to protect American interests. For over

30 years now, the United States Navy and the U.S. Coast Guard, both under Republican and Democratic administrations, former Secretaries of State, and U.S. military personnel have been consistent and strong proponents of U.S. joining the Law of the Sea Convention. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta recently said:

Not since we acquired the lands of the American West and Alaska have we had such a great opportunity to expand U.S. sovereignty.

Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said:

The Law of the Sea provides clear guidance on the appropriate use of the maritime domain.

As the world's major maritime power with the longest coastline, the U.S. has more to gain from legal certainty and public order in the world's oceans than any other country. It has been supported by every President since Ronald Reagan. The time is due for the other body to take a leadership role and ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty.

## ARMY DEPOTS PLAY VITAL ROLE IN MILITARY READINESS

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I rise today to express my concern regarding the reduction in funding for Army depots and arsenals contained in the Defense appropriations bill that we're debating today on the House floor. Army studies have shown that these reductions will have a lasting negative impact on the Army's organic industrial base.

I have the privilege of representing the Corpus Christie Army depot, known as the "best kept secret in the Army," saving taxpayers millions of dollars. It costs about \$6.7 million to repair a crash-battle damaged Blackhawk versus \$17 million for a new one. In fiscal year 2011, a record production year, CCAD produced more than \$47 million in cost savings for the Army. The depot shares a great relationship with the community, employing over 6,000 civilian, 56 percent of whom are veterans. The Army depot serves as the world's largest facility for the repair and overhaul of Army aviation helicopters. Without CCAD, the Army would be unable to sustain maximum combat power for the warfighter.

I look forward to working with the committee and the chairman to address these concerns and ensuring the Corpus Christie Army depot and others depots and arsenals continue to play a vital role in maintaining the readiness of our military.

## INTERNATIONAL AIDS CONFERENCE

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. With the International AIDS Conference less than a week away, I join my colleagues to celebrate the progress we've made in the fight against HIV/AIDS, to honor those who have lost their battle to this disease, and also to remind everyone that we still have much work to do in Sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean and Asia, but also the United States, where more than 1 million people—a disproportionate number of whom are people of color—are living with HIV and AIDS today. Blacks and Latinos together account for 64 percent of all new HIV infections, yet are only about 28 percent of the population. The AIDS case rate among African Americans is nearly 10 times higher than that of whites; and one recent study found that 2 percent of all blacks in the U.S., compared to only .2 percent of all whites, are HIV positive. In my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, which is predominantly black and Hispanic, we're extremely hard hit, with the third largest AIDS case rate in the Nation.

The conference offers all of us an opportunity to reinvigorate our commitment to battling this disease, to reinforce existing relationships and forge new ones with the leaders in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and to take significant steps toward making HIV/AIDS a disease of the past.

## ILLINOIS' 14TH DISTRICT 2012 OLYMPIANS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the remarkable accomplishments of six athletes from Illinois' 14th Congressional District who will represent the United States at the 2012 Olympics in London. Twin brothers Grant and Ross James from DeKalb will both compete as part of the men's eight rowing team. Track and field athlete Evan Jager of Algonquin will compete in the steeplechase. Anna Li of Aurora will travel to London as an alternate member of the women's gymnastics team. Charlie Jayne of Elgin will serve as alternate for the equestrian team. Finally, the men's volleyball team will include Sean Rooney, a graduate of Wheaton-Warrenville South High School.

Each of these men and women are making us so proud as they represent Illinois and the United States this summer. The House of Representatives wishes them the best of luck.

## READ IT AND WEEP

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, wonders never cease. I picked up The Hill this morning, which is a local newspaper that most people read once in a

while, and there were the words of one of the best Republican doctors that ever served in the Congress. Bill Frist has said he's encouraging his Republican colleagues to embrace the insurance exchange which is central to President Obama's health care plan. He said:

Originally it was a Republican idea. The State insurance exchanges will offer a menu of private insurance plans to pick and choose from, all with a required set of minimum benefits to those without employer-sponsored health care insurance.

Now, here's a Republican doctor who was the Majority Leader in the Senate. Contrast him to who we have there now. We have 31 times in this body tried to repeal this, and here you have a Republican doctor who was Majority Leader of the Senate saying we ought to do it.

Read it and weep.

□ 1220

#### SEQUESTRATION

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, once again, President Obama displays his lack of leadership and refuses to take charge in order to avoid the forthcoming devastating ramifications associated with sequester. That's why I enthusiastically agreed to cosponsor H.R. 5872, the Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012.

For months, the House Armed Services Committee has repeatedly asked DOD and OMB for specifics of how sequestration would be implemented and its impact. In response, we have received nothing.

Once H.R. 5872 is implemented, the President will be forced to forgo his laissez-faire approach to crisis resolution and will be required to report to Congress the details of the administration's plans to implement the budget sequestration cuts. He will be forced to include an estimate of the sequestration percentages and amounts necessary to achieve the reduction for both defense and non-defense categories.

Of course, the impact on our military personnel and their families cannot be overstated. Frankly, it's inexcusable that these men and women who sacrifice so much for our Nation should suffer through these uncertainties while Senate Democrats and the White House refuse to offer a specific proposal to fix the sequester. As such, I urge Senator REID to take this bill up immediately.

#### BUFFALO IS BACK IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to talk about the ex-

traordinary transformation in the city of Buffalo and Buffalo's waterfront. The national publication, *The Economist*, had declared last week that the city of Buffalo is back in business.

Buffalo was once an industrial economy and an industrial working waterfront. Today, there is a transformation of public places along the water's edge attracting some 800,000 people from all over Buffalo, western New York, and southern Ontario into the city of Buffalo. There are 425 cultural and arts events. Four years ago, there were none.

Buffalo's last 36 months have been a period of great progress, with tens of millions of dollars of private sector investment following the public investment of infrastructure that has transformed Buffalo's waterfront. The last 36 months have been a period of great progress. The next 36 months are poised to be a period of even greater progress.

#### HONORING THE FIREFIGHTERS OF HIGH PARK, COLORADO

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave firefighters, the sheriff's department officials, and first responders who fought the High Park fire near Fort Collins, Colorado, and those who cared so deeply for their neighbors and their communities by providing a helping hand.

The High Park fire was the most destructive in the history of northern Colorado, burning over 87,000 acres, destroying 259 homes, and displacing hundreds of families for weeks. At its peak, over 2,000 firefighters, National Guardsmen, law enforcement, and others braved extremely rugged terrain, 100-plus-degree temperatures, and high winds to battle this complex and fast-moving fire. In some cases, local volunteer firefighters fought on the fire line for the good of the community, despite knowing that their own homes would likely be burned to the ground.

As signs popped up across the front range of Colorado thanking those brave men and women for their service, this Congress salutes you. Because of the brave and immense effort of these firefighters, lives were saved, homes were preserved, and generations to come will be able to continue to enjoy some of the most beautiful and majestic forested areas in the country as we work to restore those areas that were lost.

I'm proud to recognize the great and heroic efforts of our firefighters.

#### HONORING GAIL PENNYBACKER

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gail Pennybacker, an award-winning, longtime television

journalist who has covered local news in the District, Maryland, and especially Virginia for the ABC Channel 7 news team since 1986.

During her time as the northern Virginia bureau chief, Gail has garnered the respect of law enforcement, legislators, and everyday citizens alike. Gail has covered the Capital region's top stories for the last quarter century, including the September 11 terror attacks, the beltway sniper shootings, and the Columbine High School massacre. She has reported directly from the Persian Gulf during the Iraq war, conducted exclusive interviews with nationally known individuals, and earned several Edward R. Murrow Awards and other accolades.

Active in her community, Gail has been deeply involved with a variety of civic associations and organizations, including the Alzheimer's Association and the American Diabetes Association.

Her recognition by the Northern Virginia Victims Coalition for the "objective, fair, and compassionate portrayal of crime victims" is truly a testament to her respect for all persons, no matter their situation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I'm honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Gail Pennybacker upon her retirement from ABC7. Her dedication to making news reporting a reliable source of information has made her an institution in our community. While Gail's familiar face will be missed, we wish her only the best as she begins the next phase of her life.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF WILLIAM RASPBERRY

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a great man, Mr. William Raspberry of Okolona, Mississippi, who died Tuesday at the age of 76.

He was hired by *The Washington Post* straight out of the Army and worked his way up from teletype operator to the op-ed page. At the time, he was only one of a handful of nationally syndicated and widely read African American columnists.

And though Mr. Raspberry lived most of his life away from Mississippi, he never forgot Okolona. He devoted much of his time in retirement to the foundation in Mississippi that bears his name that helped children from at-risk families be prepared for entrance into kindergarten.

He was a model of how to talk about complicated and divisive issues in a respectful and civil tone. In fact, he once said:

Perhaps it was then that I found myself trying to write in such a way that people who didn't agree with me might at least hear me. Then I found they were talking back to me in similarly civil tones. And it felt good.

His attitude would be a model for all of us that debate public policy.

William Raspberry was a fine man and a great Mississippian. He will be missed.

#### MAKE IT IN AMERICA

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every citizen deserves an equal opportunity to make it in America. Last week, I, along with Democratic Whip STENY HOYER and other members of the Democratic Caucus unveiled a plan to jump-start growth in the United States manufacturing industry and support job creation that we so desperately need.

My bill, the Advancing Innovative Manufacturing Act of 2012, makes investments to spur innovation and increase the competitiveness of American manufacturers.

In order for America to make it, we need to maintain the capacity to manufacture new and innovative products right here at home in America. The Make It In America agenda will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I would say: Let all of us face and focus on our responsibility to America's business and press ahead to make it all in America.

#### NORTH KOREAN GULAGS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the privilege of meeting Shin Dong-hyuk, the only known defector to have escaped from one of the many concentration camps operated by the Communist government in North Korea.

He was born in the camp and faced starvation, torture, and brainwashing on a routine basis, which is described in the book, "Escape From Camp 14." On the same day, the authorities executed both his brother and his mother in front of him for attempting to plan an escape. He knew nothing of the outside world, only living day to day, doing whatever was needed to survive. Heartbreakingly, this included informing the guards when he heard about his family's escape plan. Years later, a new prisoner came to the camp from Pyongyang, and Shin began to learn about the outside world and then began to long to escape.

By some estimates, as many as 200,000 people are held in the brutal gulags like Shin. As we negotiate with the gangster government of North Korea over their nuclear weapons program, we cannot forget about these human rights atrocities perpetrated against millions of their own people.

□ 1230

#### TAX CUTS FOR MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge us to reclaim the security that middle class Americans have lost over the last decade.

Beginning in 2001, Republicans passed trillions of dollars in tax cuts, primarily benefiting the wealthiest Americans. We were told these tax cuts would unleash a torrent of job creation and economic growth. That was baloney. It failed miserably. The wealthiest Americans experienced unprecedented gains while middle class families saw their budgets shrink in tandem with rising poverty and the slowest rate of job creation in half a century.

Well, lesson learned. It's time to let the tax cuts for the wealthiest expire, but not at the expense of middle class families. It's time to extend, without delay or uncertainty, tax cuts for all families, for all income up to \$250,000. If we don't, it will be a disaster, and a tax hike will result for those middle class families.

Mr. Speaker, it's unacceptable, particularly when Republicans are holding these tax cuts hostage so that wealthy Americans can continue to reap the benefits of a broken system that hasn't worked to the advantage of most Americans and has exploded our deficit. Lesson learned.

Let's not let tax cuts expire for people whose income is up to \$250,000.

#### CONGRATULATING WARRINGTON-WARWICK LITTLE LEAGUE SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Warrington-Warwick Little League softball team for their victory over Minersville on Saturday in the State championship game in Pennsylvania.

Our community can be proud to be represented by this group of young women as they compete for the regional title this week. As the father of three girls who are involved in our community, I understand the dedication required of the players and their families to achieve such a success.

The team will head to Bristol, Connecticut, today, where they will compete against State championships from nine other States for the title. Congratulations to Coach Bitting, Coach Corso, and Coach Ruscio, and players Stephanie Andreoli, Madison Bitting, Sophia Boggs, Meghan Bradley, Lauren and Nicole Corso, Lauren Crim, Alexandra DeLeon, Sabrina Dobron, Kaitlyn Hammond, Alexis McConomy, Madeline McShane, Giuliana Ruscio, and Cassie Underkofler.

Congratulations once again to everybody who took part in this historic run. We wish all the players and coaches and parents the best. I'm proud and honored to see a local team go so far.

#### CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF MORRO BAY

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the city of Morro Bay in my congressional district on the central coast of California.

Last month, the city won the 2012 award for Excellence in Local Governance for coastal and ocean management from NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This award is for its groundbreaking work with other coastal communities in California, local fishermen, and the Nature Conservancy to preserve historic fishing activity and build long-term economic and environmental resiliency on California's central coast.

Working together, these partners realized that Morro Bay and other small fishing communities—our working waterfronts—needed to respond to the changing conditions of their fisheries. This effort has not been easy, to be sure; but Morro Bay's leaders, who have faced huge obstacles in their efforts to try new approaches to fisheries management, were determined to make this work. So it is great to see this recognition of their courage and their hard work to improve Morro Bay's leading industry.

Again, I congratulate the city of Morro Bay and its innovative partners for earning this acknowledgement.

#### THANKING SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to all those small business owners across America who have used their ingenuity, hard work, and tireless effort at great financial risk to build a business from the ground up.

Americans know that jobs aren't created by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. We know that our country's greatest innovators succeed in our American free enterprise system because they pour their hearts and souls into their dreams, overcoming each obstacle placed in their way.

In our current economy, Congress should be doing everything it can to minimize the burdens on these entrepreneurs; yet, day by day, new regulations, mandates, and taxes pile up and make it that much harder for these innovators to succeed and harder for them to create good jobs and grow the economy.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, as thousands of small business owners rise at the crack of dawn once again to build on the American Dream, we say thank you. It's their hard work and determination, and it's the tireless effort of every working American that has built the most prosperous Nation the world has ever seen.

#### INTERNATIONAL AIDS CONFERENCE

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The International AIDS Conference could not be returning to America at a better time. This year's conference could mark the turning point in the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Advances in research are finally allowing us to picture the possibility of a generation that is free from this disease.

Despite great promise, there is still much to do. Now more than ever, America must remain committed to leading the fight against HIV/AIDS, combating the crisis right here at home and abroad. Our continued support is absolutely vital to developing new treatments and prevention techniques, including microbicides, as well as to finding a cure.

The United States must continue to do everything we can to increase access to treatment for infected individuals around the globe, including the availability of life-saving drugs. Let this conference serve as a reminder of America's contribution to combating this epidemic and a rallying cry for why we can't turn back now.

#### CALLING FOR A VOTE ON THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House Ag Committee reported out of committee a version of the House bill. I rise today to call for this important measure to be brought to the floor for a vote as soon as possible.

Agriculture is the backbone of North Dakota's economy. Our great State leads the Nation in nine different commodities. This farm bill takes into consideration unique things within our State and within many other States as it relates to agriculture and those commodities. Specifically, it implements a strong crop insurance program that would be so beneficial in times like these where we're facing severe drought in much of our Nation. North Dakota's farmers and ranchers need the stability that this farm bill can bring, and it needs to be a long-term authorization.

Now is the time for the House to act. For farmers and ranchers across this country, now is the time to ensure that we act on this important piece of legis-

lation and get it reauthorized for the long term. The time for the farm bill is now.

#### STUNT

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize STUNT, a new competitive team sport which focuses on the technical and athletic components of cheerleading, including stunts, basket tosses, and tumbling.

With more than 800,000 cheerleaders in the United States, USA Cheer created this NCAA emerging sport to provide new opportunities for female athletes to compete at the high school and collegiate level, while still allowing traditional cheerleading to remain a vital and important part of the schools' spirit program.

There are 22 colleges that have already participated in the national championships, with this number poised to expand significantly by next year. As cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on Youth Sports, it is my distinct pleasure to highlight the success of STUNT and to commend the inaugural players of this sport. Your pioneering efforts will inspire and generate excitement amongst the next generation of potential STUNT athletes. May God bless you for your efforts to involve more young female athletes in healthy physical activities and sports.

#### VETERANS JOBS ACT

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the President to sign the Veterans Jobs Act.

This body has a duty to make sure that every veteran, our brave men and women who are returning home—at 200,000 leaving Active Duty every year—actually have jobs available to them and that they're actually certified to be able to accept those jobs.

We invest billions of dollars every year to give the best training in the world to our young men and women who are serving our country. Yet when they leave Active Duty, most times they're not certified for the very jobs that they're trying to get. Our brave men and women deserve the opportunity to jump right into these fields. Why should they have to get 2 or 3 extra years of training to duplicate the training they already have that is oftentimes much better training that they had on Active Duty.

We have a duty to pass this bill, to have it signed into law, and to not let a day go by that these veterans return home and make sure that they've got the certifications to immediately enter our workforce.

I urge the President once again to sign this important legislation that both bodies have passed now on a bipartisan level.

□ 1240

#### RETURN OF THE INTERNATIONAL AIDS CONFERENCE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in more than two decades, the United States will host the 19th International AIDS Conference, drawing over 20,000 people from around the world to our Nation's Capital.

Having participated in every conference since I was first elected to Congress in 1998, I knew we could not bring the conference back to the United States until the discriminatory immigration ban on people living with HIV was lifted.

In 2007, I introduced a bill to repeal the ban. Few believed it could be done, but through bipartisan support we achieved this goal, and I want to thank Members who are still here for their support in that effort.

This week, the return of the conference is an important opportunity to shine a global spotlight on the fight against AIDS in the African American community and communities of color, and a national spotlight on the ongoing global epidemic. Yesterday I introduced new legislation to do just that.

Ending the HIV/AIDS Epidemic Act articulates a policy and financing framework to achieve an AIDS-free generation in the United States and abroad. I urge all my colleagues to support it so that we can begin to bring an end to AIDS here at home and around the world.

#### TRICKING THE PUBLIC IS OBSCENE

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, funding the military is imperative, and supporting our troops at home and abroad is fundamental. But overfunding it at the expense of vital domestic programs is irresponsible.

The Defense appropriations bill is \$8 billion more than the agreed-upon level set by the Budget Control Act. This means that real programs in our home districts, which many of our constituents rely on, will be cut or go unfunded.

Every family in this Nation knows what it is to make a budget and the reasons behind needing it. This bill blatantly ignores the need and purpose of a budget. Certain aspects of this bill are hundreds of millions of dollars above requested levels. If a family tried to live like that, they would be in dire straits.

Designating money when it is above and beyond what is needed is nothing more than a gratuitous earmark. Now, I am in favor of earmarks; I'm just not in favor of trying to trick the public. I believe that earmarks are right. It is our constitutional responsibility as Members of the House. But tricking the public by adding \$8 billion more is obscene.

#### PROPOSED SNAP PROGRAM CUTS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Republican majority has, in another wasted effort, repealed health care reform for the 33rd time, at a time when we will not see on this floor a vote to extend tax cuts for the middle class, now the Republican majority is planning to literally take food out of the mouths of families and children by cutting \$16.5 billion from the SNAP program in the farm bill.

This represents 45 percent of all the cuts, immediately cuts 3 million families and children from the program, and this is at a time when one in seven American families depend on some supplemental food assistance.

But as the Republican majority fiddles away, we know that there is a crisis. Fifty-eight percent of all food bank clients currently receiving SNAP benefits need assistance from them. The resulting demand to food banks will put additional pressure on our communities and on families.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

H.R. 1627. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements for the placement of monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5856, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 717 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5856.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) kindly take the chair.

□ 1245

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 18, 2012, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 153, line 15.

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7 of title 1, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is the DOMA limitation amendment. We've seen this last year where it passed out of the House of Representatives with a substantial vote. And it says, as it reads, that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act, which passed here in this Congress in 1996.

What we've seen since the passage of the Defense of Marriage Act is an effort on the part of the executive branch to undermine, I believe, marriage between one man and one woman within our military ranks.

We saw the President of the United States make some statements along the way that his position was evolving on marriage that seemed to be a signal to the Department of Defense, which issued two memoranda, one of them on September 21, the Secretary of Defense memorandum that identified facilities, and it says that the facilities, our military facilities should be made, the use of them should be made on a sexual orientation-neutral basis. That's a signal that says same-sex marriages on U.S. military bases and U.S. facilities.

The second memorandum came 9 days later to our military chaplains, and it says a military chaplain may officiate any private ceremony, on or off a military installation. That's not just permission, that's implied encouragement to conduct same-sex marriages on our military bases, conducted by our chaplains who are, presumably, all under the payroll of the United States Government.

This same-sex marriage that has been taking place on our military bases, where otherwise legal around

the world, contravenes the Defense of Marriage Act. The Defense of Marriage Act means this, actually says specifically this: marriage means only a legal union between one man and one woman, as husband and wife, and the word spouse refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife. Pretty simple statute being contravened by the directives of the President of the United States as exercised through the Secretary of Defense.

And I would point out that the President has demonstrated disrespect for the Constitution and the rule of law on multiple occasions. I just came from the Judiciary Committee, where I reminded Secretary Napolitano of the same thing.

Congress directs and acts within the authority of article I of the Constitution, our legislative authority, and the President of the United States, or his executives who are empowered by him, seek to undermine the law of the United States, instead of coming here to this Congress and asking for the law to be changed, or simply accepting the idea that they've taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the rule of law, and to take care, under article II, section 3, that the laws be faithfully executed.

That's not happening, Mr. Chairman, and this amendment prohibits the use of military facilities, or the pay of military chaplains, from being used to contravene the Defense of Marriage Act. The President has now stepped out and said that he supports same-sex marriage in the United States. That is, apparently, the most recent evolution of his position.

□ 1250

But an evolving position of the President of the United States cannot be allowed to contravene the will of the people of the United States, as expressed through the statutes of the United States and as signed by previous President Bill Clinton in September of 1996.

So I urge the adoption of this amendment. It prohibits the utilization of any of these funds that are in the Defense appropriations bill to be used to contravene the Defense of Marriage Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, DC, September 30, 2011.

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF  
THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS—  
CHIEFS OF THE MILITARY SERVICES  
SUBJECT: Military Chaplains

In connection with the repeal of Section 654 of Title 10 of the United States Code, I write to provide the following guidance, which hereby supersedes any Department regulation or policy to the contrary:

A military chaplain may participate in or officiate any private ceremony, whether on or off a military installation, provided that the ceremony is not prohibited by applicable state and local law. Further, a chaplain is not required to participate in or officiate a private ceremony if doing so would be in variance with the tenets of his or her religion or personal beliefs. Finally, a military

chaplain's participation in a private ceremony does not constitute an endorsement of the ceremony by DoD.

CLIFFORD L. STANLEY.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, DC, September 21, 2011.

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF  
THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS—  
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
FOR ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND  
LOGISTICS; UNDER SECRETARY OF  
DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND  
READINESS

SUBJECT: Uses of DoD Facilities

In connection with the repeal of Section 654 of Title 10 of the United States Code, I write to provide the following legal guidance.

Determinations regarding use of DoD real property and facilities for private functions, including religious and other ceremonies, should be made on a sexual-orientation neutral basis, provided such use is not prohibited by applicable state and local laws. Further, private functions are not official activities of the Department of Defense. Thus, the act of making DoD property available for private functions, including religious and other activities, does not constitute an endorsement of the activities by DoD.

JEH C. JOHNSON.

#### TITLE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### CHAPTER 1—RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

###### Sec. 7. *Definition of "marriage" and "spouse"*

In determining the meaning of any Act of Congress, or of any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States, the word "marriage" means only a legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife, and the word "spouse" refers only to a person of the opposite sex who is a husband or a wife.

Source: Added Pub. L. 104-199, Sec. 3(a), Sept. 21, 1996, 110 Stat. 2419.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment is being offered for purely political reasons.

As the gentleman knows, the Defense of Marriage Act is already current law. Despite the successful repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell last year under DOMA, same-sex military spouses are not entitled to the same benefits as other married couples. This amendment only seeks to divide this House. He knows that current law already prohibits same-sex spouses from independently shopping at military commissaries, using base gyms, or benefiting from subsidized dental and health care.

I do believe we should have the debate of the effects of DOMA on our servicemembers and their families, but introducing this contentious and discriminatory amendment to this bill is not the place. I urge my colleagues to oppose this divisive amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman from Iowa has explained the amendment very thoroughly. It is easy to understand. The House has spoken many, many times strongly on the issue, so I would add my support to the King amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DICKS. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Funds made available by this Act for operations of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan shall be obligated and expended only for purposes of providing for the safe and orderly withdrawal from Afghanistan of all members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense contractor personnel who are in Afghanistan. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the use of funds for the continuation of combat operations in Afghanistan while carrying out such withdrawal or to prohibit or otherwise restrict the use of funds available to any department or agency of the United States to carry out diplomatic efforts or humanitarian, development, or general reconstruction activities in Afghanistan.

Ms. LEE of California (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is straightforward. It would put a responsible end to combat operations in Afghanistan by limiting funding to the safe and orderly withdrawal of United States troops and military contractors.

Eleven years after Congress wrote a blank check for war without end, which I could not support, the United States is still in Afghanistan. Ever since that vote, I have introduced this Lee amendment—that responsibly and safely brings our troops home—on numerous occasions and at every opportunity. It is past time that Congress caught up, had the debate, and passed this amendment.

Today, we have the opportunity to stand squarely with the war-weary American people who want to bring our troops home. It is clear that the American people have been far ahead of Congress in supporting an end to the war in Afghanistan. The call has been growing across this land to bring this war to an end, and it is past time for Congress to answer that call.

After over a decade of war and over a half a trillion dollars in direct costs—not a penny of it, mind you, paid for, and we talk about deficit reduction—when we should have been actually investing in jobs and our economy here at home, it is really time now to say enough is enough. It is crucial to our economy and to the future of this country to stop pouring billions into a counterproductive military presence in Afghanistan. It is no wonder that 7 out of 10 Americans oppose the war in Afghanistan. The American people have made it clear that the war should end, that it should not go on for another year or 2 years and, surely, not for another decade or more.

Mr. Chair, the costs of the war are unacceptable, particularly when we ask what we gain by keeping our troops in Afghanistan through 2014. The war in Afghanistan has already taken the lives of over 2,000 soldiers, has injured tens of thousands more, and has drained our Treasury of over a half a trillion dollars. These costs will only go up as we spend trillions of dollars on long-term care for our veterans, which of course we must do.

As the daughter of a military veteran, I know firsthand the sacrifices and the commitment involved in defending our Nation; but the truth is our troops have been put in an impossible situation. There is no military solution, and it is past time to end the war and to bring our troops home. Quite frankly, it is time to use these savings from ending the war to create jobs here at home. We need to provide for the health care and economic security of our returning troops by rebuilding the American economy.

The American people have made it clear that the war should end. Not an extra day—not an extra dollar—should be spent extending the decade-long war in Afghanistan. After 11 long years now, it is time to bring our troops home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

##### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect, so I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction on the expenditure of funds.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise to make just a very brief announcement.

For years and years in the past when presenting the Defense appropriations bill, it has always been my policy, if any amendment is out of order and is subject to a point of order, to allow the introducer of that amendment at least 5 minutes to discuss it before raising a point of order. I hope we can do that today and expedite the process. I would like to move this bill a little quicker than maybe we had anticipated.

So I just make that announcement. We will continue to allow you to have your debate time before raising the point of order, but I would hope that everybody would be respectful of the time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the following entities:

- (1) The Government of Iran.
- (2) The Government of Syria.
- (3) Hamas.
- (4) Hizbullah.
- (5) The Muslim Brotherhood.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 5856, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013.

The amendment seeks to halt any potential Department of Defense funding from being used to aid States and organizations that pose real threats to the international community. My amendment is simple. It prohibits any DOD funds from being spent on the Government of Iran, the Government of Syria, the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, and Hezbollah.

□ 1300

The cases against each of these organizations are well documented. Each of them has either sponsored terror activities, performed terror activities, made threats of terror activities, or engaged in atrocious human rights violations. None of these organizations are particularly friendly to the United States, and each of them harbors hate towards our friend and ally, Israel.

Further, I know that some make the argument that sometimes foreign aid eases diplomatic relations with certain entities. While I do not discount that theorem, I do not believe that the United States should be disbursing any funding to any entity that promotes terror and violence. To that I say, trust is a series of promises kept, and we need to start with upholding good behavior, and that is by honoring previous promises.

This amendment is almost exactly the same as the amendment I offered to the last DOD appropriations bill, only that this amendment has included Damascus, due to the al-Assad regime's terrible atrocities of late. That amendment was adopted by voice vote in the House of Representatives.

I ask my colleagues to give my revised amendment the same unanimous approval as last time. In the words of the old American adage: We do not negotiate with terrorists.

I thank the chairman and the committee for their work, and I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would just like to advise him that our side of the committee especially and enthusiastically endorses your amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I appreciate the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAHN. Today is actually my 1-year anniversary of being sworn in to this Congress. It's hard to believe it's been a year.

One of the things I came to Congress to do was to really move us toward ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. While we look toward the 11th anniversary of Operation Enduring Freedom, I believe it's necessary to reflect on the staggering human and economic costs this country has endured over the past decade. Since 2001, we've spent nearly \$635 billion on the Afghanistan war. Under FY 2012 figures, this equates to an average of \$8.8 billion a month, \$2 billion a week, and nearly \$300 million a day.

With what it takes to keep this war going for a week, we can hire 45,000 more construction workers to help repair and build our own crumbling infrastructure. With what it costs to keep this war going for 1 more month, we can hire over 250,000 new teachers, nearly enough to hire back all of the teachers and public school officials who've lost their jobs during this great recession. While these figures seem astounding, they don't begin to compare

to the human toll that this war has taken on our active servicemembers and military families.

Last October, on the weekend of the 10th anniversary of this war in Afghanistan, I visited Arlington West in California—an incredible memorial to the men and women who died in Iraq and Afghanistan. It's truly a moving experience walking through row after row of crosses in the sand at Santa Monica Beach.

As of today, 2,041 U.S. soldiers have been killed in Afghanistan, and over 12,000 have been wounded. While many of us talk about these figures here on the House floor, I know many of us have even more personal experiences with families who have suffered loss or illnesses or injuries of their loved ones.

Unfortunately, I had reason to visit Walter Reed twice in the last 6 months, and I've seen the evidence of the sacrifice that we're asking these young men and women to bear. I think all of us should take the time to walk the halls of Walter Reed and see the full cost that this war has taken. My own cousin, a young man of 26, was only in Afghanistan 3 months and was shot in his leg. It's unclear whether or not he'll get full recovery of his leg. Last week, I visited one of my former employees in the City of Los Angeles whose son, Ben, was in Afghanistan. He reenlisted three times to go back. Unfortunately, this last time, he's now lost both of his legs. His future and his family's future has changed forever.

When you walk the halls at Walter Reed, you're made to remember the mothers bearing the crosses of their children, armed with only the memory of the love lost and unique responsibility that we all have to the fallen. You're reminded of the men and women who are still here and of the battles that they're going to have to fight long after they hang up their fatigues and come home. You're reminded of the struggles shared by the families—the mothers, the fathers, the sisters, the brothers, the sons, and daughters—of these veterans who bear the seen and unseen scars of four, five, even six tours of duty.

These scars are most evident in the recent news that 154 Active Duty servicemembers have committed suicide in the first 150 days of this year. This is nearly 1 per day. This is a heart-breaking statistic that brings into stark relief the terrible toll of nearly 11 years of war.

Mr. Chairman, we need to bring these troops home. That's why I support this amendment that provides for the safe and orderly withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan and to help bring this war to an end. A decade at war is too long.

I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for raising this incredibly important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this effort and help bring the troops home. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$19,200,000,000.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available—

- (1) under title I;
- (2) under title VI for “Defense Health Program”; and
- (3) under title IX for—
  - (A) “Military Personnel”; and
  - (B) “Defense Health Program”.

Ms. LEE of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I'm pleased to be joined by my colleagues in offering an amendment to set Pentagon spending at the levels from the 2008 financial year adjusted for inflation, or at \$500 billion.

I'm offering this amendment for one simple reason: the bloated Pentagon budget must be addressed if we are serious about solving our Nation's deficit. Quite frankly, our real national security is about rebuilding our economy. It's time to use these tax dollars to create jobs here at home.

It's time to rebuild America and also to provide for the health and economic security of our brave troops and the communities that they live in back here at home. Even with this modest cut—and it's very modest at \$19.2 billion—the Pentagon-based budget would still be, mind you, a half trillion dollars, excluding war funding for Afghanistan, far outpacing any other nation in defense spending.

Americans across the country have been forced to cut back, and many are barely able to make ends meet while Pentagon spending has doubled over the past decade. The United States spends as much on its military as the next 14 countries combined, and all but three of these are close allies. Americans believe no Federal agency should be immune from cuts, including the Pentagon. In fact, the average American would pursue a much larger cut of over \$100 billion according to a poll released earlier this week by the Stimson Center.

Some have argued that defense cuts will result in job losses. The Pentagon, quite frankly, is not a jobs program. Even if it were, defense spending creates fewer jobs per billion dollars spent than investing in other sectors: education, health care, clean energy, or even tax cuts.

The bloated Pentagon budget has been immune from oversight and scru-

tiny for too long. We couldn't even pass my amendment yesterday calling for an audit of the Pentagon. This really has resulted in unbalanced spending where nearly 60 cents of every discretionary dollar now goes to the Pentagon. If we are serious about addressing the deficit, we must take reasonable steps to rein in Pentagon spending.

My amendment makes modest cuts to defense spending while protecting our active military personnel and retirees from misguided efforts to cut their compensation and health care expenditures by prohibiting the additional cuts from coming from Active Duty and National Guard personnel accounts from the defense health program. Let me repeat: not a single penny would come from Active Duty and National Guard personnel accounts or from defense health programs.

President Eisenhower famously said that the United States “should spend as much as necessary on defense,” which we all agree with, “but not a penny more.”

□ 1310

At a time when American families, businesses, and government agencies are facing budget cuts and tightening their belts, the Pentagon should not be immune from the need to justify its expenses and guard against waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am proposing a very modest proposal over the course of a decade that would equal less than \$200 billion, \$200 billion. The Bowles-Simpson Commission outlines \$750 billion in suggested defense cuts in the next decade.

President Reagan's Assistant Secretary of Defense, Lawrence Korb, has proposed \$1 trillion in cuts to the Pentagon over the next 10 to 12 years. As I said, the average American would cut 18 percent of the Pentagon budget, or a little over \$100 billion.

Finding \$19 billion in savings next year is a very modest first step after an unchecked decade of runaway Pentagon spending. While many Americans would support a larger cut, this is a commonsense amendment to change the direction of Pentagon spending towards a reasonable level aligned with actual threats to our national security.

I hope my colleagues, many of whom speak out here on the House floor frequently about the importance of addressing our deficit, will support this amendment. If we are really concerned about the deficit, then vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that slashes large amounts from our overall Defense appropriations bill.

I would say that this subcommittee is not adverse to reducing defense

spending when we can do so without having an adverse effect on readiness or without having an adverse effect on our troops, their medical care, and their families. I understand the gentle lady does protect some of those issues in her amendment.

This committee has already proven that we are willing to cut defense. In the last 2 fiscal years, this subcommittee, on a bipartisan basis and in a bipartisan way, was able to reduce \$39 billion, and we did so very carefully by looking at every account, every project, every place that we could find weakness in the spending, in the contracting, in programs that were terminated or about to be terminated, and we can do that, but just an across-the-board cut is not smart.

Here's what could happen. We could actually, with this amendment and this reduction, we could require that we reduce or cancel training for troops returning home from the battlefield or cancel Navy training exercises because they are running very tight on funding already, or reduce Air Force flight training or delay or cancel maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles. All of this relates to readiness: to make sure that the men and women in the military are ready, that they are trained properly, that they have the equipment, and that the equipment is ready.

Now something new here, interesting for this year: the CBO—and everyone understands that CBO is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization—has just issued their analysis of the Department's Future Year Defense Programs, the FYDP, and determined that Department plans will actually cost \$123 billion more than they actually project, which means what they say we will get for the money, we won't get that for the money.

Further cuts would make it very difficult to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force. We just don't want to do that.

This is not the only amendment. We have dealt with similar amendments numerous times yesterday, and I expect that we will again numerous times today. This is not a good amendment, and it's one that I would hope that the Members reject.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to cosponsor this amendment offered by my friend from California. As she clearly stated, this amendment would cut \$19.2 billion of Pentagon spending and bring the overall spending down to \$500 billion while at the same time protecting our troops and their medical needs.

Even with this cut, the \$500 billion that remains amounts to a generous appropriation for the Defense Department. With this cut, the Pentagon

budget would still be greater than the next 10 countries' defense budgets combined. That's right: military spending from China, Japan, Germany, the U.K., Russia, India, France, Saudi Arabia, and Brazil combined would still trail our United States' military Pentagon budget by hundreds of billions of dollars.

I just don't understand how someone can stand here and say half a trillion dollars isn't enough. How many more outdated Cold War weapons systems do we need? How many helicopters with unreliable mechanical systems do we need? How many fighter jets causing pilot blackouts do we need? How many more private defense contractors do we have to pay and overpay?

At some point we have to say enough is enough. It's time, Mr. Chairman, for a reality check. It's time to accept that we spend too much on our bloated defense budget. I mean, ask any other Department or agency if they would make due with half a trillion dollars. I think we all know what that answer is—they would be delighted.

I urge you all, vote "yes," bring some sanity back to our budget.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof to provide the government of the Russian Federation with any information about the missile defense systems of the United States that is classified by the Department or component thereof.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank Representative MIKE TURNER, chairman of the Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee, and Representative TRENT FRANKS, cochair of the Missile Defense Caucus, for their support of this amendment.

This amendment prohibits the administration from using funds to share the United States' classified missile defense information with Russia. It is similar to an amendment which passed with bipartisan support in the House version of the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act.

In light of recent statements by President Obama that he wanted "more space" from the Russians in regards to missile defense, and his statement that he would "have more flexibility" on this issue after the elections, I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the United States' hit-to-kill and other valuable missile defense technologies may become pawns in a political chess game of appeasement with the Russians.

Statements by Russian Chief of General Staff Nikolai Makarov have increased my concern. In reference to the United States' desire to strengthen our missile defense sites in Europe, General Makarov threatened the use of military force against the United States, declaring that "A decision to use destructive force preemptively will be taken if the situation worsens."

Mr. Chairman, if Russia's defense staff is willing to blatantly threaten the United States, why should the United States hand them the keys to technology that gives America's warfighter a decided advantage.

The danger to national security is obvious, but there is more to this picture. The Congressional Research Service estimates the United States has spent approximately \$153 billion on missile defense. A vast majority, roughly 90 percent, was spent on hit-to-kill technology. It makes no sense to spend \$153 billion of taxpayers' money on advanced weaponry just to give it away.

This amendment builds on a letter that had broad bipartisan support in the United States Senate and was signed by 39 senators in April 2011 expressing concern about giving the Russians sensitive missile defense data and technologies.

□ 1320

These Senators were concerned, as I am, that the White House must not use America's missile defense technologies as a bargaining chip in negotiations with Russia.

This amendment helps the United States lead the world in missile defense technologies, preserves investments of billions of dollars, and ensures the viability of current and future missile defense technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague and good friend, Congressman TURNER from the great State of Ohio.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may yield, but not specific amounts of time.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. BROOKS.

I just want to point out the importance of this amendment and also reiterate that this amendment says that classified information about our missile defense system should not be allowed to be provided to the Russians. We have two areas of concern:

Obviously, one, Iran and their growing ICBM threat to the United States.

I previously wrote a letter with Chairman MCKEON to Secretary Panetta asking about specific information for the rising ICBM threat with Iran.

The second aspect is that we're all aware that the President is currently in negotiations on a secret deal with the Russians. We saw that in the open mike discussion that the President was having with Medvedev in South Korea, where he said he wanted greater flexibility until after the election. Some of that flexibility should not be disclosing classified information concerning our missile defense system to the Russians. This amendment would say: Mr. President, you won't tell us what your secret deal is, but that secret deal better not include sharing classified information of the United States with the Russians about our missile defense.

Again, Mr. BROOKS' amendment is very important because it says: Mr. President, even though you won't tell us what the secret deal is, we will not allow you to exchange classified information and weaken the security of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2012.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY PANETTA: We write out of concern with the Administration's plans for missile defense, specifically, the continued sharp decline in the attention and resources invested in U.S. national missile defenses. We fear that this situation could be severely exacerbated under current plans, including the threat of defense sequester, which could be prevented under recent legislation passed by the House of Representatives. Further, we are in receipt of an \$8 billion reprogramming request that could, in view of new information, continue to mis-prioritize scarce defense resources.

In 2009, the Administration justified a significant shift in U.S. missile defense policy on the basis of what was labeled "new intelligence assessments". Secretary Gates, in a September 17, 2009, press conference, stated, "our intelligence assessment also now assesses that the threat of potential Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities has been slower to develop than was estimated in 2006." (emphasis added). It therefore follows that a shift in intelligence could justify a further change in U.S. missile defense strategy.

The recently released unclassified 2012 Report on the Military Power of the Islamic Republic of Iran suggests to us just such a shift may be at hand. For example, the report stated, "Beyond steady growth in its missile and rocket inventories, Iran has boosted the lethality and effectiveness of existing systems with accuracy improvements. . . . Since 2008, Iran has launched multistage space launch vehicles that could serve as a test bed for developing long-range ballistic missile technologies."

Because of our concerns that the 2009 judgments may be superseded based on new intelligence information, we have the following questions, which we request be answered by you with an unclassified written response:

1. Have key judgments about Iran's efforts to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) shifted since 2009? Does Iran now intend to develop an ICBM? If so, when is the earliest it could deploy such a capability?

2. Has Iran continued to improve its ICBM-related technical capabilities through its

short-range, medium-range, and alleged space-launch vehicle tests since 2009?

3. If Iran has now decided to develop an ICBM capability, does that suggest anything regarding Iranian decisions to develop a nuclear weapons program? There appears to be no reason for Iran to develop ICBMs unless it has already decided to develop nuclear weapons, or other weapons of mass destruction, to put on top of those missiles.

4. Have there been any further developments that suggest North Korea could be preparing to deploy a new road mobile ICBM this year?

Additionally, for almost three years, the Committee has been asking for, and repeatedly promised by your Department, a “hedging strategy” for national missile defense in the event that the Administration’s plan, as articulated in the September 2009 decision on the Third Site and the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) and the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, is delayed for technical or budgetary reasons, or if the ballistic missile threat to the United States emerges faster than was assessed in 2009. Indeed, in the FY2012 National Defense Authorization Act, such a plan was required by law. The Committee has thus far received no such strategy.

The Administration’s plan for national missile defense is almost entirely focused on assumptions for future changes to the shot doctrine of the GMD system—which would not happen for years under the program of record, assuming it is possible, or the SM-3 IIB missile, which is now a year delayed, and about which the Defense Science Board and the National Academies have all expressed grave concerns for its projected capability. Indeed, the Government Accountability Office has expressed concerns about the absence of any real Analysis of Alternatives to substantiate technical capability and requirements for the IIB missile and therefore has warned about the risk of delay and budget overrun. We urge the Administration to provide the Committee all the analysis that was prepared when the SM-3 IIB missile was recommended in September 2009.

Committee staff were briefed in March of this year on some elements of the “hedging strategy”, as then under consideration, including potential configurations of an East Coast site consisting of 20 ground-based interceptors. The Committee is now informed that the Department has determined not to share even those briefing slides with the Committee.

We request you submit the hedging strategy mandated by section 233 of the FY12 NDAA not later than the week of July 30th, in time for Committee Members to be briefed before the August district work period and Senate consideration of the NDAA, and we request you immediately transmit the briefing slides of the March 6th briefing.

The Committee is in receipt of almost \$8 billion in FY12 reprogramming requests, with significant sums of money intended for missile defense capabilities and capabilities oriented to a potential conflict with a regional threat. We therefore believe it appropriate for our requests in this letter to be answered prior to any decision by the Committee on those matters.

We appreciate your willingness to work with us on these requests in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. “BUCK”  
MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee  
on Armed Services.*  
MICHAEL R. TURNER,  
*Chairman, Sub-  
committee on Stra-  
tegic Forces.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC, May 23, 2012.*

President BARACK OBAMA,  
*The White House,  
Washington, DC.*

MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, there is profound interest on the subject of you and your Administration’s efforts to enter into an agreement with the Russian Federation on the subject of U.S. missile defenses. These efforts were the subject of considerable debate during the recent consideration of H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Specifically, there is still a great deal of concern about what you meant when you were overheard during a recent meeting in Seoul with Russia’s former President, Dmitri Medvedev, that after this election, your “last election,” you “would have greater flexibility” to make a deal with Russia concerning U.S. missile defenses.

One of your aides, Mr. Nabors, wrote to me stating “[i]t is no secret that this effort [referring to the effort to negotiate an agreement with Russia about U.S. missile defense] will be more complicated during election years in both the United States and Russia.” The inference is that the American people may not like the deal your Administration is planning to negotiate. If that is the case, why make it at all?

What is it you and your administration are concerned the American people would object to in such a deal with Russia? Would it be limitations, unilateral or bilateral, with Russia on the speed, range, or geographical deployment of U.S. missile defense interceptors?

Of like concern is your apparent belief that U.S. missile defenses are a hindrance to further U.S. nuclear arms reductions. At present, your Administration is conducting what’s known as the NPR Implementation Study, which press reports indicate could recommend up to 80 percent reductions in U.S. nuclear forces, on top of the unilateral U.S. reductions your Administration just negotiated in the New START treaty. This review is being conducted in total secrecy, without any information having been shared with the Congress. Many in Congress, me included, are deeply troubled that you may be willing to further trade or give away U.S. missile defenses to get closer to your goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

You may be able to put to rest such concerns if you would simply direct your Administration to share with the Congress the draft agreements that have been offered to Russia. For example, according to President Putin in a March 2, 2012 interview with RIA-Novosti:

“They [referring to your Administration] made some proposals to us which we virtually agreed to and asked them to get them down on paper. . . They made a proposal to us just during the talks, they told us: we would offer you this, this and that. We did not expect this, but I said: we agree. Please put it down on paper. . . We were waiting for their answer for two months. We did not get it, and then our American partners withdrew their own proposals, saying: no, it’s impossible,” he added.

This is not the first such reference to a secret deal the Obama Administration offered to Russia. The Russian newspaper Kommersant reported last October that it obtained the copy of a deal that was to be agreed to at the May 2011 08 summit in Deauville, France.

Mr. President, the unwillingness of your Administration to provide copies of these draft agreements to the Congress does nothing to resolve concerns about just what your Administration is prepared to offer to Russia

regarding U.S. missile defenses after your “last election.”

After all, it was not that long ago that your Administration unilaterally withdrew from the plan to build the European Third Site in Poland and the Czech Republic just to earn goodwill from Russian Presidents Putin and Medvedev during the negotiations of the New START treaty. Additionally, your signing statement earlier this year that you would treat section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 as non-binding, is troubling in that this provision, which you signed into law, only seeks to protect classified U.S. missile defense information from disclosure to Russia or those to whom it proliferates, like the Islamic Republic of Iran and Syria.

I encourage you to direct your Administration to provide to the Congress the draft agreements provided to the Russian Federation. Such transparency would be the best way to resolve concerns in the Congress about your statement to President Medvedev—“[t]his is my last election. . . After my election I have more flexibility”—about your intentions for missile defense. And, I can see no reason why you wouldn’t provide to the elected representatives of the American people that which you and your Administration have provided to President Putin, President Medvedev and others in their government.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. TURNER,  
*Chairman, Strategic Forces Subcommittee,  
House Armed Services Committee.*

Mr. BROOKS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this actually may be the most critical amendment that we will consider on this bill today. There should be no secret deals on our missile defense with a Russian President or any other person not involved with the security of our own Nation. This amendment precludes that.

Mr. BROOKS has pointed it out extremely well and Mr. TURNER has certainly made a very strong case. But let me add, our national defense interests have got to be our interests, not somebody else’s. Our national defense investments must be made based on what is the threat to our Nation, and missile defense in particular. The Iranians have just shown a massive arsenal of missiles—short-range, medium-range, and some long-range capability. Those missiles would have the ability to target our troops wherever they might be in the Persian Gulf region. They can even reach to Israel, one of our very best partners and coalition allies.

We just can’t let this happen. We can’t let anyone make a secret deal with a Russian President on missile defense. The threat is too great.

The threat is growing not only from Iran, but from North Korea. The North Koreans have invested a lot of time, a lot of money, and a lot of technology in developing their missiles, and I don’t suspect that they are for peaceful purposes.

We have to be always on guard that we protect Americans and our interests

and our troops, wherever they might be, from hostile attacks by somebody's missile.

So this is a critical amendment, and I think it is important that we have a very large vote and send the message that we are not going to toy with the defense of our Nation, especially missile defense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Frankly, we don't have any problem with this amendment. I would be very surprised if the administration would give any classified information to the Russian Government. Now, maybe the gentleman knows something that I don't know. And I understand that there was an inadvertent comment suggesting that after the election there may be a better opportunity to work between the two governments. Those things are said at times. But I have no personal information that anyone is saying that we're going to give them this information. So I personally think it would be a mistake to give it to them unless it was declassified so the American people would know what the information was.

But in this case, just to be sure, I'm willing to go along with the gentleman's amendment. We have to be very careful here with classified information, there's no question about that. There's been some concern expressed about classified information being released to the public, which is another questionable activity.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I rise for the purpose of a colloquy regarding an amendment that I had intended to offer relating to military families.

Mr. Chair, our military personnel have access to great health care through TRICARE, but in certain cases—and many would be surprised to learn this—TRICARE does not cover every health service. And this comes into play sometimes with children of military families with special needs. There's also a circumstance when someone in the military is separating from the military but they don't have retirement benefits, and their family, their children, may not have access to health insurance.

I ran into this in a case back home in Tampa, Florida, at MacDill Air Force Base, not unlike many of our colleagues here who participate in forums for veterans and job fairs and the like.

The military health folks didn't know a lot about Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program, whether it applied to military families that they talked to all of the time or those families that are separating from the military and are no longer covered by TRICARE. So we tried to investigate this with the Pentagon a little bit, but they were not able to clarify anything for us.

I have done a little research. There was one report, entitled, "Medicaid's Role in Treating Children in Military Families." That report advised that 1 in 12 children from military families rely on Medicaid for some health service; and for children with special needs in the military families, 1 in 9. I was surprised to learn that, frankly. Plus, we have many that have served in the military and have come back from Iraq or Afghanistan and have a lot of questions about what it means for them finding a job, finding coverage for their family as they move on in their lives.

So I had intended to offer an amendment that simply clarifies the fact that nothing prohibits DOD from providing that information at a job fair, a health fair, or advising military families that the Medicaid coverage or the SCHIP coverage could be an option. So I would really like to work with Chairman YOUNG, the Department of Defense, and Ranking Member DICKS so that our military families don't have to worry about health coverage, whether they're in the military, they have children, children with special needs, or they're separating from the military and they just simply need answers to questions about where they can turn.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to thank her for the attention and the hard work that she does to ensure that our military servicemembers and their families have the very best information and resources regarding health care.

□ 1330

That is only fair. One of our highest priorities has always been to take care of the health of our men and women in uniform and their families.

I thank the gentlelady again, my neighbor in Florida, for her advocacy on this issue and guarantee that we will be very happy to work with her and the Department to make sure that all relevant health care information is available to our servicemembers, our retirees, and their families.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman. And this is especially meaningful coming from Chairman YOUNG. No one has been more attentive to military families and our servicemembers—no matter what service, no matter their veteran status—than Mr. YOUNG, my colleague and friend from Florida.

I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. I would ask the gentleman from Florida if he would be willing to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would be happy to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the very distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As chairman of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, I have taken an interest in the use of our Nation's spectrum resources by both Federal and non-Federal users. Spectrum is becoming increasingly important as our Nation's needs for mobile communications grow. Unfortunately, however, demand is quickly outpacing the supply of spectrum.

The U.S. Department of Defense is a large user of spectrum. Efficient use of spectrum would therefore not only greatly benefit our country in terms of technological and economic development, but also help our military in conducting its critical mission.

Recent discussion of spectrum policy in government has turned to ways that governmental and nongovernmental users might share spectrum to the benefit of both. It has come to my attention that the work of the Department of Defense—through the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Joint Program Executive Office Joint Tactical Radio System, and other programs—has been examining some of these sharing technologies, but with mixed results. It is my belief that Congress would benefit greatly from a report on this research. I would suggest that the Department of Defense draft such a report that details the status of its work on cognitive radio, dynamic spectrum access, software-defined radio, and any other spectrum-sharing techniques and technologies.

I would like to ask for your support, Mr. Chairman, and assistance in working with the Department of Defense to get additional information on the types of technologies under development and production and how much has been spent to date for these efforts, as well.

In addition, I believe that a clearer understanding of the efforts being pursued by the Department of Defense and the associated organizations for joint spectrum management technology developments, what has been deployed and what future investments will achieve is important and should be pursued and we should fully understand what they're doing.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would say to him that today, spectrum is a commodity, and the efficient management of that commodity is critical. I agree that understanding the Department of Defense's plans and budgets for research and development and deployment of these capabilities is critical.

I look forward to working with Mr. WALDEN and the Department of Defense

to understand the technologies and techniques being employed to improve government spectrum efficiencies. I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the chairman for his work on not only this issue and working with us on this, but also your terrific dedication to the country over the years, and especially in moving this legislation forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$7,583,000,000.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available—

- (1) under title I;
- (2) under title VI for “Defense Health Program”;
- (3) under title IX; and

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. The Lee-Van Hollen-Smith amendment would limit Department of Defense funding to the amount authorized under the Budget Control Act of 2011, resulting in a \$7.6 billion reduction in spending from the level authorized by the Appropriations Committee.

This amendment is cosponsored by my colleagues, Armed Services Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and Representatives AMASH, BLUMENAUER, CLARKE, JOHNSON, NADLER, POLIS, SCHRADER, STARK, WELCH, and WOOLSEY, among others.

As you know, Mr. Chair, last year, Congress passed the Budget Control Act, which put in place spending caps on discretionary spending. Despite these statutory limitations, the Appropriations Committee set overall military spending billions of dollars above what the Pentagon requested or what was agreed to under the Budget Control Act.

A deal is a deal. While many of us did not support the discretionary caps under the Budget Control Act, our amendment simply brings Pentagon spending in line with the law. Again, a deal is a deal. It does this while protecting our Active Duty military personnel and retirees from misguided efforts to cut their compensation and health care expenditures, by prohibiting the additional cuts from coming from Active Duty and National Guard personnel accounts or from the Defense Health Program.

Let me repeat: not a single penny would come from Active Duty and National Guard personnel accounts or from the Defense Health Program.

The Pentagon budget already consumes almost 60 cents out of every discretionary dollar we spend, and adding

billions of unrequested dollars—mind you, unrequested dollars—at the expense of struggling families during the ongoing economic downturn is wrong.

Once again, I just have to remind us that yesterday an amendment was struck down, made out of order, that we still can’t even get an audit of the Pentagon; and here, once again, we’re going against the law of the land and violating a deal and asking for more money—outrageous.

At a time when American families, businesses, and government agencies are facing budget cuts and tightening their belts, why shouldn’t the Department of Defense be asked to become more efficient and eliminate wasteful programs?

While many of us would support a larger cut, this is a commonsense amendment to keep spending in line with what was agreed to last year. Remember, a deal is a deal.

I hope my colleagues, many of whom speak here on the floor frequently about the importance of addressing our deficit, will support this amendment. So I ask my colleagues, if we are really concerned with the deficit, then vote for this amendment. This is money the Pentagon did not ask for and it does not need.

Some of us really do believe that your word is your bond.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to say that I really respect Ms. LEE’s tenacity and her determination. There’s no doubt that she is sincere, but I just disagree with her amendment.

Actually, except for the numbers that have changed, this is basically the same amendment that has been offered before even today. And so rather than repeat the arguments, I will just say the arguments are the same.

This is not a good amendment, and I would hope that the membership would oppose this amendment as we have others similar to this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, we have actually completed our withdrawal from Iraq. We are on our way to withdrawing from Afghanistan. There is not a strategic need to increase the base budget for the Defense Department beyond the BCA, Budget Control Act, agreement.

Our own military leaders have acknowledged that our debt and deficits are the largest national security threat that our country actually faces. We need to be building on the fiscal foundation the BCA laid in order to provide for our children’s futures and the mili-

tary they will need to defend their freedoms. Sticking to the BCA framework is our strategic priority.

We should take a moment to remember where we were at this time last year. There was a real threat of government and economic shutdown due to the approaching debt limit. In the very 11th hour, we passed the bipartisan Budget Control Act to forestall a sovereign debt crisis by cutting \$900 billion from the deficits and agreeing to cut another \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Even still, our national debt has increased by \$1.3 trillion since we came to that agreement last August. In part, this is due to the failure of the supercommittee to reform entitlements in our Tax Code.

In the coming months, we need to finish the job we began with the passage of the Budget Control Act. Reforming entitlements and instituting comprehensive tax reform as suggested by the Bowles-Simpson plan is no longer an option but a national necessity. Changes scheduled to go into effect in January would harm the economy and the middle class while proving ineffective in true deficit reduction. Backpedaling on the BCA is irresponsible.

□ 1340

By holding this body to the bipartisan law we passed last August and reducing our debt by reducing the underlying bill’s appropriation by a mere \$7.5 billion—in Washington, D.C. terms—the amendment before you today will enhance our national economic security.

We need to stick to the spending caps and move on from the FY 2013 appropriation process so we can work on getting the next framework put in place to responsibly address what has become known as the “fiscal cliff.”

The American people and businesses in this country deserve certainty about their future. We need to do right by them, avoid a crisis of our own making, and lay the groundwork for restoring our economy and getting hardworking Americans back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. I’d like to first thank my friend, Ms. LEE, for bringing up this important amendment. She knows so well that the less experience people in this body have had with the military, the fiercer they are. That goes to the Republicans wanting to exceed their own funding cap in the Budget Control Act by \$8 billion. This is a moderate amendment to bring us back under the Budget Control Act.

This is the 12th year that we’ve been fighting and funding a war in Afghanistan and that area; and there’s no peace, there’s nothing, no stability. The war in Afghanistan has basically

contributed to our instability. Nothing has happened over there. Since 2001, we have spent \$600 billion or \$700 billion on this Afghani war alone, and the Defense Department appropriations bill wants another \$600 billion.

Republicans like to talk about entitlements like Medicare driving the debt. Well, let me tell you, defense spending has become just as much of an entitlement, with a team of lobbyists and Members of this body who are more interested in protecting defense contractors than protecting our country's health, education, and economic growth.

This bill ignores administration proposals to delay or terminate military programs while providing funding instead for weapons that the Department of Defense doesn't want, doesn't need, and won't work. Apparently, funding wars and weapons instead of better health care, education, and repairing our infrastructure are more important to the Republican majority than all other issues.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and start reining in our out-of-control defense budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I'm very proud to join with my colleague from California (Ms. LEE) and Mr. SMITH, the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, in support of this amendment.

This amendment is, in fact, different than every other amendment that has been offered on this bill. This amendment is very simple and very clear in its purpose: it's to make sure that this Congress complies with the Budget Control Act agreement that was set by this body on a bipartisan vote just last year.

I would just refer my colleagues to the Budget Control Act and refer them to section 302, Enforcement of Budget Goals. It's right there in plain English what the 050 number will be, the Defense appropriation number will be. That was the Budget Control Act that was supported and voted on by the chairman of the Budget Committee, by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and by the chairman and the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

In fact, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, said last year, when we passed it:

Tough choices will have to be made, particularly when it comes to defense and national security priorities, but shared sacrifice will bring shared results.

He went on to say:

The Appropriations Committee has already started making tough decisions on spending and will continue to under the spending lim-

its and guidelines provided in this bill—meaning the Budget Control Act.

That was August 1 of last year. The chairman of the full Appropriations Committee was right last year, but the bill that's coming to the floor today is in violation of that bipartisan agreement. As a result of that violation, while the Defense appropriation bill exceeds significantly what was requested by our own Defense Department as what was necessary to meet our national security needs—because this bill dramatically increased that level above what was requested—the reality is the other bills that are coming through the Appropriations Committee are taking very deep cuts—deep cuts to education, deep cuts to health care programs. In fact, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. DICKS, described that Labor-H bill as one of the most partisan bills that he has seen. That's true, and that is a direct result of the fact that this bill that's before us today dramatically explodes the Budget Control Act agreements.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just refer the body to the statements made by Admiral Mullen recently, who of course was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, pointing out that our military strength depends on our economic strength and our economic strength depends on our long-term fiscal health and the soundness of our fiscal policy. And I quote Admiral Mullen, who said:

Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

He went on to say:

Everybody must do their part.

He said:

We can no longer afford to spend taxpayer resources without doing the analysis—this is Admiral Mullen—without ensuring every dollar is efficiently and effectively invested. We can no longer go along with business as usual if we are going to get our fiscal house in order.

That is why this body, on a bipartisan basis, agreed to the Budget Control Act. So it's very unfortunate that this bill now comes to the floor in violation of an agreement, in violation of an understanding that in order to get our fiscal house in order, we had to make tough decisions on defense and nondefense alike.

By violating the agreement in this regard, what the committee is saying is they're willing to make really tough decisions. In fact, they make irresponsible decisions with respect to the non-defense domestic spending, and we doubt we'll even see a Labor-H bill on the floor of this House, it's so bad. The reason it's so bad is because, in part, that Budget Control Act was violated and so much was added to the Defense Department, again, as my colleagues have said, more than requested by our military leadership and more than requested by the Defense Department.

I agree with Admiral Mullen, who said we all need to share in this responsibility. I agree with what my Republican colleague said just last year when

we passed the Budget Control Act. Let's stick to an agreement and let the people know that when this body comes to an understanding after a hard compromise, we stick with it for the public good.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5856, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013. Until we can rein in defense spending and treat it like all other federal programs facing damaging funding cuts, I cannot support yet another bloated defense budget. Republicans talk about how entitlements like Medicare are driving the debt. But it is clear that defense spending has become just as much of an entitlement, complete with a team of lobbyists and members of this body that are more interested in protecting defense contractors than protecting our country.

This bill marks the 12th fiscal year the United States has been fighting and funding the War in Afghanistan. During this time, we have pursued a variety of strategies and plans—none of which have delivered peace and stability to Afghanistan or the region. The War has, however, contributed to fiscal instability in our own country. Since 2001, we have spent \$634 billion on the Afghanistan War alone. This appropriations bill is going to cost another \$608.2 billion that we do not have. Yet the cycle continues.

This year's bill exceeds the Republicans' own funding caps set by the Budget Control Act by almost \$8 billion. This bill ignores administration proposals to delay or terminate several military programs while providing funding for weapons programs the DoD said it doesn't want or need. Apparently, funding wars and weapons instead of better health care, education, and repairing our crumbling infrastructure are more important to the Republican Majority. It is unconscionable for us to be cutting these vital programs at the same time we're increasing the defense budget. That is why I joined with Representative BARBARA LEE (D-CA) to offer an amendment to cut that \$8 billion from the defense appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and join me in voting against this out of control defense spending bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. 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 California will be postponed.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman, Mr. YOUNG, in a colloquy if he will so engage.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you and your committee for your hard work putting together this bill. The efforts

by your committee and your staff to provide our warfighters with the tools they need to keep our Nation secure are our first priority, and I thank you for your service doing just that.

I applaud your work also to mitigate risk associated with shrinking budgets. I believe this bill shows your leadership to make the tough decisions to fund our Department of Defense at the appropriate levels even during this time of fiscal austerity.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONAWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I want to thank him very much for the comment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank you specifically for your work addressing the wasteful pursuit by the Department—specifically the Navy—to stand up an alternative energy industry. These efforts go against the primary mission of the Department and are a colossal waste of taxpayer money, especially as we are scrubbing every penny inside the Pentagon.

The Navy claims that its pursuit of a green fuel source that is produced in the United States would help protect it from price shocks and volatility within the oil markets. I have yet to hear an argument that supports how spending, on average, \$26 a gallon for biofuels would protect our fuel budgets when we could be paying \$3.60 a gallon. This argument simply doesn't add up.

□ 1350

Prices, Mr. Chairman, would have to rise eightfold for this equation to work.

The Navy claims that development of biofuels will limit the number of deaths associated with fuel convoys in theater. Yet, this is a specious argument. Convoys will still be needed to haul biofuels across dangerous areas to supply our needs, just like conventional fuels. And if they're less efficient, more convoys would in all likelihood be needed.

The Navy also claims that buying biofuels and sailing their Green Fleet will end up saving American taxpayer dollars and ultimately lead our military to energy independence. Throughout hearings in the House and the Senate Armed Services Committee, witnesses failed to offer any verifiable analysis that shows the costs of achieving this goal or when these goals can be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, time and time again, with this current administration we've seen instances of shortsighted, unrealistic expectations like this and its sister project, Solyndra, at the Department of Energy where venture capitalists are making a fortune off frivolous spending of taxpayer dollars on projects that belong in the private sector.

The Department of Defense should be in the business of prosecuting wars and keeping this country safe, not wasting

dollars on the pursuit of green fuel. I would argue that Department leaders should focus on buying the cheapest most readily available fueling which keeps our ships steaming and our planes flying.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONAWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Thank you for yielding.

I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this matter, and I support his efforts to prioritize spending within the Defense Department. I look forward to working with him to ensure that our scarce defense dollars are spent in a responsible manner, and I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the administration of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery for the student (high school) testing programs.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Just so you know, and I want the chairman and the ranking member to know, in offering this amendment, it's not my intention to wipe out military recruiting. It's very important for people to be able to serve our country. It's an honorable profession. It's essential to America.

What this amendment is about really is about upholding the right of parents to be able to determine whether or not their young person should have to take a test that would be given to them under the auspices of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Test. This is a test that is administered annually to 1 million military applicants, high school and postsecondary students.

But it's more than just a test. Here's the kind of information that students who take this test divulge: Social Security number, gender, race, ethnicity, birth date, statement of future plans, and most significantly, their aptitude on a battery of subcritical tests.

Now, if you ever wanted to make a case for the danger of Big Government being able to reach into schools, think about this. You've got the largest organization in the government administering tests to high school kids and basically getting all the information they want about these young people, and without their parents' consent. I have a problem with that, and we all should have a problem with that.

Now, if someone can tell me that you'll fix this and provide for an opt-in or opt-out, or tell me that, you know,

DENNIS, you're right; any young person who could end up in military service, their parents ought to consent to whether or not they should be able to take the test and/or whether the results of the test should be released.

This is about privacy. It's about parental rights, and it's also about not letting Big Government become Big Brother, gathering information about our children at a very early age in order to have some higher purpose.

It might be very altruistic here. We've got to be very careful about this system we've set up. This Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Test is administered in recruiting centers. That's true. Fine. But it's also offered to high schools and postsecondary students. And according to the Pentagon, the Career Exploration Program is designed to help students explore civilian and military careers.

But the rise of this test in high schools has led countless students and parents to feel that they're being unfairly, potentially illegally, and often-times unknowingly recruited.

The Department of Defense claims it's just a tool to screen students' enlistment eligibility and determine their interests and skills for non-military careers, but Mr. Chairman, more than 90 percent of the scores being sent are sent directly to military recruiters. So it's obvious this is a recruiting tool. Fine.

How about letting the parents know about it? How about giving parents a choice, because most of the times you're talking about somebody that's under 18 years old?

So I don't oppose military recruitment. I want that understood. But I am concerned that this test is being administered to kids in our public schools in a way that circumvents parental consent. The vast majority of students think they're taking the test and that it's required by their high school. Parents aren't informed that children are given the test. Why? Because their consent isn't required.

Let's get the parents in on this.

Now, my dad encouraged me to be in the military. I had a heart murmur. I couldn't serve. All my brothers and my sister did. But you know what? We had some feedback with our parents about this.

You give a kid a test, that puts that child on a track to military service, parents don't know about it? Are you kidding me?

Parents have a right here, and we have to restrain the impulse of a big government organization to gather information about these kids that ordinarily the government would never be entitled to.

So I want to make sure that my friends in the majority and my friend, who's the ranking member, understand that my amendment in no way stops consenting adults from pursuing a career in the military or from taking the test at a recruiting station or processing station. It doesn't prohibit military recruiter presence in our schools.

We dealt with that in No Child Left Behind. I was on the other side on that, but my amendment doesn't stop that.

But it stops the administration of this test in schools, so it can't be used as a recruiting tool disguised as a test that targets children who are legally too young, too young to consent to a career in the Armed Forces.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This amendment would basically prohibit funds from being used to administer the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery test. This amendment would negatively impact both the education and recruiting communities.

This test is administered free of charge on a voluntary basis. It's on a voluntary basis to high school and college students as part of a comprehensive Career Exploration Program. This program integrates student aptitudes and interests to help them explore postsecondary opportunities, including college, technical schools, and civilian as well as military careers.

As education resources grow together, many schools rely on this free test to provide a valuable career exploration experience. And we, as a Nation, benefit from this test. Through this amendment, the gentleman would effectively prohibit high schools from offering this test, which would be unfortunate, and we are strongly opposed to the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise Members of something that they might be exposed to here shortly. Recently, I had an opportunity to experience what I call ambush journalism on an issue that—I really found it hard to believe that this investigative reporter would raise the issue.

□ 1400

He was very upset because of the amount of money we spend to return our "killed in action" heroes back to their families at their home bases after they arrive in the United States at Dover. I was really shocked that that would be a concern to anybody because I believe that those heroes should be treated with the utmost respect.

I told this distinguished gentleman that I would do everything that I possibly could to make sure that the proper respect and dignity were awarded

these heroes as their remains return home to their families. This gentleman thought that Congress actually set the schedules and decided which airplanes fly the soldiers back home. I explained the law. I explained that that was not the case. I explained that the Pentagon had a lot of people who did administrative things like that, including scheduling.

I expect that many of you might also face this same investigative reporter and be asked the same question. I just want you to be aware that that is the issue. I don't understand why anybody would want to deny a hero killed in action dignity and respect as he returns home to his family. It is just exasperating to me, I will say, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted Members to be aware. You may be faced with this very same question, with this very same issue. I hope you're not, but you might be; so I bring this to your attention just in case.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I have had a chance to talk to the distinguished chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, about this issue. I can tell you, based on long experience, that no one cares more about our wounded warriors and also of those who have lost their lives and are coming home for the last time.

I think the way that the Department of Defense handles this is appropriate. They are trying to get these bodies back to the parents or to the families as expeditiously as possible. Obviously, Congress doesn't tell them how to do this. Obviously, we fund that program. I just appreciate Mr. YOUNG's history of concern about our troops. I know that he stood up to a journalist, as most of us have had to do from time to time, who thinks he knows all the answers but who has not gotten all of the information.

As was suggested, the decisions about how to do this from Dover to the home are made by the Department of Defense. I think that it is done appropriately, and I think it is done in a dignified way and in a way that all of us can be proud of. So I appreciate what Mr. YOUNG has done here. I just want him to know that I support him and will be glad to talk to any reporter.

I see the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee is here as well. Maybe it's necessary to have another meeting and to bring in some of the senior Members of the House and those who are leaders in defense to talk to this reporter and to try to make him understand how this actually functions.

I just want my good friend Mr. YOUNG to know that we support him. This is not something that he has day-to-day responsibility for, and he should not be blamed in any way. Again, we

just know that he and his wife, Beverly, have been such great supporters of the troops, so to have any insinuation here is just not appropriate.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great pride to stand with Chairman YOUNG in order to reaffirm my commitment and the commitment of the members of the Armed Services Committee to the dignified and respectful transportation of the remains of our war casualties to their final resting places.

The current process of airlifting our fallen warriors was initiated by the Committee on Armed Services and legislated in 2006 following a series of unfortunate cases in which the transfers of remains simply did not meet the high standard that the people of our Nation demanded. As awareness grew, it was very quickly clear that the routine treatment of our warriors on their returns home was not meeting the expectations of families and communities across the Nation.

Without this law, the Department of Defense would be required to transport them by the cheapest means, in other words, to transport remains without an escort and in the cargo holds of commercial airliners along with the suitcases and FedEx packages. No one wants to see that. That is not how the American people wish to treat those who have made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

The soul of a nation can be measured by its commitment to honor those who have sacrificed all to defend that nation. If a nation takes a bookkeeper's approach to measuring that commitment, then, in this Nation's case, the cost of Arlington, of all the national cemeteries, of the cemeteries we maintain overseas, of the efforts made to account for our war dead and missing is too high. When it comes to upholding the traditions so intrinsically linked to the values treasured by the American people, our Nation will never be accused of possessing a bookkeeper's mentality. There is only one standard for the treatment of our fallen heroes, and the American people will demand that the standard will be met in the most dignified and respectful manner possible.

I commend the gentleman from Florida for taking a moment to reaffirm the commitment of the Congress and the American people on this important issue. I cannot understand anyone who would challenge him on his devotion to our servicepeople. He and his wife both have dedicated the ultimate measure to seeing that our servicepeople are given the respect and the things that they need. I don't know anyone who has visited the hospitals more or who has really cared about our people. I commend the chairman for this, for his

devotion to those who wear the uniform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. As a United States marine who served in Iraq and Afghanistan and who saw the bodies and the flag-draped caskets with dignity and respect get put into the backs of airplanes and sit off of the battlefield in those two theaters, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for standing up for the fact that we accept them back into our arms in this Nation with the same dignity and respect.

I would like to go a little bit further.

Beyond saying this isn't Congress' job, if it were not for Congress, the bodies of our dead military men and women who come back to this Nation would be in the cargo holds of commercial airliners. As the moms and dads watch their sons and daughters get forklifted off a commercial airline cargo hold and set on the ground—with no military escorts and with no flag-draped coffins—that is what we should be ashamed of. I would say that this is an issue that resonates with anybody who has worn a uniform or with any family who has had to receive the remains of a loved one.

Those who die for this Nation should be handled by honor guards, not by forklifts. It's harsh but true that the people who question the necessity of this process need to examine their souls and ask themselves if they are even worthy of the freedoms that are protected and secured by our military heroes. There is no extravagant cost. There are no luxury accommodations. Those who pay for our freedom with their lives deserve to be treated with respect and handled as the heroes that they are.

There are plenty of places in the defense budget we can find savings, but the idea that someone would suggest the way we treat our war dead is a waste of money and resources should be ashamed, and he should not bring that up to any more Representatives in the future.

I again want to thank Chairman YOUNG for his extraordinary service and for the way that he honors our wounded and our KIAs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1410

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I wish to engage in a colloquy with Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS.

Yesterday, the House adopted an amendment I offered with Congresswoman BUERKLE directing the National Guard to conduct a capability assessment of the medical equipment in its

domestic Humvee ambulances. This will pave the way for the retrofitting of Humvee ambulances that lack adequate cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment. As you know, the National Guard's mission includes responding to terrorist attacks, homeland security emergencies, natural disasters, and providing defense support to civil authorities. This equipment will allow the Guard to effectively carry out their mission.

But the retrofitting of currently-owned Humvee ambulances is not enough. To purchase ambulances in the future that lack cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment is, frankly, irresponsible. Mr. Chair and Mr. Ranking Member, the adjutant generals in eight different States, including Washington, New York, and my home State of Oregon, have indicated that this equipment is necessary to their missions, and could make the difference between life and death in an emergency situation.

Mr. Chair and Mr. Ranking Member, both Congresswoman BUERKLE and I appreciate your support for our amendment yesterday and your commitment to all who serve in our Nation's National Guard. Congresswoman BUERKLE and I had another amendment to ensure that this important lifesaving equipment would be included in Humvee ambulances purchased for the Guard in the future. In lieu of that amendment, I ask if you will work with Ms. BUERKLE and me to ensure that future Humvee ambulances purchased for Guard use contain adequate cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment?

I would be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank the gentlelady for raising this issue.

The attention and hard work to ensure the proper equipping of Humvee ambulances in units of our National Guard is extremely important. In today's wars, because we have these increased benefits, we have better training, we have better medicines, we're able to move soldiers from the battlefield almost as soon as they're hurt. Lives are being saved. Troops are surviving who in previous wars would not have survived. So the gentlelady's work is a very important part of this capability.

I agree that the Humvee ambulances and National Guard units should be outfitted with proper medical equipment to effectively accomplish the assigned missions, and that any new purchases of Humvee ambulances should include the equipment necessary for mission accomplishment. The capability assessment that the National Guard will soon conduct will greatly assist this effort. I thank the gentlelady for her advocacy in this extremely important issue of saving the lives of our heroes on the battlefield.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. BONAMICI. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with my colleague and look forward to working with you on this issue. Our National Guard and Humvee ambulances must have the cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment and capabilities needed to respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and homeland security emergencies. This should be given careful thought when the Department of Defense makes future purchases. I might point out that this probably comes in other procurement for the Army, but also that the committee has provided \$2 billion in National Guard equipment so that this money goes through and the National Guard actually gets to decide what that equipment is.

We look forward to working with you, with the Army, and the National Guard to see if there's an answer to this problem.

I appreciate the gentlelady yielding.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

I sincerely thank the chairman and the ranking member for their attention, cooperation, and willingness to work on and address this very important issue. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about what is happening in Syria today as we speak.

What began as peaceful demonstrations against a nonrepresentative minority government quickly became violent when Bashar al-Assad chose the path of violence over an inclusive government. Since the uprising began in March of last year, at least 16,000 Syrians have been killed, countless thousands have been seriously injured, and at least 200,000 people have been displaced.

In neighborhoods like Homs, as well as in defenseless refugee camps, women and children are being attacked, sexually assaulted, and summarily executed. Accused civilian sympathizers are being brutally tortured, I won't even go into the manner in which they are torturing them with all the acid burns, and sexual assaults, and so on.

And, this country's violence is only going to get worse. We read what happened yesterday when some of President Assad's closest military advisers,

including the minister of defense, were assassinated in Damascus. As the unrest spreads, as all this violence continues, the international community has had to sit on the sidelines, unable to take action because of Russian opposition at the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, perhaps one reason the Russians oppose more forceful steps against Syria is because they are the regime's principal weapons supplier. They have a vested economic interest. That's why they won't cooperate with the rest of the international community who is trying to act responsibly.

Just last year, Moscow sold Damascus \$1 billion in arms. In particular, a Russian state-owned firm, known as Rosoboronexport, has provided Assad's regime with mortars, sniper rifles, attack helicopters, and even recently agreed to provide advanced fighter jets. In a recent letter from the Pentagon to the Congress, the Pentagon wrote that there is evidence that this Rosoboronexport's arms are being used to kill the civilians in Syria. As we speak, more Russian arms, including refurbished helicopters, are steaming towards Syria on a ship. I raise this ongoing humanitarian disaster in Syria and the role of this particular Russian firm in it because the U.S. Government has substantial business dealings with Rosoboronexport, and that makes us in some ways complicit in what is happening.

To date, the Department of Defense has purchased 23 Mi-17 helicopters from Rosoboronexport for use by the Afghan National Security Forces. Just this past weekend, DOD agreed to purchase 10 more, which will not be delivered until 2016, 2 years after we've left Afghanistan. I don't know about you, but I'm nervous about how those helicopters might be used 2 years after we've already left the country. Who are they going to be used by? And who are they going to be used against?

Even more distressing is that DOD is buying these helicopters for our Afghan allies from Syria's main arms supplier through a no-bid contract. It's an earmark for the Russians, no less. There has never been competition for supplying rotorcraft for the Afghan National Security Forces. If there had been, our American firms would have won it.

Mr. Chairman, I should think it's troubling to all of us that we are purchasing helicopters from a Russian firm that is directly complicit in the deaths of thousands of innocent Syrian men, women, and children. This has got to stop.

What this amendment would do is to simply say no more purchases from this Russian arms supplier. We don't need to be purchasing any more helicopters for years in advance when we're not even going to have a military presence in the country.

□ 1420

The Russians have vetoed U.N. resolutions designed to stop this violence

in Syria. They are preventing an expansion of the current U.N. mandate. Our financial support for Rosoboronexport, has to be stopped. We have to divest ourselves from dependence on this state owned arms supplier.

This amendment would stop our business dealings with Syria's principal arms supplier. Otherwise, our condemnations of Syria's regime ring hollow.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the American taxpayer and for this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of my colleague's bipartisan amendment, which prohibits any funds provided in this act from being used to fulfill the Defense Department's current contract with Rosoboronexport, the Russian state arms dealer currently providing weapons to Syria for Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan security forces.

This amendment builds upon the bipartisan support of the amendment added to the House authorization bill that prohibits future contracts along the same lines and requires future contracts to be competitively bid so that U.S. manufacturers can compete on these taxpayer-funded deals.

For over a year now, we have seen Syrian President Bashar al-Assad respond to peaceful demonstrations by the Syrian people with a brutal crackdown. According to the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, over 17,000 people have been killed by the regime since violence began there in March 2011. Fighting this week has further intensified in and around Damascus, and there are reports, after similar violence in Houla and Qubair, that more than 100 civilians have been massacred in Tremseh. This is on top of torture, sexual violence, inference with access to medical treatment and many other gross human rights violations perpetrated by the al-Assad regime.

At the same time, Russia continues to provide that regime with the means to perpetrate widespread systemic attacks on its civilians. Last year alone, they reportedly sold Damascus \$1 billion in weapons. In January, they signed a deal with Damascus to supply Syria with 36 combat jets.

Last month Secretary of State Clinton expressed concern that Russia is sending attack helicopters to Syria. The New York Times last Saturday, in an article on the defection of Syrian Air Force Captain Akhmed Trad, detailed the use of rocket-equipped Mi-17 helicopters by the regime. Earlier today, Russia, along with China, vetoed a U.N. Security Council resolution that would have sanctioned the Assad regime for the continued use of heavy weapons.

Yet, incredibly, the U.S. Defense Department has purchased 21 Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan security forces

and is reportedly purchasing 10 more through a no-bid with that Russian company, even though it supplies arms to Syria and was, for years, on the U.S. sanctions list for providing illegal nuclear assistance to Iran.

If U.S. taxpayer dollars are going to be spent providing helicopters to the Afghans, those dollars should be spent on American systems that create jobs here at home. There are American companies available to manufacture the aircraft, which would increase interoperability with both the U.S. and NATO forces and support American manufacturing. The Defense Department is reportedly already training the Afghans how to fly and maintain American-made helicopters.

At the very least, there should be an open competition for procurement of these helicopters, a competition we believe superior American manufacturers would win. In any case, the American taxpayer dollars should not be used to subsidize al-Assad's murderous regime in Syria.

This amendment will end this no-bid contract, stop the use of Federal dollars to subsidize the massacres being perpetrated by the al-Assad regime. I urge you to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to discuss this amendment numerous times with Mr. MORAN and with our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, and I would like to say that I am here to support this amendment.

However, I would like to engage Mr. MORAN and ask if he would be willing, as we move forward—I know we can't do it on the floor today—to include a national security waiver in this language when we get to conference. As we go through the process, would the gentleman have any difficulty supporting us in that effort to get a national security waiver?

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you, first of all, for your support of this amendment as well as your leadership of this committee.

I think this is an excellent idea. Perhaps, if we were to get into conference with the Senate on this bill, which I expect we will, we could add that national security waiver at that time and, thus, we would not be compromising the things that don't need to be discussed on the floor.

But I think that's an excellent suggestion, and I appreciate the gentleman's deference to concerns that HASC might have. With that, I do appreciate the very distinguished chairman's support.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much, and I do support this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I support the amendment as well, and I appreciate the work of my friend and colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO on this issue.

There are some reasons why these Mi-17 helicopters are sold to the Afghans. It's not just a blunder. It's because of the altitude of the country. There is a legitimate national security issue here that has to be addressed, and I think we do have helicopters, maybe not Black Hawks, but CH-47s, that can go to a higher altitude. I don't know how much more expensive they are or anything about it.

But I just want to point out that, because I don't want people to have the impression that they just did this maliciously. There were some legitimate reasons for this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I very much thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the committee.

That is an important point to make. The Pentagon not only has to be concerned about the operability in Afghanistan, which is quite different.

Mr. DICKS. Very unique.

Mr. MORAN. It is very unique. Plus, the Afghans need helicopters they can maintain after we leave. They are used to maintaining Russian helicopters. During the occupation, they learned that. I understand they are easier to maintain than some of ours.

But notwithstanding that, I think the gentleman would agree that there is reason for some apprehension after we have left the country to continue supplying these helicopters.

Mr. DICKS. There ought to be a competition. I mean, there is no reason that this should be sole-sourced. There should be an opportunity for American contractors to compete, and one thing we're going to have to work on is logistics and their ability to handle equipment. That's a very weak point right now with the Afghan military.

Mr. MORAN. The other point, if the gentleman would further yield, is this firm is not someone we ought to be dealing with unless we absolutely have to. These are people that have violated our concerns about providing nuclear capacity to Iran. They have been cited about that. They are supplying a billion dollars of arms to Assad; and its principal reason, I suspect, because it's a state-owned firm, that Russia won't comply with the rest of the world.

It does need to be seen in that context, as well, to send this kind of a

message. It's not a message I am necessarily sending to the Pentagon. It's a message we're trying to send to Russia: Let's get on board.

Mr. DICKS. In that respect I am totally supportive of what the gentleman is trying to accomplish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1430

Mr. ELLISON. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to see that there's broad bipartisan agreement on this issue. It's always a great benefit when we can work things out—and occasionally we do, just as we've seen. So that's a good thing. But I do have an obligation to speak up for constituents of my own on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say on the record that there have been more than 17,000 people killed in Syria over the last 14 months. That's when a non-violent uprising began in response to Bashar Al-Assad's brutal torture and murder of teenage kids in the city of Dara'a. Violence against civilians has escalated rapidly in months. There have been large massacres in the villages of Houla, Qubair, and possibly Tremseh.

The international community, including the Arab League, has overwhelmingly condemned Al-Assad's violent repression. One country—Russia—has refused to stop arming Al-Assad and his murderous campaign. In fact, a Russian cargo ship could deliver military helicopters to Syria this week. Rosoboronexport is the Russian weapons dealer arming the Al-Assad regime. There's substantial evidence Al-Assad is using weapons from Rosoboronexport against innocent civilians in Syria. I was surprised to learn that our own government is buying Russian-made helicopters from Rosoboronexport.

Put simply, our government is supporting Syria's arms dealer, which is enabling the Syrian regime's bloody crackdown. This should stop. That's why I urge all to support this amendment, which it looks like there's broad agreement on. American taxpayers should not be supporting Syria's arms dealer. If the military wants to buy helicopters, it should by American ones and create jobs at home, not in Russia. Our amendment does the right thing. It ends the U.S. purchases from Rosoboronexport. I'm proud that it has strong bipartisan support, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

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

(1) reduce the nuclear forces of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)); or

(2) implement the Nuclear Posture Review Implementation Study or modify the Secretary of Defense Guidance for Employment of Force, Annex B, or the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, Annex N.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Turner-McKeon-Thornberry amendment. I, as chairman of the House Strategic Forces Subcommittee, am offering this amendment, along with the House Armed Services Committee chairman, Mr. MCKEON, and the vice chairman, Mr. THORNBERRY.

For 66 years, the U.S. nuclear deterrent has kept us and our allies safe from large-scale war under a remarkably consistent policy supported by Presidents of both parties. Now, however, President Barack Obama appears to be unilaterally changing it—for reasons not yet explained.

House Armed Services Committee Chairman BUCK MCKEON and 31 other committee members and I recently wrote to the President, expressing concern over reports that he is directing a review of U.S. nuclear weapons strategy that could result in U.S. reductions of up to 80 percent. We asked to understand what the President is doing, and why. We've received nothing back from the President.

The Obama administration reportedly is weighing at least three options for reducing U.S. nuclear forces: Cutting to roughly 1,000 to 1,100; 700 to 800; or 300 to 400. Our arsenal now includes about 5,000 warheads, with approximately 2,000 deployed warheads permitted under the new START Treaty. The remaining 3,000 are kept in storage as a hedge against advancements by other nations. Russia has 4,000 to 6,500 warheads and China is reported to have more than 300, though no one outside of the Chinese Communist Party knows for sure how many they have. These countries, as well as India; Pakistan, which is building a stockpile expected to soon surpass Britain; Britain itself; France; North Korea; and perhaps soon Iran have active nuclear weapons modernization programs. Only the United States does not.

Now, the President may soon seek to have the U.S. make the deepest reductions in its nuclear forces in history. The new strategic review could be on the President's desk within the next

month. It is unclear whether he expects the cuts to be unilateral or within the framework of a treaty with Russia or China and others. At least one of the President's senior advisers has suggested that these reductions could be unilateral. It's worth noting that the impetus for this review is outside the norm. It is unexplainable. Traditionally, a President has directed his military advisers to determine, chiefly, what level of our nuclear force is needed to deter a potential adversary from attacking us or our allies. The answer to that question should be what drives the strategy, not a President's political ideology.

For example, this is how Secretary Powell stated that President Bush looked at the issue. He stated:

President Bush gathered his advisers around him and he instructed us as follows: "Find the lowest number we need to make America safe, to make America safe today, and to make America safe in the future. Do not think of this in Cold War terms."

The House Armed Services Committee has been asking questions, holding briefings with the administration, even hearings about the details that we need to explain what the administration is doing. Unfortunately, the only information we have at this point is what we're learning from the media. Why would the administration be unwilling to share even the basic terms of reference for this review, known as Presidential Policy Directive 11? Why wouldn't it share other basic instructions from the Defense Department? The President, after all, is directing a strategic review that could border on disarmament and significantly diminish U.S. strength.

It is not even clear that the unilateral reductions to the U.S. nuclear forces that are currently required by the New START agreement are in the best interests of our national security. And the Defense Department refuses to tell Congress how it plans to implement that treaty. The Senate was ultimately comfortable with those reductions once the President promised to provide his own plan for modernization of our U.S. nuclear deterrent. The President's most recent budget, however, abandons the nuclear modernization funding that he promised.

Case in point is the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility, the construction of which the President pledged a little more than a year ago to accelerate and which in this year's budget he deferred for 5 years, which basically means that this project will be canceled. Thus, the President leaves the United States with virtually no militarily significant plutonium pit production capacity, which other nuclear weapons state still possesses. And he wants to seek steep new reductions in the U.S. nuclear forces. This can only be described as a bait-and-switch strategy.

Any further reductions must be met with ample justification for how U.S. nuclear security will be enhanced. Sim-

ply saying that U.S. should "reduce the roles and numbers" of its nuclear weapons is nothing more than putting hope in the place of our strategy.

Our military leaders share these sentiments. General Chilton, in talking about the number of warheads that we currently have, said: "The arsenal that we have is exactly what is needed to provide the deterrent."

Clearly, any further reductions will undermine the deterrent that has kept our country safe. Our nuclear weapons provide for the safety of this Nation and our allies around the globe. A number of countries with the capability and resources to do so have not pursued this.

We ask for support for this in Ronald Reagan's "peace through strength" policy.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. As you know, the New START, or strategic arms reduction, is a nuclear arms reduction treaty between the United States and Russia. On December 22, 2010, the Senate increased our national security by providing its advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty with Russia. With the New START Treaty, the United States and Russia will have another important element supporting our reset relationship and expanding our bilateral cooperation on a wide range of issues.

As the President said during the end of the last Congress, the treaty is a national security imperative as well as a cornerstone of our relations with Russia. Under the terms of the treaty, the U.S. and Russia will be limited to significantly fewer strategic arms within 7 years from the date the treaty entered into force. Each party has the flexibility to determine for itself the structure of the strategic forces within the aggregate limits of the treaty.

□ 1440

We should carry out our commitment to the New START treaty and not restrict our country's obligation to implement it. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I would say to the gentleman, if there is one thing—and I stand here as a member of this subcommittee for 34 years—that we can reduce, it's strategic weapons. We have never used one, except in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And we can have a credible deterrent with a much smaller force. In fact, I agree with General Cartwright that we could use our strategic ballistic missile submarines and our long-range bombers, the B-2s and hopefully a new bomber, and reduce dramatically the number of land-based ICBMs.

We simply don't need, and we can't afford to have and continue to produce all of these nuclear weapons that will, more than likely, never be used. They are a good deterrent and they have

been an effective deterrent. Thank God for that. But the Cold War is over, and we are in a position today where we must reduce the size of our nuclear weapons force.

I yield to the gentleman. I've been here a long time. I went through all the arms control debates, and I know something about this subject.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Sir, thank you for yielding me time. And I know you certainly do know about this topic, which is why I know that you also know that we use our nuclear deterrent every day. While we stand on this floor and speak with the freedoms that we have, our nuclear deterrent keeps us safe. Abandoning our nuclear deterrent would not make us safe.

Mr. DICKS. Regaining my time, just for a second, I worked to convert the B-2 bomber from a nuclear weapon carrier to a conventional carrier. Do you know why a conventional bomber is, I think, more of a deterrent than a nuclear bomber? Because with a conventional bomber, you can use bombs. You can go in, and with the JDAMs that we put on those bombers, in one sortie, you could take out 16 targets. That is real deterrence. And that is having a conventional force that is usable.

Nuclear weapons are not going to be used, and that's why both sides can have a much smaller force. We can bring the number of nuclear weapons down. At some point, it becomes ridiculous to have that many warheads when there aren't that many targets, and we're not going to use them.

I know the gentleman is all wrought up about this and protecting our great deterrent, which has been a very valuable thing to our national security. But I have to tell you, if there is one thing that we can reduce by agreement with the Russians, it is nuclear weapons.

I will yield to the gentleman again if he wants to say anything else.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. To respond to the gentleman, again, our nuclear deterrent is used every day. Every day, it keeps us safe because it ensures that our country—

Mr. DICKS. It isn't used every day. It's available every day.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. This is my time. The time that I am speaking is my time. You yielded me some and you kept your own.

Mr. DICKS. I yield.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. The reality is that our nuclear deterrent is used every day. And when you say that nuclear weapons won't be used, you can only say that with respect to our heart, the heart of this country, the heart of this country that wants to make certain that freedom is safe and our allies are safe.

We can't say that for others. Iran and North Korea are pursuing nuclear weapons not because they just want the increased power, they want that technology. They want that ability to have weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. DICKS. I reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. You don't need thousands of these weapons. A couple hundred, frankly, could take out Iran and almost any country you can imagine. So, again, we can't afford to do everything. We are in an era where we're dealing with terrorists, and we need to have special forces that can be utilized. We need to have these very effective drones. We need to look at the threats that are out there today and equip our military accordingly.

This is not our responsibility. The Senate handles advice and consent on treaties. We should stay out of this. In my judgment, this amendment is unnecessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We support the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio. On behalf of the Appropriations Committee, we appreciate his work.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his work on this on the appropriations side.

This is an important issue, and this really goes to the heart of our national security. My amendment does nothing, by the way, to prohibit the implementation of New START. But the thing that is important here is that there are those who talk about nonproliferation, and I think we are all wanting nuclear weapons to be restricted and to stop their growth. But there's a difference between nonproliferation and disarmament of the United States. Only the United States is reducing our nuclear weapons. In New START, Russia wasn't required to reduce at all. Only the United States was reduced.

You have India, you have Pakistan, you have Iran and North Korea. North Korea already is a recognized nuclear weapons state. Iran is seeking nuclear weapons. And both of those nations are seeking ICBM technology for the purposes of placing the United States at risk. Secretary Gates, upon his departure, was saying that North Korea is becoming an absolute threat to mainland United States with its nuclear weapons and its ICBM technology.

We can only be confident that others will not use nuclear weapons to the extent that we can stand strong as a nuclear weapons state. That needs to be derived from what is the threat and the number of weapons to ensure that we have both survivability and the ability to place their assets and their nations at risk.

A couple of hundred—and all due respect to the ranking member—is based upon no science whatsoever. Our com-

mander of U.S. Strategic Command, General Chilton, who has been through this science and who is charged with keeping the United States safe, said that the arsenal that we have is exactly what is needed today to provide the deterrent.

Our concern is that the President, on his road to zero, has made it clear that even though it will have no effect on reducing the nuclear arsenals of other nations, he would move to unilaterally reduce ours. That's why we're on this floor, not as the Senate, but as the House to say we are going to restrict funding to prevent the President from unilaterally disarming us.

If the President is committed to a road to zero, show us any evidence that he is able to persuade anyone else to reduce their nuclear weapons, because we don't have any evidence of anyone else reducing except the President's trying to reduce ours.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Let me begin again by thanking Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS for their continued leadership on this bill and this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, Representative BACA and I offered an amendment that directs \$10 million from the Defense-Wide Operations and Management account and moves it to the Strategic Environmental Research Program and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program.

These funds would provide the Research and Development Programs additional resources for competitive grants that allow our communities to provide clean water. It is critical that Congress support DOD efforts to develop innovative solutions that use the best technology available to us for problems like the perchlorate contamination that areas in my district in California deal with.

Perchlorate is a chemical used to produce explosives that, when found in groundwater, can be harmful to women, children, and the elderly. In fact, one-quarter of Inland Empire aquifers, including basins from surrounding counties, contains high concentrations of perchlorate.

Just this week, the U.S. Geological Survey released findings from a statewide assessment of groundwater quality that high levels of perchlorate were discovered in 11 percent of wells and moderate concentrations in 53 percent of wells. That is statewide, Mr. Chairman.

Groundwater contamination and other contamination from former defense sites are becoming increasingly problematic throughout the Nation. Based on those facts, I would like to yield to the chairman for the purpose of entering into a colloquy, with hopes that we can work on this issue in the future.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The committee does, in fact, recognize that these R&D programs provide necessary resources that help invest in innovative new technologies which benefit local communities that are dealing with these contamination issues through competitive grants.

□ 1450

We look forward to working with Mr. MILLER to see how we can properly address the needs of communities looking to provide clean water to all of their citizens.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I thank the chairman for agreeing and committing to work with me on this issue. I'd like to thank Representative BACA for his leadership in support of this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor or any subcontractor of the contractor to an employee performing work under the contract or any subcontract under the contract for compensation if the compensation of the employee for a fiscal year from the Federal Government for work under Federal contracts exceeds \$230,700, except that the Secretary of Defense may establish one or more narrowly targeted exceptions for scientists and engineers upon a determination that such exceptions are needed to ensure that the Department of Defense has continued access to needed skills and capabilities. This section shall apply to contracts entered into during fiscal year 2013.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the FY13 Defense appropriations bill.

My amendment is a modest, straightforward reform to fix the current cap

on Federal salaries paid to government contractor executives. This is part of a bipartisan reform that I and our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, have been working on for the past 2 years; and despite significant bipartisan progress in the Senate, this issue has never once been allowed so much as a vote in the House. I expect today will be no different.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chair, it was once my understanding that the highest individual salary funded by the American taxpayer was that of the President of the United States at a total of \$400,000; but it turns out that the leader of the free world isn't actually the highest paid executive on the taxpayers' payroll. The highest Federal Government salaries are actually earned by private sector executives who can be paid nearly \$770,000 in taxpayer dollars under current law. That's nearly twice the salary of the Commander in Chief and more than three times the salary of the Secretary of Defense. In fact, gaping loopholes in the law mean that many can earn far more. Let me emphasize that these are federally funded salaries for private sector executives—funded 100 percent by the American taxpayer.

You won't find these exorbitant pay rates on government pay schedules, and they certainly aren't subject to the pay and hiring freeze. In fact, just weeks ago, top government contractors got a \$70,000 raise on the taxpayers' dime for no reason other than the current law demanded it. That raise alone, \$70,000, is more than the salary of most Federal employees. That raise brought the current cap on Federal reimbursements for contractor compensation up to nearly \$770,000, an incredible 10 percent raise for the top echelons of the contractor workforce that is estimated to outnumber Federal civilian and military personnel by more than 2-1.

To put that delta into perspective, compare the 10 percent contractor increase to the 1.7 percent raise that this bill proposes for our women and men in uniform. Compare it to the total pay freeze under which our civilian personnel are operating. If you believe that reining in personnel costs is a smart way to reduce the deficit, then you cannot possibly argue that we should maintain a blank check for the estimated 7 million contractors on the Federal Government payroll.

This problem started in the late 1990s with a law that created the current, deeply flawed formula to reimburse government contractors for the pay of their top executives. The so-called "cap" under this law has grown by leaps and bounds each year, increasing by more than 75 percent in just the last 8 years. That is an unsustainable and unjustifiable trend that must be put to a stop. In a year where we can agree on so little, I have found that many of us can agree on this.

From 2001 to 2010, spending on service contractors rose by 137 percent, making it one of the Pentagon's largest cost drivers. Given the rampant growth

in contract spending, the Army estimated earlier this year that limiting contractor compensation to even the salary of the President—that's \$400,000—would have saved the taxpayers \$6 billion in fiscal year 2011 alone, or a savings of approximately 15 percent in contract services. Six billion dollars—that's only for the Army, and that's only in 1 year. Imagine what we could be saving government-wide.

Our amendment is a modest, bipartisan proposal that reins in the most excessive government salaries by revising the cap to a set level of \$230,700—or the salary of the Vice President of the United States. The cap would apply to all defense contractors and subcontractors. However, it also reaffirms the authority of the Secretary of Defense to create exceptions to the cap in certain circumstances.

This authority was established in last year's defense authorization to preserve flexibility for our military in maintaining access to individuals—particularly scientists and engineers—who possess unique skills and capabilities critical to the United States' national security.

To reiterate, this amendment does not grant new authority to the Secretary of Defense. It is not legislating in an appropriations bill. It merely reaffirms the current authority of the Secretary codified in title 10. To be clear, this amendment deals exclusively with taxpayer dollars spent to reimburse contractors.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment changes the application of existing law. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language conferring authority on the Secretary of Defense to establish certain exceptions. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support an amendment by my good friend and colleague from New York to cap excessive contractor compensation. Ballooning contractor costs are wasting taxpayer dollars and weakening our national defense.

While our government employees accept pay freezes, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy raised the cap on executive compensation for contractor executives by 10 percent to nearly \$770,000. This, my friends, is a no-brainer: we can't afford to pay contractors twice the President's salary.

Now, mind you, this does not mean that the CEOs can't make more than \$770,000. They can, in fact. In fact, they can be paid much more by their shareholders. We want to reduce the amount of money they make to no more than that of the President.

Throughout this budget process, defense contractor CEOs have threatened to fire people if they do not get what they want through the suspension of sequestration, saying that they can't afford to continue their operations unless the Department of Defense is spared from the chopping block. But if you look at the Forbes magazine list of the top compensated CEOs, you see that it is the taxpayers who can't afford them.

The Federal Government's top contractors make anywhere from \$5 million to \$56 million each year. While these costs are not all coming directly from the Treasury, we contribute, nonetheless, in cost overruns and single-source contracts that make them all too big to fail.

□ 1500

Last year we passed language that capped some of their compensation, but excluded scientists and engineers from these caps because we were worried that we would not be able to get the talent we need. But when you think about it, this argument is ludicrous. The U.S. Government isn't their only client, but we're expected to pay the whole cost for the talent they need to win contracts with us.

The Senate agrees. The Armed Services Committee unanimously passed a bill that would include this cap on contractor compensation. "Unanimously" means it was bipartisan.

What we're asking contractors to accept, the same salary as the Vice President, isn't unfair or unprecedented. It's time that we stop asking taxpayers to pay excessive contractor compensation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MY COFFMAN OF COLORADO

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be available to continue the deployment, beyond fiscal year 2013, of the 170th Infantry Brigade in Baumholder and the 172nd Infantry Brigade in Grafenwöhr, except pursuant to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, on April 4, 1949, and entered

into force on August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 2241; TIAS 1964).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Cold War ended more than two decades ago, and the Iron Curtain and the Soviet Union no longer exist.

While the United States is spending 4.7 percent of our economy on defense, only 4 out of 28 of our NATO allies are spending even 2 percent of their economy on defense. Our allies in Europe have drastically reduced their national defense spending because they take for granted that the United States will continue to be the guarantor of their security. Now it is time for our NATO allies to provide more of their own security and not be so reliant upon the United States.

We face difficult budget challenges here at home. The resources that we are currently spending on maintaining a military presence in Europe are needed to meet much more significant security challenges elsewhere.

The Pentagon has recently stated that the American military presence in Europe is a diminishing priority and has proposed removing two combat brigade teams in fiscal year 2013. This bipartisan limiting amendment to the Defense appropriations bill will force the Department of Defense to follow through with withdrawing two brigade combat teams from Europe and will deny the ability for the Pentagon to reverse this decision later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, as I appreciate him bringing this amendment to the floor.

I think it's telling that our friends in European NATO countries, since 2008, have reduced their defense spending 12 percent. They're having tough times. They're retrenching. They recognize the new posture in terms of security. We should do the same thing. We should do the same thing. Absolutely.

It's ironic that this Chamber is going to be considering massive cuts in food stamps to have more responsibility and accountability that some of us think are draconian. But for heaven's sake, why can't we, 60 years after World War II, almost 25 years after the collapse of the former Soviet Union, can't we help Europe assume a little larger role for their own defense? For whom are these troops positioned in terms of some sort of military posture?

I think most of us agree that it's highly unlikely they'll be used in combat. Any cost that would be incurred by accelerating it is money that's going to be spent anyway, notwithstanding all the costs to keep them there.

So I think the gentleman is spot on. I'm happy to cosponsor the amendment. I'm happy to speak in support of it. I hope this body approves it in a

small way to help the Europeans assume their own responsibility and for us to be able to focus on things that are more important for us.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Would you explain—you say here you have these two brigades, except pursuant to article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Could you explain what the impact of this is, the treaty commitments here?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. To the gentleman from Washington, I believe that this certainly does not disallow us to maintain rotational forces in Europe. There is no provision within the NATO Charter that requires the United States to maintain a permanent military presence in Europe.

Mr. DICKS. It says:

None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available to continue the deployment beyond fiscal year 2013 of the 170th Infantry Brigade in Baumholder and the 172nd Infantry Brigade in Grafenwoehr, except pursuant to article 5 of the North—

Is there some commitment in the North Atlantic Treaty that requires us to have these two brigades there?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. To the gentleman from Washington, there is no requirement where we have to maintain a permanent military presence in Europe.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I believe that this amendment is unnecessary because the Department of Defense is currently in the process of reducing the number of troops in Europe. The Department has already announced the closure of Army garrisons in Schweinfurt, Bamberg, and Heidelberg by fiscal year 2015.

Furthermore, the Department has begun the process of deactivating two infantry brigades, the 170th Infantry Brigade and the 172nd Infantry Brigade, each with 3,850 soldiers. I think this is what the gentleman intends. In addition, the U.S. Army in Europe will see a reduction of approximately 2,500 soldiers from enabling units over the next 5 years.

Reducing end strength of any military service is an art form, as projecting future needs for future conflicts is a very difficult task. Reducing end strength should be part of a deliberate and thoughtful plan that incorporates current and future national security needs of the Nation.

I believe adding an arbitrary cap to the number of servicemembers assigned to Europe could put our national security at risk. I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. I rise in agreement with the ranking member on the issue of this amendment.

The subject matter of this amendment is really wholly inappropriate. It is the movement of brigades. From a policy perspective, we should not, on this bill or on any bill, be dictating the movement of brigades.

Should we get out the map of the world and see where all of our brigades are and have a debate in Congress as to how they be moved about? No. That is something that is supposed to occur in consultation with the experts in full, and participation of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense. And no disrespect to the authors, but they have no expertise or experience in how the positioning of our brigades should go for our overall national security.

Mr. COFFMAN has previously authored an amendment that was on the National Defense Authorization Act that used language of permit the reassignment or the removal of brigades. But this is directive. This says these brigades shall be moved, and it does so under the assumption that there will be cost savings. But we all know that when you actually move a brigade, there are a number of costs that are incurred that are greater than any savings that you would have in offset.

It's been said that the Soviet Union no longer exists. You're right; the Soviet Union no longer exists. But we have commitments in the Middle East and our assistance to Africa and our relationship with Israel. These troops are not there standing guard against the Soviet Union that's not there anymore. They're in active deployment under the Secretary of Defense with the current threats that we have for our national security.

Certainly, as the ranking member has indicated, there's ongoing assessments as to where these brigades should be assigned and where their responsibility should be, and those should be left to our oversight of the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense, not to our directive of the moving of brigades.

□ 1510

There are some concerns that even the language of this and the directing of movement of brigades might be logistically implausible. One of the reasons we don't direct these things is that we don't really have the ability to understand all of the cascades of effects that occur.

Now, I certainly understand the call for increased spending from our NATO partners. That is certainly something that this body should do; but in calling for our NATO partners to increase their participation in the expenditures of NATO in their own defense, we should not be directing the Secretary

of Defense to actually move brigades. It is an expertise we don't have in a debate that should not be happening from a policy perspective on this floor.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is rare that I disagree with my good friend from Ohio, but I do. I think that it is appropriate to move forward in this direction.

As my good friend from the State of Washington indicated, we are probably going to do this, I think he mentioned, by 2015. The point here is that this reassessment has been proceeding at a glacial speed. It is important for us to be on record to move this forward. There are major things that we are going to have to do. This is relatively small potatoes compared with what we are going to have to do if we are going to meet our challenges both in terms of a different security arrangement with regard to the threats that the United States faces and our fiscal problems.

Now, we have had this sitting on the back burner for years. We are, if anything, late to the party; and of course, as long as they are there, that is a disincentive for our NATO allies to step up and to do what they need to do in their own defense. We have plenty of assets around the world. We have opportunities with naval and air strikes. The notion that we are going to be throwing ground forces that are stationed in Europe into the fray in Israel or in some battle in Africa, I think, is near-fetched at the least. Look at what we have done in the past and how we've gone about it.

With all due respect, I think, in a world where we have the capacity—as we have shown—to be able to stage and move troops when needed, this is a small step in the right direction. I think my friend from Ohio is overstating the case in the notion that somehow it costs money to do the redeployment so we should just keep them there. We are going to be redeploying them anyway, so the costs of redeployment are going to be incurred sometime this decade or sometime this century, but it costs money to keep them there.

I have a nephew who makes a very good living teaching Americans in Europe in military schools. I think it's time for my nephew to come home and teach in the United States. I think there are more cost-effective ways for us to meet our security obligations. I do think it is time for our European friends and allies to step up. We can no longer be paying almost half the defense costs of the world when many of the others in that mix are people who are our friends and allies. I think this is a small step in the right direction. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to engage in a colloquy.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I would like to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS for ensuring that this legislation, the fiscal year 2013 Defense appropriations bill, would not include any reductions in the number of C-17s that are used and serviced by our armed services.

The C-17 is the Air Force's premier strategic transport aircraft, and it remains the military's most reliable and capable airlift aircraft. The C-17 flies more than 80 percent of all U.S. airlift missions while comprising only 60 percent of the airlift fleet. The C-17 has proven capable of delivering more cargo, troops, and non-war humanitarian missions than any other aircraft that we have.

Mr. Chairman, this aircraft was instrumental in saving lives during the devastating earthquake and tsunami that struck Japan last year. In addition to that, it was instrumental in aiding in the humanitarian efforts that I witnessed personally in Samoa. Some of the other missions include the delivery of 10,005 tons of disaster relief supplies and the carrying of 13,812 passengers in response to the earthquake that struck Haiti in 2010. In 2009, I worked with Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA to help get disaster relief supplies to American Samoa after an earthquake and tsunami that ravaged that island. The 10-day relief mission was conducted with the C-17 aircraft.

The C-17 provides rapid-response capability for relief missions anywhere in the world, including—but not limited to—serving those who serve us.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to these humanitarian efforts, the C-17 leads in providing positive economic benefits to our country. The C-17 is built in Long Beach, California, which I happen to have the privilege to represent with my colleague Mr. ROHRBACHER. The production of the C-17 is responsible for over 13,000 jobs in California, and it provides \$2 billion in economic benefit. Nationally, the production of the C-17 has suppliers in 44 States, all of which we represent here. It supports more than 30,000 jobs and has an \$8.4 billion economic impact.

While we are looking for ways to rein in spending, the C-17 remains critical

to our national security, to our humanitarian relief missions, and to our economy. My effort today is to make sure that we have an adequate number of C-17s that are available, serviced and maintained for our Armed Forces.

Will the chairman and ranking member continue to work with me to ensure that there is a sufficient and well-maintained fleet of our C-17s in our armed services?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I also thank her for her strong support of the C-17, and she is right on with regard to the vital role it plays in our Nation's defense.

This committee has been a strong advocate for the C-17. Our bill fully funds the C-17 and ensures that no action can be taken by the Air Force to reduce the C-17 fleet.

I again thank the gentlelady for her very timely comments on this important issue.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I was a very strong proponent of the C-17 even when Douglas Aircraft in Long Beach was building this airplane. I had a chance to go there when they were doing the wooden mock-ups and when they brought in the load masters, who made it such that the plane was built in a way that it could load cargo faster than any other airplane in history. We have 54 of these at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in the great State of Washington. We are very proud of the C-17. It is now built by the Boeing Company.

I just want you to know that we are a very strong proponent. We had some great work done in the nineties in upgrading the software when we had major software issues. We also had a dramatic workforce out there that really used all of the tools of lean production. So the C-17 is a very high priority, and we will certainly do everything we can.

I wish we'd built more of them, frankly, while we had the line open, but we did everything we could. We are at a point now where the line is closing down except for foreign sales. We have a number of foreign sales; and if at some point we need to come back to it, I certainly would be open to that.

□ 1520

Ms. RICHARDSON. I would like to thank Chairman YOUNG and also Ranking Member DICKS for their response and their commitment to this program.

Yes, in fact, we have been utilizing foreign sales, and given the current occupations in this country, we stand ready to continue to build them to protect this country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, it is fortuitous now that I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida on an issue that deals directly with the C-17, I might add.

I rise today to voice my concern over recent and devastating wildfires that have enveloped massive amounts of land throughout our country. The ruin caused by these wildfires has consumed 2.1 million acres, destroyed over 1,600 homes, killed 7 people, and threatened many more. This recurring problem, caused by dry conditions, hot weather, and ample fuel, tests the limits of our current Federal, State, and local firefighting resources.

When homes and lives are on the line, I believe we should take all possible action to protect lives and property, including the deployment of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve resources when appropriate. We oftentimes think of the Department of Defense as an entity that should be aimed at defending our Nation from foes abroad, but the fact is that there are enormous resources held by the Department of Defense, such as cargo planes that are capable of assisting in many other efforts, including firefighting efforts, which threaten the lives and property of our people.

For example, one specific concept, named the Precision Container Aerial Delivery System, or PCADS, needs only an additional \$2.6 million in funding to complete its already years-long evaluation of this technology. Unfortunately, however, DOD has not committed this meager sum to finish evaluating PCADS, despite the authority to do so.

What are PCADS? They essentially allow any military cargo plane that has a ramp in the back—mainly, our C-17s and our C-130s—to assist in wildfire efforts without having to modify the airplane at all. This means the C-17s and the C-130s, of which we have right now many stationed all over the country, could be deployed to help extinguish wildfires at a relatively low cost, creating a new and enormous firefighting capability. As I say, it's at a minimal cost.

Basically what we're talking about is a huge container system in the back that is made out of cardboard and a water balloon, which will permit putting them onto the C-17s and the C-130s to rolling right on 1,000 pounds of water per container. These C-130 pilots and C-17 pilots are already trained to drop these things, and without modifying the airplane, they could become an enormous resource to fighting fires throughout our country without adding any extra cost after this \$2.6 million for the final test.

I, therefore, have one simple request: to the extent that the Department of

Defense is capable of exploring new, innovative, cost-effective, and promising firefighting technologies that can be used for our civilian population, but especially for the firefighting capabilities that can aid in support, as I say, firemen's requests throughout our country and from the State and Federal level, I urge the Department of Defense to do so to the degree that it can.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for bringing this to our attention and for supporting innovative and cost-effective ways for our government to protect our people and their possessions from wildfires. I, too, believe the Department of Defense should seriously consider promising and cost-effective firefighting technologies where appropriate.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. This has been a subject I've been very interested in as former chairman of the Interior Appropriation Subcommittee where we have to fund the efforts for firefighting, which are very massive.

I have tried to work with the Defense Department. The biggest problem we face is that OMB, when you want to lease these airplanes—we're looking mainly at the C-130J here—lease them for firefighting purposes and then have them deployed with the National Guard in California or somewhere on the west coast, you get into the fact that if you try to lease them, the budget control people want to put the whole burden on the first year. This is why leasing has become difficult. We've got to work out a way to get these airplanes.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. In the past, in order to achieve the goal that you have outlined, we needed to reconfigure the inside of these C-130s and have special C-130s deployed.

This new PCAD system, which we can roll on enormous amounts of water in these little container systems, which is 1,000 pounds of water per container, can be dropped without reconfiguring the C-130s or the C-17s.

Mr. DICKS. I'm very interested in this, and I want to talk to my good friend about this. I would like to work with you on it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I have one last note. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There's been a series of tests to show this is very effective. One more series of tests will

cost \$2.6 million and can deploy these. I believe it will increase the value of our C-130s and C-17s to the point that we can actually maybe charge a little bit more money when we sell the C-17s, which will be far more than the \$2.6 million for this final test. It will pay for itself, not to mention the property damage that we can protect against.

Mr. DICKS. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I would like to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS for including language in the conference report that recognizes the importance of increasing the fair opportunity for numbers of women and minorities in officer positions and within the Special Operations Forces.

Minorities and women to have an opportunity to fairly compete—and I stress, "compete"—are often underrepresented in the leadership ranks within our Armed Services. African Americans account for 12 percent of the U.S. population but represent just 8 percent of Active Duty officers. Likewise, when it comes to Hispanic Americans, it's even worse. Hispanics make up 15 percent of the U.S. population but number only 5 percent of the officer corps.

While the number of women in officer positions has seen increases, there is still a lack of women in top officer positions. In 2009, there were 40 individuals who held the highest rank in our Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, do you know how many of those were women? I'm sad to say, just 1 out of 40. This shows that there is considerable room for improvement.

Having served on the Transportation Committee with Mr. CUMMINGS, much work was done on the Coast Guard side, but really should be equalled throughout the Armed Forces.

I was planning on offering an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill that would make it explicit that it is the sense of Congress that efforts should be made to increase the number of women and minorities in officer positions, but it would be subject to a point of order. However, I've worked with Chairman YOUNG and his staff that going forward we would continue to look at ways to increase women and minorities within the leadership ranks and to give them an opportunity again to compete for fair positions.

Chairman YOUNG, will you continue to work with me on this very important issue?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank her for calling attention to the fact that the subcommittee in our report said

this is an issue worthy of attention. Our language in the report said: urges the services, and specifically our Special Operations Forces, to conduct effective outreach and recruitment programs to minority populations to improve diversity in the military.

Absolutely. We agree with you totally. That is the intent of our committee. It becomes the intent of the Congress. We will continue to work with you to make sure that we do better at every opportunity.

I thank you for raising this issue today.

□ 1530

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for his response, his leadership, and his commitment on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I want the gentlelady to know that we worked with Mr. YOUNG on a number of insertions of report language in the report because of our concern about this issue as well. This is something where we always have to be vigilant because the people kind of forget what the legal responsibilities are. These are statutory responsibilities.

I appreciate the gentlelady from California bringing this to our attention. We'll work with her on this issue.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and also Ranking Member DICKS.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of the following nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of the United States:

- (1) Heavy bomber aircraft.
- (2) Air-launched cruise missiles.
- (3) Nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines.
- (4) Submarine-launched ballistic missiles.
- (5) Intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman, I have the distinct honor to represent several military installations in my State of North Dakota, including the Minot Air Force Base, the home of the 91st Missile Wing and the 5th Bomber Wing, which relates to the amendment I have to offer today.

The amendment, which I offer today, along with my colleagues Mrs. LUMMIS of Wyoming and Mr. DENNY REHBERG of Montana, is very straightforward. It prohibits the fiscal year 2013 funds from being used to implement plans under the New START Treaty to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and their delivery system, which sig-

nificantly reduces America's ability to develop and use our nuclear defense capabilities.

We all know that during the 2010 lame duck session the Senate ratified the New START Treaty, and President Obama made a promise to Congress that as long as he was President we will continue to invest in nuclear modernization.

Mr. Chairman, since then, he has backed away from his promise, and we all heard the President's unsettling off-mike comments that he would have more flexibility after the November elections.

The treaty provides for 7 years for the United States and Russia to reduce the number of deployed ICBMs, deployed submarine-launched ballistic missiles and deployed heavy bombers equipped to carry nuclear armaments to no more than 700 weapons.

I know that many of us may not agree on the appropriate level of deployed nuclear weapons or our view on the New START Treaty. However, we need to make one thing clear: nowhere in the New START Treaty does it require reductions from the United States to make these cuts prior to fiscal year or during fiscal year 2013.

Furthermore, we're still waiting on the administration to tell us exactly how sharp the cuts in our deployed nuclear weapons could be under the New START Treaty.

The Associated Press has reported the Obama administration is going beyond the level laid out in the New START Treaty and is considering as much as an 80-percent reduction in our current nuclear arsenal.

It appears that the administration is planning drastic cuts to our nuclear arsenal and could be planning to move away from our nuclear triad strategy altogether. All three legs of our Nation's nuclear triad are complementary to the defense of our Nation.

Drastic cuts in our overall level of our Nation's nuclear arsenal puts our national security at risk and sharp reductions to any one leg of the nuclear triad would destabilize a sound defense strategy.

Therefore, since the President made an agreement to modernize our arsenal, and Congress is still waiting to hear what those specifics are, Congress should not provide funding to facilitate these reductions.

I urge adoption of these amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him very much for bringing up this issue. I believe that the Berg amendment recognizes the world as it really is, the threats that we potentially face. I think he has done the Congress a real service today by emphasizing this issue with his amendment, and I support his amendment.

Mr. BERG. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. The New START Treaty limits the total number of weapon delivery vehicles by 2017. According to the Air Force, they are funded for New START implementation, but are awaiting final force structure decisions to determine numbers of weapon delivery vehicles to be reduced in FY 13.

We should carry out our obligation under the New START Treaty and not restrict the Department's obligation to implement it. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I want to make it clear to my colleagues just what we're talking about. Under the New START we will have 520 ICBMs with 420 warheads. We will have 60 bombers, 42 B-52s and 18 B-2s that are nuclear capable, and they have many warheads. We have 240 sub-launched missiles. The number of subs are not restricted, but we have 14 Trident submarines.

I would, with all due respect, just say this, this is one area where we can, if we can come down on a mutual agreement with the Russians to a lower level, we can save ourselves the money of not having to replace all of these weapons systems. A lot of very thoughtful people have looked at this issue, and they believe that the two most survivable legs of the triad are the ballistic missile submarines and the bombers. The land-based missiles are vulnerable. Now, we had great debates over the MX missile. We got into how many RVs coming in to take out an existing missile, usually it's two, so the enemy would be using up weapons.

But the point of it all is, the last thing that we're going to be using is nuclear weapons. It just is not going to happen; it would destroy the world. So we can come down to a lower level and still have a credible deterrent. We can't afford to do everything.

The most important thing today, I think, is to build up our Special Forces, build up our intelligence capabilities, and look at the threats that we're facing out there with al Qaeda and the terrorists. Frankly, nuclear weapons are a relic of the Cold War, and we should bring down the size of this.

General Cartwright, one of the most thoughtful former members of the Joint Chiefs, has suggested that we go to a DYAD, just having ballistic missile submarines and bombers. That's something that we should consider. The Markey amendment would have started us in a way of reducing the number of land-based missiles.

I just think it's not right for us to get in the middle of this. The Senate had long hearings. They went through a process of ratification. This treaty was ratified by the United States Senate.

Again, I just think if there is one area where we can make some reductions, it's in the area of nuclear weapons. We're just not going to need as many as we've had in the past, and we can have great deterrents at a lower level. I hope we can reach that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1540

Mrs. LUMMIS. I'm pleased to work with Representative BERG on this amendment, which will protect our nuclear triad from the reductions scheduled under this treaty for the term of this 2013 budget year. Each leg of our nuclear triad—bombers, submarines, and land-based missiles—complement each other and they strengthen each other.

As a lifelong resident of southeast Wyoming, I have come to understand and appreciate the role of our intercontinental ballistic missiles. The 90th Missile Wing in Cheyenne keeps 150 of our ICBMs at nearly 100 percent alert. The bombers and subs have their own unique strengths, but no other leg of the triad comes close to this alert level. The constant alert, wide geographic dispersion and immediate, global response capability of our ICBMs make them an indispensable part of our triad.

ICBMs are the most cost-effective leg of the triad as well. At less than \$3 million per ICBM, they are less than a third of the cost of a sub-launched missile or a nuclear bomber. It's because of ICBMs that we can say with confidence that we are fielding a nearly unbeatable nuclear force.

Those that want to slash our nuclear force forget that it was American strength that ended the Cold War. It was American strength, including the Peacekeeper and Minuteman III missiles, that allowed us to negotiate landmark reductions in American and Russian nuclear arsenals. Remember, we were able to retire the Peacekeeper missile silos in Wyoming. It was a victory for global stability; but we did it through American strength, not through unilateral disarmament.

That's what makes the New START Treaty so troubling. It is bilateral in name only. The United States bound itself to unilateral reductions in strategic nukes, but Russia can still expand its strategic arsenal. Russia can stack their bombers to the hilt with warheads and call it a single-delivery vehicle. Russia can deploy an unlimited number of the tactical nuclear weapons under which they hold an advantage. Russia can develop new, long-range nuclear-tipped cruise missiles. With New START, we negotiated away American strength and received little in return.

It is dangerous to assume that our nuclear competitors have the same mo-

tives and ideals that we do. If we roll over and capitulate to the demands of our competitors, we cannot assume that Russia, China, and Iran will follow. But if we maintain our strengths and our unbeatable nuclear posture, we will be far more effective at securing the peace that we all want.

Again, I want to thank Representative BERG and Mr. REHBERG. I encourage you to vote against unilateral disarmament. Vote for our amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. This debate has taken on the characteristics of ancestor worship, and I understand it. I know it's hard for individuals to let go of the Cold War, to let go of an era where foreign policy was characterized by this bitter rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. The reality: We won. It's over. We didn't just win. It was basically a world where there's unipower now. It's us.

The Chinese only have 40 to 50 nuclear missiles. The Russians have already dramatically reduced their weapons. The likelihood of a nuclear war between the United States and Russia is negative zero. And yet there are Members that don't want to see any reductions in our nuclear weapons force, notwithstanding the fact that those extra expenditures then would have to come out of other budgets, including the budget for the National Institutes of Health to find a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's. And so we have this curious disconnect between the reality of the world that we live in today and the understandable but erroneous commitment that many Members on the other side have to a relic of a Cold War-era rivalry that no longer can withstand fiscal scrutiny.

So let's just take this debate about whether or not the United States is vulnerable.

Each one of our submarine-based nuclear weapons systems have 96 independently targetable warheads onboard. That is: each one of our sub commanders can destroy the 96 biggest cities in China; each one of our sub commanders can destroy the 96 biggest cities in Russia; each sub commander, with their first nuclear weapon, could destroy Tehran; each sub commander could destroy Pyongyang and still have 95 independently targetable nuclear weapons onboard that one submarine, much less every other submarine that we have out there.

And so to have an amendment that says, after New START was agreed to between Russia and the United States, after the Air Force and the Navy signed off on New START, to have Members of the House proposing that notwithstanding that agreement that was reached that does enhance American national security by reducing the

likelihood that there would be a conflict between the United States and Russia, as low as that likelihood is, that we have this micromanagement that comes in of our military.

But it's more than that. Let's admit it. It's all about jobs. You're thinking about the defense bill as a jobs bill, and I understand that. But whenever we're talking about the defense bill, those jobs that are created should relate in some way to American national security. And what the Air Force and the Navy are saying is that they do not believe they need more nuclear weapons. In fact, they can agree to and have already accepted the reduction in nuclear weapons that is in the New START Treaty.

And so I understand from a jobs perspective why you want to lock in jobs that may have been created a generation ago in the height of the Cold War, but we have to redeploy for the 21st century not only militarily, but also into what strengthens us domestically in terms of medical research and educational programs.

So I can't really understand why we're even debating this issue. There is a treaty between our two countries. Our military has signed off. Our military says it actually enhances our security.

And I agree with the gentleman from Washington State: This is an area where we should actually give some respect to the United States Senate that ratified the treaty, to each one of your Joint Chiefs that signed off on it, and not allow a jobs bill to trump our national security; and that if you can find programs that actually enhance our security and you want to spend the money on it, let's debate that. But this is an area that is already resolved.

I urge a "no" vote on the Berg amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chair, we've got to do everything we can to stop New START in its tracks.

President Obama, with the support of the Senate put the United States on a dangerous path of unilateral disarmament. New START forced the United States to reduce our nuclear arsenal, while actually allowing Russia to increase theirs.

And for Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana—home of the 341st ICBM Missile Wing—this does more than threaten our national security. For the Great Falls community, it threatens the foundation of our community and economy.

Last week, I heard from community leaders and activists in Great Falls. They made it clear that New START, and the deeper cuts it foreshadows, is a bad idea.

Today, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to protect our nuclear deterrent and derail this harmful treaty. I urge "yes" vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BERG. 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 North Dakota will be postponed.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. I wish to engage in a colloquy with the ranking member of the Committee, but let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Washington and Chairman YOUNG for accommodating my request, for the second year in a row, for an additional \$20 million to be included in the appropriations bill for suicide prevention and outreach programs.

□ 1550

The committee last year honored this request, and I think it's a clear demonstration of the committee's intent that the Department do more and more to end this epidemic of suicide among our Active-Duty, Guard and Reserve force.

I do have a clarifying question I would like to pose to the gentleman from Washington.

Is it the committee's intent that the \$20 million in this legislation in additional suicide prevention funds be made available for successful suicide prevention programs, such as New Jersey's Vets4Warriors peer-to-peer counseling and outreach program?

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I can assure the gentleman from New Jersey that the committee intends to fund those programs that most effectively minimize suicides. And I'd point out that in most of these situations, this money is going to be competitively awarded. But I'm sure that the gentleman's New Jersey program will compete very well.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

I would also like under general leave to insert in the RECORD a letter from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, and the Marine Corps League to Secretary Panetta concerning this Vets4Warriors program.

JUNE 15, 2012.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a group of the nations' leading veteran service organizations we take very seriously our commitment to the men and women who serve in uniform. They have answered the call and put their lives in mortal danger to protect the nation from adversaries and to advance our national security interests. One of the most important things we can do to honor their service and give something back to those who have given us so much is to ensure that they have healthy conduits to alleviate their mental and psychological anguish.

Unfortunately, the nation has not yet succeeded in bringing this to pass. Though many programs and alternatives have been explored by the Departments of Defense and Veterans' Affairs, few or perhaps none have been as successful as the Vets4Warriors program. The program is based on the New Jersey Vet2Vet program, a nationally-recognized peer support program that has received critical acclaim for over 7 years. Vets4Warriors, the nascent program of the Army National Guard—a mere six months old—is showing incredible promise and we are confident that it will be as successful nationally as Vet2Vet has been in New Jersey.

Already, this program has received over 7000 calls and nearly 500 inbound contacts through other means such as Internet-based chats. Vets4Warriors provides effective, on-going peer support for men and women from all service branches—past and present. Any military personnel, family member or veteran can call this toll-free line 24/7 and have the call answered immediately by a carefully trained veteran peer counselor. We believe there are none better positioned to understand and assist with the rigors of military life than someone who has lived it. The calls are all confidential and can be anonymous. The peer counselors are able to triage the callers' needs, provide crisis intervention, local referrals for any needed services such as mental health, financial counseling, legal aid, or a host of other possible needs. At all times, a licensed mental health professional is immediately available to the peer counselor, should the situation warrant it. The goal is to create a stigma-free environment that encourages service members to contact Vets4Warriors when any concerns arise and the peer counselors help prevent these problems from becoming crises. There is also a formal relationship with the National Veterans Crisis Line, so calls to Crisis Line that are not crises are transferred to Vets4Warriors and crisis calls to Vets4Warriors can be "warm transferred" to the Veterans Crisis Line. Vets4Warriors strives to use all existing resources and not duplicate any of them.

These and other characteristics make this program unique and successful. However, what truly sets their work apart is that they show their commitment to individuals by proactively reaching back to each person that contacts Vets4Warriors to make sure they are getting the help they need, preventing problems from becoming crises. Vets4Warriors has made approximately 8400 follow-up calls to veterans who have contacted them—about 900 or 11% more than their incoming call volume. Every single call is logged into a database, so there is extensive information available on who is calling, why they are calling and the outcomes of the calls.

Vets4Warriors employs 27 veteran peer counselors representing all branches of service, so callers may even choose a peer counselor by their military experience. The same peer counselor will maintain contact with the caller over weeks or months, until the issues are resolved. They will also become advocates for the callers, should that be necessary. To our knowledge, no other program provides this kind of personal investment in the service member and offers the variety of services needed to meet the diverse needs of our military members and their families.

It is because of the enormous success of the program that we are so determined to ensure it receives the funding it needs to achieve long-term success. Recent developments have made us very concerned that the program will not be budgeted for in 2013, and we urge you to make funding this program a top priority. The investment is marginal, yet the impact is huge. The health and readiness

of the military depends on personnel that are resilient against the stressors of military service, both on and off the battlefield. Having seen it first-hand, we believe Vets4Warriors is a tremendous program that must be given a legitimate opportunity to succeed. With your support, we have every reason to believe that it will make a measurable difference in the lives of many veterans, military personnel and family members, and we strongly urge you to ensure full funding for the program.

Respectfully,

STEWART M. HICKEY, National Executive Director, American Veterans, Forbes Boulevard, Lanham, MD.

BARRY A. JESINOSKI, Executive Director, Disabled American Veterans, Maine Avenue, SW., Washington, DC.

MICHAEL A. BLUM, Executive Director, Marine Corps League, Merrifield, VA.

PETER S. GAYTAN, Executive Director, The American Legion, K Street, NW., Washington, DC.

ROBERT E. WALLACE, Executive Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, DC.

In this letter, the five veteran service organizations note that of all the suicide prevention programs and alternatives explored by the Department, "perhaps none have been more successful than the Vets4Warriors program."

I raise this letter, Mr. Chairman, because just this past week, the National Academies of Science released a report on the DOD and the VA's response to this explosion of PTSD cases and suicide-related mental health problems for veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan.

We want to make sure that the successful programs are recognized; and to date, no servicemember or veteran who has used these Vets4Warriors or vet-to-vet program has taken his or her own life. They have been successful.

One of the shortcomings in our government's approach to dealing with the suicide epidemic among servicemembers and veterans is the assumption that only programs within the DOD and within the VA are capable of dealing with this crisis. Our experience in New Jersey strongly suggests otherwise, and I ask the gentleman from Washington and the chair of the committee for their help in prodding the National Academies and the government at large in evaluating the potential positive role that community-based programs like Vets4Warriors can play in helping defeat the suicide epidemic among our troops and veterans.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman from New Jersey has my assurance we will work with him on this issue. And I would just say that our chairman has been a great leader on this issue. No one has done more than BILL YOUNG on this. I look forward to working with him and trying to make sure that this program is completely and thoroughly evaluated by the Army, by the National Guard, and by the VA.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the comments of Mr. DICKS, our former chairman, and would say that I agree strongly with him, as I do most of the time. We have a great history of working together for many, many years. We will be very happy to work together with you on this issue because it is a very, very important concern to all of us and to all the members of our committee and I know to all the Members of this House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLT. Reclaiming my time, I would reiterate my thanks to the chairman and to the ranking member for the strong attention and sensitive attention that they have given to this matter.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prevents Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stop the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquid jet fuel. This restriction was based on the opinion of some environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel might produce more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional, petroleum-derived fuels.

My amendment is a simple fix, and that fix is to not restrict our fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, bad policies, and misguided regulations like those in section 526.

Placing limits on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's petroleum independence and our national security. Mr. Chair, section 526 restrictions make our Nation more dependent on unstable Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us promote American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs. In addition, and prob-

ably most important, we must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

With increasing competition for energy and fuel resources and with the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to further develop and produce all of our domestic energy resources.

In some circles, there is a misconception that my amendment somehow prevents the Federal Government and our military from being able to produce and use alternative fuels. Mr. Chair, this viewpoint is categorically false. All my amendment does is to allow Federal purchasers, particularly our military, to be able to acquire the fuels that best and most efficiently meet their needs.

I offered a similar amendment to the CJS appropriations bill for FY 2013, and it passed with strong bipartisan support. My identical amendments to four other FY 2013 appropriations bills also each passed by voice vote. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also had language added to the defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

Let's remember the following problems with section 526: one, it increases our reliance on unstable Middle Eastern oil; two, it hurts our military readiness, our national security and our energy security; three, it prevents the increased use of some sources of safe, clean and efficient American oil and gas; four, it hurts American jobs and the American economy; five, last and certainly not least, it costs our taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

My amendment fixes those problems. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, everyone in this House would sleep much easier at night if our airplanes flew on sunbeams and our ships steamed on rainbows, but they don't. They use diesel, and diesel they must have if they are to continue to protect this Nation.

I rise today in strong support of this amendment to lift the restrictions on the military's procurement of alternative fuels enshrined in section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act. I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mr. FLORES and Mr. HENSARLING, for their work with me on this issue.

Section 526 prohibits the military from purchasing alternative fuel products that have "life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions"—that's a mouthful—that are "less than or equal to such emissions from conventional fuel." Mr.

Chair, this prohibition makes no sense to me.

Several months ago, Secretary of the Navy Mabus said:

Our dependence on foreign sources of fossil fuel is rife with danger for our Nation, and it would be irresponsible to continue it. Paying for spikes in oil prices means we may have less money to spend on readiness, which includes procurement. We could be using that money for more hardware and more platforms.

□ 1600

If protecting fuel supply lines and avoiding price volatility are truly the goals of the military—and I do believe that these are worthy objectives—then lifting the restrictions imposed by section 526 should be a no-brainer.

Section 526 puts technology like coal-to-liquids, gas-to-liquids, oil shale, and oil sands out of reach for the United States military. These technologies are capable of meeting the Department's objectives for safeguarding production and reducing price volatility, and in most cases are far more advanced than the exotic biofuels project that the Navy is currently pursuing.

This amendment will offer us a stark choice: The military can meet its strategic fuel supply concerns or operational planning can take a backseat to environmental posturing.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will spend their time talking about how dirty fuel derived from coal-to-liquids or oil sand technology is. They will offer up and knock down straw men dealing with global warming and carbon footprints. But what they will not talk about is the critical need for our Department of Defense to procure the cheapest, most readily available fuel that fulfills its strategic requirements.

I offer my full-throated endorsement for the Department's work to increase its energy efficiency, to reduce the need for fuel convoys, and to limit vulnerabilities in the fuel supply chain. However, those aren't the issues that we're dealing with with this amendment. The question this amendment asks is: Is it appropriate for Congress to continue to prohibit the military from purchasing certain domestically available synthetic fuels?

The Department of Defense's singular objective is to protect this Nation. Department of Defense leaders have made it clear that foreign sources of oil and price volatility present an obstacle to fulfilling that obligation. Lifting the restrictions contained in section 526 will free the military to utilize any technology it believes can help to confront that danger.

I urge my colleagues to join me to lift this irresponsible prohibition and provide the military with the options it needs to manage the long-term, strategic risks facing our Nation.

I thank my good friend for offering this amendment, and I look forward to its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise to support this very, very popular amendment.

Mr. FLORES offered the same amendment to each fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill, and all were accepted by a voice vote. Also, each fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill that has already passed the House includes this amendment. All passed by voice vote, with the exception of CJS, which had a roll-call and a positive vote of over 250 votes "yes." Fifteen Democrats supported the amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY offered an amendment to the FY13 Armed Services Committee bill which has the same effect. The amendment was accepted into the House bill. This obviously is a very popular amendment, and I'm happy to be supportive of it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have a question to the author of the amendment and to those who are supporting it on the other side.

In listening to your discussion, you seem to be in a posture of the military—Navy in this case, and I suppose other branches—having access to alternate fuels. You spoke specifically of coal-based fuels. Are you speaking of all kinds of alternative fuels and that the military should pursue those fuels so that they might be available to pursue them in their development phase as well as when they are fully developed?

Mr. FLORES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLORES. All my amendment does is remove any external restrictions from the Department of Defense being able to acquire fuels. It doesn't restrict their ability to acquire alternative fuels, such as the Green Fleet.

Now, I have issues with paying \$56 a gallon for fuel, but I'm willing to battle that at a future date. I'm not endorsing the use of those expensive fuels. I think they're irresponsible uses of taxpayer funds when the purpose of the military is to defend our country, not to be trying to promote alternative fuels.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Reclaiming my time, sir, in listening to your discussion about the coal-based fuels, clearly those are in the development stage; they're not yet in place. I would assume that in the development stage, the U.S. military would be purchasing those for the purposes of testing as well as providing an early market, a development market, for those fuels. Therefore, I would assume that that same logic would apply to other kinds of biofuels, would it not?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLORES. The logic applies. But again, I think it's an order of magnitude.

For instance, technology to do coal-to-liquids fuels was used by the Germans in World War II. It's been tried in the past. It's still not cost effective. I think there's an order of magnitude. For instance, if the military can do it for, let's say, 50 percent more than it costs for conventional fuel, that's one thing; but if it has to pay 10 times more for biobase fuels, that's another issue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, reclaiming my time, and thank you, sir, for the information.

The point here is that in the early development of all of these fuels, whether they are coal-based or other kinds of biofuels, there is a higher cost in the early stages that presumably and hopefully and, in fact, must be reduced if the Navy is to procure those fuels for the normal utilization of their fleet, or whatever the fuel might be used for. Therefore, in listening to your discussion, which I do support, I think it's important to understand that in the early development there is going to be a higher cost which could not and should not carry forward for the normal use of those fuels.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. It's been argued that section 526 harms our military readiness. This is simply not the case, particularly according to the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has stated this month, very clearly, the provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we need today worldwide to support the military missions. But it also sets an important baseline in developing the fuels that we need for our future.

DOD, the Department of Defense, supports this section and recognizes that tomorrow's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are going to need a greater range of energy sources. In fact, the Department says that repealing this section could, and I'm quoting the Department, "complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy solutions to our warfighters and to take advantage of the promising developments in homegrown biofuels." I would also emphasize the impact it would have on our economy and the creation of new jobs in our economy.

I believe the amendment would damage the development of biofuels, given the fact that the Department of Defense is such a huge procurer of energy, at the worst possible time for our economy. It could send a negative signal to America's advanced biofuel industry and could result in adverse impacts to the U.S. job creation efforts, rural development efforts, and the export of world-leading technology.

I would also emphasize to my colleagues the section does not prevent the sale of fuels that emit more carbon, nor does it prevent the Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need to.

Government policies should help drive the development of alternative fuels that cut carbon emission, not increase it. I think that's a commonsense approach.

Again, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment and, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Flores amendment that will prevent funds in H.R. 5856—the FY13 Defense Appropriations Act—from being used to carry out Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Section 526 prohibits all federal agencies from contracting for alternative fuels that emit higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions than "conventional petroleum sources." This means that if a federal agency—particularly the Department of Defense—attempts to utilize an alternative fuel that even has one scintilla more carbon emissions than conventional fuels, it is prohibited from doing so. As a result, Section 526 limits innovation from DoD to improve clean carbon capture technologies for alternative fuels, thereby increasing our dependence on foreign oil, and will only further increase fuel costs.

The amendment intends to remove the handcuffs placed on the agencies under this bill by Section 526. This means that the DoD will still be able to purchase Canadian fuels with traces of oil sands that may create more of a carbon footprint than completely conventional fuel.

Mr. Chair, I support a full repeal of Section 526 because the cost of refined product for DoD has increased by over 500% in the last ten years when volume only increased by 30%. Furthermore, within the last month, the U.S. Navy spent \$26 per gallon and the U.S. Air Force just spent \$59 per gallon for biofuels used for the Administration's Great Green Fleet Demonstration while conventional fuel bears less of a cost on the Pentagon.

When defense spending is already facing \$600 billion in sequestration cuts, we must find commonsense ways to best utilize taxpayer dollars. This amendment takes a very important step of achieving this goal by prohibiting funding to carry out Section 526 for the upcoming fiscal year at the DoD.

With that in mind, I commend my colleague from Texas—BILL FLORES—for his continued leadership on this important issue. I urge this body to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I rise for the purpose of a colloquy between my friend, the chairman from Florida, and the ranking member, my friend from Indiana.

I was planning to introduce an amendment on this issue, an amendment that would require the Department of Defense to buy American flags that are made in America by American workers using American-grown and manufactured materials.

Wherever an American flag is flown, it's a symbol of the freedoms men and women throughout our history have marched, fought, and died to secure.

□ 1610

There's no greater symbol of our country, our unity, our freedom, and our liberty than our flag.

The Veterans Administration is already required, by law, to purchase 100 percent American-made flags of American-made materials to drape the caskets of each deceased war hero.

I understand that there are already requirements prohibiting the Department of Defense from purchasing certain items not produced in the United States, but there are no requirements for the Department of Defense to purchase American-made American flags.

I believe it's important that every American flag the Department of Defense buys should be made in America by American workers with American materials. It's as simple as that.

At a time when our domestic manufacturing sector is struggling, and millions in our country are out of work, it's a slap in the face to all Americans to have their tax dollars spent on flags that are made overseas.

I ask the gentlemen here today with me, do you share my concerns about this issue? Will you and the ranking member, Mr. Chairman, work with me to address this omission, and help to ensure that the brave men and women in uniform receive American-made American flags?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for discussing this with us earlier on. We have had a very good conversation, and I would say that I am strongly supportive of what the gentleman has just said.

I believe that the American flag should be made in America, with American materials, whatever they might be. And so I do share that, and I guarantee him that we will continue to work with him to find a workable solution to see that this does happen.

I thank the gentleman for raising the issue. I thank him, again, for discussing this early on with me, and I'm here to be supportive.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Reclaiming my time, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to working with you.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and would associate myself with the remarks of the chairman.

I really appreciate the gentleman raising this issue before the body, and certainly want to work with Mr. THOMPSON, as well as the chairman of the committee, on this very important issue, and certainly pledge myself to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Indiana, and look forward to working with both of them and others in the House to ensure that we can bring this to resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the Operation and Maintenance funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 41106 of title 49, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to bring this forward.

Congress has a responsibility to see that funds are spent appropriately by the Department of Defense to support missions and provide for our national security.

The Department has been using foreign-owned aircraft to carry equipment in and out of Afghanistan, totaling over \$140 million year-to-date. These missions could have been completed by American carriers.

American carriers are regulated by the FAA and have a much better safety record than foreign airlines. And U.S. government dollars go to develop U.S. jobs.

The U.S. government specifically designated the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, or CRAF, to supplement national security air transport needs through partnership with private U.S.-based airlines. The program allows civilian airlift capability to integrate with military command structures on short notice.

Using foreign-owned aircraft is not only disadvantageous for our military carriers but also for U.S. commercial airlines that have dedicated aircraft to CRAF. It removes the incentive for American carriers to hire American workers and use American mechanics and suppliers, and ultimately harms a vital national security program.

This amendment requires that the Department of Defense use American-owned and operated aircraft whenever possible to move cargo and passengers. It ensures that troops in the field get what they need by allowing the Department to use foreign carriers when necessary. It strengthens this vital national security program and assures that American dollars are spent on American services.

Current law, the Fly CRAF Act, is not being complied with to the extent, again, of \$140 million. It has gone to foreign carriers this year, and unapproved carriers are being assigned CRAF missions. This "leakage" from CRAF programs is a threat to the viability of our CRAF carriers, the program, and ultimately, our warfighters.

I would encourage all Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this excellent amendment, and I thank Mr. RUNYAN for offering it today. And so I do accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), appropriations made in title IX of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$12,670,355,000.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to the following accounts in title IX:

- (1) "Afghanistan Security Forces Fund".
- (2) "Defense Health Program".
- (3) "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense".
- (4) "Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund".
- (5) "Office of the Inspector General".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered by Mr. JONES and myself. The current Overseas Contingency Operation budget is based on the assumption that we will have 68,000 troops in Afghanistan throughout the entire fiscal year 2013. However, this is not the plan that our Commander in Chief has put forth, nor is it the plan that many of us who would like to see the war come to a quick end would support.

As President Obama has repeatedly stated, we are winding down this war. After withdrawing the surge troops by the end of this summer, that will bring us to 68,000 troops at the beginning of the 2013 fiscal year. We will continue to bring our troops home from Afghanistan, and I quote the President, "at a steady pace."

This amendment captures the billions of dollars that we will save by pursuing this steady drawdown of troops, as opposed to maintaining troop levels at 68,000 throughout the entire fiscal year 2013, and then presumably, on October 1, bring 28,000 troops home.

This amendment would cut \$12.67 billion from the Overseas Contingency Fund.

Let me be clear about what this amendment does not do. It does not cut funding for troops on the ground in Afghanistan. I believe, as do all of my colleagues who have advocated for an accelerated end to this war, that our troops in harm's way should have all the resources they need to safely execute their mission. And I am committed to ensuring that our troops on the ground have the best equipment and the compensation that they deserve.

This amendment does cut the OCO funds that are unneeded and would not be used if we pursue the President's steady drawdown plan. In these fiscal times, stringent as they are, we should not be paying for things that we're not going to buy and that we don't need, and we certainly don't need to further pad the OCO budget.

The committee has already approved an extra \$3.25 billion cushion on the OCO fund that was not even part of the President's request. We have already spent half a trillion dollars of taxpayer dollars on the war in Afghanistan, and the Department of Defense can't even account for many of those funds, lost due to contractor fraud or Afghan corruption.

□ 1620

When we take into account the long-term costs of this war, such as servicing our debt and caring for the wounded warriors, the costs are even more staggering.

Many of us support a quicker timeline of withdrawing troops from Afghanistan than the President has proposed. After a decade of war, we recognize that our core national security objectives have been met in Afghanistan and that there is no U.S. military solution to the remaining challenges in the Afghanistan nation.

We began our military operations in Afghanistan to eliminate those international terrorist organizations that threaten the United States. Thanks to the remarkable bravery and competency of our men and women in uniform, al Qaeda has been virtually eliminated from Afghanistan; terrorist training camps have been demolished; and Osama bin Laden is dead. Thousands have given their lives to accomplish this, and tens of thousands have suffered life-altering wounds. It is now time for our troops to come home.

It is also time for this House not to waste further money. This amendment is not about ending the war. It is about reducing the deficit by \$12.67 billion. We can do that by capturing the billions of dollars saved by the President's proposed troop drawdown and by redirecting those funds towards reducing the deficit and by bolstering our fiscal security here at home.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. First, I would like to say that I understand the sincerity of the gentleman's presentation. It is very much like a number of other amendments that we have had.

Mr. Chairman, in Afghanistan, we are in a very critical position. I think it's important that we allow the military commanders—those who are commanding our troops, those who are leading our troops into combat—to tell us how we achieve our goal and then how we depart from Afghanistan. We need their advice.

I will tell you that I have been to Afghanistan, but I've seen more of the war at the hospital at Walter Reed in Bethesda. I've seen too many young folks—men and women—who are quadruple amputees, triple amputees, and who have more serious mental issues and traumatic brain injuries. From my weekly visits there, I can tell you that this is a mean, mean, nasty war with a mean, mean, nasty enemy.

We have got to let, not politics, but the wisdom, the vision, the knowledge, the advice of our military commanders in the field who are responsible for this operation make our decisions. Their advice is not compatible with this amendment, so I do strongly oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman.

My apologies to Mr. JONES who was about to stand up and speak on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your sincerity and your extraordinary work on the issue—a very, very difficult issue. I share with you the obvious compassion that you have for our troops—those who are there and those who have been wounded. However, if I might pose a question:

The Commander in Chief, who presumably had the advice of the generals on the ground and in the Pentagon, has stated clearly that at the beginning of the next fiscal year, which would be October 1 of this year, there would be 68,000 troops on the ground in Afghanistan and that there would be a steady drawdown, or a steady pace, so that at the end of the fiscal year there would be some 40,000 troops, which would be September 30, 2013. Now, a steady drawdown would assume that you would take 28,000 troops, and you would remove them on a steady basis so that, over the course of that year, you would have half the troops in the country and the other half would be gone. That being the case, you don't need to budget for all 68,000 being there the entire year. In fact, you budget for something between 40,000 and 68,000. However, the

appropriation that we have before us actually assumes that all 68,000 are going to be there until October 1 of 2013. That's not what the President has said. That's apparently not what the generals are planning and what the planning and execution is.

So what this amendment simply does is to recognize what it is that the generals intend to do as commanded by the Commander in Chief. Now, we may disagree with that, but the advice just given to me by the chairman is that we ought to pay attention to the generals, who are apparently saying a steady drawdown. There is \$12.5 billion at stake here, and what we are trying to do is to capture that. Now, at least there would be concern that something would go awry and that the drawdown wouldn't occur. The appropriation actually places a \$3.2 billion cushion for unexpected contingencies.

So what are we doing here? Do we care about the deficit or not? My amendment simply speaks to: let's be wise with the taxpayers' money. Let's not appropriate money that should not or is not apparently going to be necessary, and if there is a contingency, there is a \$3 billion cushion built into this budget and into this appropriation already.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I strongly support the effort by my colleague from California.

I would say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that it's certainly the case that, once the society through which democratic processes has determined what it wants to do in a military area, then we need the technical advice from the military experts. But there is a prior question with regard to Afghanistan: Should we be staying there?

It wasn't up to the military—and they never claimed that it was—to go in on their own. They went in pursuant to a vote of this House and of the Senate. It is the duty of the Members of this House to decide whether, in taking all of the factors into account, the time has come to wind it down or not. Once a decision is made, then we listen to the military.

Clearly, what is at stake here in this amendment is not simply a technical question of the way in which the logistics of a drawdown are handled but, really, whether or not the House wants to affirm that the time has come to begin a steady withdrawal. I might also add I would like to go more quickly than this amendment would allow, but we probably won't have the votes for that.

I disagree with the notion that this is a matter on which the elected representatives of the American people must defer to military experts. Yes, we will once we have made the democratic decision about what to do. But with all

of the factors taken into account, the time has come, just as this House authorized the military to go in, to reaffirm the decision that the time has come to begin to withdraw. So I very much support the gentleman's amendment in that particular context.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The President has said, with the advice from the military, it is time to bring the war in Afghanistan to an end and to bring our troops home.

I have the greatest respect for the gentleman who is the chairman and who was just here, Mr. YOUNG.

I've signed over 10,474 letters for those who have given their lives for this country. Many families are divorced. And I take the pain home every weekend. No, it's not like being in Afghanistan, but I don't forget the war. I don't think many of my colleagues here forget the war. I want to make that clear.

I go to Walter Reed and Bethesda—now that they've been consolidated—and I've seen four kids that have no body parts below the waist. One of them is from Florida. He is Corey Kent. I never will forget him. He is the first one I ever met who had no body parts below his waist. He is 23 years of age, and he is a private in the United States Army.

□ 1630

I look at all the waste in Afghanistan. It is a country that will never change, no matter what you do. History has proven that. What Mr. GARAMENDI's amendment says is let's stick to the plan that's been laid out by the President with the advice of the military.

I worry about the wounded. The \$12 billion that Mr. GARAMENDI is talking about saving could be spent to take care of the wounded.

Mr. Chairman, there is a book called "The Three Trillion Dollar War," written by Dr. Joe Stiglitz and coauthored by Professor Linda Bilmes at Harvard University. Dr. Stiglitz is now saying, no, it's not the three trillion dollar war when you factor in all the pain and the wounded from Afghanistan. I would rewrite the title of the book to be "The Five Trillion Dollar War."

Are we prepared for that tsunami that is coming? No. We are a country that is financially broke, but we owe those who have given so much. That's all this amendment is doing. It's saying let's follow the plan by the President and advice from the generals. Let's save \$12 billion, spend it on the wounded and take care of their pain for the next 25 or 30 years.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will look seriously at

this amendment. Let's do what is right first for the wounded and their families; and, secondly, let's do what's right for the taxpayers and their families and bring this war to an end. If we don't do it here in Congress, there will be no end. It will be 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

Let's pass this amendment. Let's say to the President, Sir, we trust you. You listened to the generals, and this is the plan to bring an end to Afghanistan because it is a corrupt country, and nothing will change no matter what we do or how many lives we expend or how much money we expend. It will never change.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,072,581,000.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available for—

- (1) accounts in title I;
- (2) "Other Department of Defense Programs—Defense Health Program"; and
- (3) accounts in title IX.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. The amendment is fairly simple. It's an amendment to seek to freeze defense spending for 1 single year. It is not a cut. Only in Washington, D.C., could we spend more money from one year to the next and call it a cut.

This is not a "cut" amendment. This is an amendment to freeze spending for 1 year. It is an amendment to set the base defense spending levels at \$518 billion, the exact same amount as last year's appropriation that was approved just a few months ago. It is \$2 billion above what the Pentagon asked for. It is also \$2 billion above what the President asked for. While the amendment gives control to the generals over the spending, it still protects military pay, the Defense Health Program, and the war budget.

We've heard arguments in favor of a 1-year freeze before. This amendment is entirely consistent with the Simpson-Bowles plan, and it is entirely consistent with the Domenici-Rivlin plan.

What arguments will we hear against it? We may hear, as we've heard earlier today, that the defense budget has already been cut \$39 billion over the last 2 years. This is the base defense budget for the last 2 years and the base defense budget in this year.

The base defense spending has gone up from 2011 to 2012. If the bill passes unamended, it will go up again this year. Only in Washington, D.C., is that considered a \$39 billion cut.

We may hear that the CBO says that the Pentagon is still \$9 billion short based upon a report they released earlier this month. I have the report. The report reads:

To execute its base-budget plans for 2013, the Department would require appropriations 1.4 percent less than last year's appropriation.

We may also hear the argument that this amendment would compromise our defense in some fashion. That can only be true if the same exact appropriation that we passed just 6 months ago put our defense at risk, because this is the exact same spending level as we established 6 months ago.

The one thing we do know is that even with this amendment, if this amendment would pass, we will be spending more on defense spending than the Pentagon asked for and that the President asked for, and we will be spending exactly the same as we did last year.

We've heard a lot in the last day or two about "austerity." It's another word that, I think, has lost its traditional meaning. It means something different in Washington than it does back home.

"Austerity," to me, means spending less. Total discretionary spending will be up this year. Total mandatory spending will be up this year. Total government spending will be up this year. We are still facing a \$1 trillion deficit by the time that this year is over. We need to do better in getting our spending under control. It is easy to cut things that we do not like on both sides of the aisle; it is hard to cut things that we like.

The defense of this Nation means a tremendous amount to me, as I know it means to every Member of this Chamber. If I thought for a second that this amendment would put a single soldier at risk, if I thought for a second that this amendment would put a single citizen at risk, I would take it down immediately. All it does is freeze spending from last year. If we cannot do that simple task, do we really think we have an honest chance of solving our debts and our deficit problems?

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, respectfully, I think this is an appropriate time to remind our colleagues that under the Constitution, national defense is the top priority of the House and Senate. Article I, section 8 gives Congress specific authority to declare war, raise and support armies, provide for a navy, establish the rules for the operation of American military forces.

It was in this context that, under Chairman YOUNG, our subcommittee carefully reviewed, over many months, the President's budget and Secretary Panetta's new strategic guidance for the Defense Department. Frankly, we found the administration's approach lacking in many respects. In several key areas, the subcommittee was concerned that the level of risk tolerated by the Armed Forces was unacceptable. We've talked a lot about that on the floor over the last couple of days.

As the Constitution requires, we made adjustments, which is our duty and obligation. Yet even within the allocation that is \$3.1 billion higher than our President's request, our subcommittee could have done more for our national security and for our troops, with more resources.

I want our colleagues to know that our subcommittee clearly recognizes the size and nature of the Nation's deficit and debt. That's why we found areas and programs for reduction that were possible without adversely impacting the warfighter or any efforts towards modernization and readiness.

Exercising our mandate to adhere to sound budgeting, we reclaimed funding for programs that were terminated or restructured since the budget was released by the President. We achieved savings from favorable contract pricing adjustments and schedule delays. We cut unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need. We took decisions and surplus from prior years.

Even with these steps to stretch our defense dollars, there remains capability gaps:

In the Navy, we've heard a lot about that over the last couple of days. Our fleet needs more ships. They've got more responsibilities in the Asia Pacific;

The Air Force tactical fighters are aging rapidly. They've had a lot of activity in Iraq and Afghanistan;

The Army is struggling to modernize its ground combat inventory;

The Marines need their version of the F-35, the Joint Strike Fighter;

We need to be prepared to respond to every future crisis. Who knows where that may be.

□ 1640

Syria is engulfed in a civil war. North Korea is unpredictable. Russia wants to reclaim its former glory. China is on the fast track to a stronger military. Iran is working night and day to acquire nuclear weapons. Al Qaeda, Hezbollah and other terrorist groups continue to plot and plan.

Obviously, the future is challenging, to say the least; and we do our troops

and our citizens a disservice if we do not prepare for the next crisis. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us includes funding for critical national security needs and provides the necessary resources to continue the Nation's vital military efforts abroad.

The Department of Defense has already sustained significant budget reductions. Cuts to the military have accounted for over half the deficit reduction efforts achieved so far, nearly \$500 billion, even though national defense accounts for only 20 percent of the entire Federal budget, which is sharply reduced from the 40 percent or more before and during Vietnam.

These are real cuts, not simply reductions to planned future spending. But given the military's urgent needs, their vital role in maintaining global stability, and this House's responsibility to protect America and Americans, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to join my colleague from South Carolina in an effort to make a small reduction in the Appropriations Committee's recommendation. Our colleague from New Jersey is right, the Constitution gives this power to the Congress, not to the Appropriations Committee, to the entire Congress.

The cuts that are being talked about consist, in the numbers—that I have seen in light of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—are entirely due to the fact that we have had a drawdown of the troops in Iraq. Now I shouldn't stop at the fact that we did reduce the money we're spending in Iraq, because that's the problem with this budget. Yes, we have threats. The problem with this budget is it is dealing with the current threats, and it's dealing with past threats. This budget fully funds a capacity to win a thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union. I do not think that's a significant threat today.

This continues the commitment made courageously by Harry Truman in a bipartisan way to defend Western and Central Europe against Stalin and his hordes because we went into Europe 65 years ago when the Communists were menacing and the European nations were weak, and we said we will protect you. We are still doing that. They're not weak, and they're not threatened; but we are still protecting them.

Look at the budgets as a percentage of gross domestic product from all of those wealthy nations in Western Europe. They are less than half of ours.

On the other hand, the French are now contemplating reducing the retirement age for certain people who

worked a certain amount of years, the official retirement age, from 62 to 60, while we're being told we may have to raise ours. How come the French can do that? Very simple: we've picked up their tab.

Yes, there are problems with China, there are problems with Iran, there are problems with North Korea. Tens of thousands of troops in Western Europe have got nothing to do with that. Yes, we should have a nuclear capacity and the submarines and the airplanes are important, but we've got three ways to destroy the Soviet Union, which no longer exists, and it's replaced by a much weaker Russia.

Couldn't we say to the Pentagon—and I know there is a great reluctance here to appear to be anything but totally deferential to them—couldn't we say to them, you've got three ways to win a thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union. Could you pick two and save much less than this \$1 billion.

There is also the question of the culture. The general response of this Agency when an agency is inefficient is to crack down. When the Pentagon is inefficient, the money keeps going.

I am told there are cuts. It was my understanding this budget, the base budget, leaving aside the war in Iraq, which has wound down, is larger than it's ever been. No, these are cuts from what the Pentagon was supposed to have.

Let's understand also this has now become a zero-sum game. Unless you are prepared to ignore the deficit problem, every dollar you put into the Pentagon over and above what I believe is needed is coming from somewhere.

I don't know how Members can go to people who are on Medicare and explain to them that there are going to be these cutbacks, or to tell people on Social Security who have been doing physical labor all of their lives not to work another year or two, and then put money in the Defense budget that is not necessary.

We are told that, well, we have to be able to protect ourselves. Against whom do we need it all?

One of the things, we are told we need more ships because we have got to protect the shipping lanes between here and China. These are, of course, shipping lanes on which the Chinese make an enormous amount of money.

The notion that the Chinese plan to shut down the shipping lanes, which are the basis for their enormous surplus of trade with America, seems to me somewhat skeptical; but we still have a greater defense than the Chinese. I noted that the Chinese recently launched an aircraft carrier, their first one. They bought it, I believe, from the Ukraine and outfitted it with model airplanes so they can learn how to do it. Now, I don't deny that there are some threats there.

The question is not whether or not we should be the strongest Nation in the world. Of course we should be, and we are. The question is by how many

multiples do we need to be stronger than any combination of enemies.

My only reluctance on this amendment is I'm embarrassed by the fact that it's only a billion, but I think the gentleman from South Carolina made a correct decision. Members will have their choices. If there is any seriousness about deficit reduction across the board in this House, this amendment will pass.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

I rise very briefly to respond to a few points made by my colleague and friend from New Jersey. Yes, North Korea is a threat. Yes, Iran is a difficulty. Yes, China's role in the world is growing, and we will need to deal with that. No, Syria was not a problem last year, but Egypt was. All of these were challenges to us last year. All of these were challenges to us just 6 months ago when we set the base Defense appropriation at \$518 billion, and \$518 billion was good enough 6 months ago. It should be good enough today.

I received a letter regarding this particular amendment, and it used a lot of the same language the gentleman from New Jersey did. It mentioned that these were real cuts already, that the cuts we have put in place regarding the defense budget were real cuts, not cuts in future growth. This is the CBO's estimate of the defense-based budget for the next 15 or 20 years.

Can someone please show me in this dark line, which is the base budget, where the cuts are? Because in my world, when we cut spending, those graphs go down. The only reductions that we have seen, the only real reductions that we have seen in defense spending are in the overseas on the global war on terror, which we all agree was a good thing because it came as a result of winding up operations in Iraq and reducing operations in Afghanistan.

But what we do in this town is when we increase spending on the global war on terror, we don't count it as an increase; but when we cut spending on that same thing, we do count it as a cut, and that is simply not right. It's not fair, and it's not honest with people back home. We should tell people how we spend their money.

To sit here and say that the cuts that the Defense Department has incurred already are real cuts is not accurate. The sequester is. This is not a debate about the sequester, because I am as opposed to the sequester as anybody in this room. I have voted several times to replace it with spending reductions in other places. That's not what this discussion is about. This is about

whether or not the \$518 billion that was good enough 6 months ago is good enough today.

With that, I ask once again for support for the amendment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a June 28 article from The Hill:

But U.S. dominance in every dimension of military power is clear. In recent years we have been building "strategic depth" into this dominance without regard to its costs—to our Treasury and to our other priorities. A responsible rollback of our military budget is achievable with no sacrifice to our security.

The author is Lawrence Wilkerson, chief of staff to Colin Powell when he was Secretary of State, and he was special assistant to Colin Powell when General Powell was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So, yes, there were times when I think: let's take some advice from some military experts.

[From The Hill, June 28, 2012]

THE EXECUTIVE VIEWPOINT—TIME TO BITE  
THE BULLET

(By Lawrence Wilkerson)

Though the U.S. budget process has been going through the motions in 2012, the real action will take place at the end of the year, when several budget overhaul strategies will converge. Around town, the train wreck metaphor is getting the most use to describe what will happen. But whatever does happen, it is certain that large cuts are coming.

Those cuts come as three wars—Afghanistan, Iraq and the global war on terror—are driving national security spending to levels not seen since World War II. Since these wars have been paid for by borrowing, they have contributed mightily to our budget deficit and diverted resources from other investments in our domestic strength.

It is time for a responsible build-down of the post-9/11 build-up. But an extraordinary feature of the dysfunctional policies of Washington is the strenuous expenditure of time and money devoted to ensuring this doesn't happen. Most of this intensity has focused on exempting the military budget from the coming sequestration of funds mandated by current law. This is unwise, because the military—or better said, the national security account—can and should contribute to our getting our fiscal house in order. In fact, we could cut our national security budget by a trillion dollars over the next decade without jeopardizing our security. Moreover, we could rebalance that budget as we cut and actually enhance our security.

The national security budget includes the Intelligence, Veterans Affairs and Homeland Security agencies, as well as bureaus dealing with international affairs and nuclear weapons issues (mostly in the Department of Energy) and, of course, the Pentagon. Last year the total was about \$1.2 trillion. The huge component in that budget is the Pentagon, at more than 50 percent of the total spending. So that is where everyone concentrates what he or she wants to cut, keep or increase. That's where most of the rhetoric is expended, too.

But this view is myopic.

National security is composed as much of good intelligence and competent diplomacy as it is of bombs, bullets and bayonets; indeed, one hopes more so. Thus, looking at the national security budget as a whole, with

all its components, demonstrates clearly that it is out of balance. Too much money is going to the iron and steel part of the budget and too little to the velvet glove.

That's the first problem that needs correcting, the balance. The second is the Pentagon. As the largest item by far in the discretionary budget, not to mention in the security budget, Pentagon spending has the largest influence over the reducing/rebalancing equation.

The United States began the new millennium with a string of military budget increases, paid for by borrowing, that swelled the deficit while bringing us to the highest levels of Pentagon spending since World War II. Our current military expenditures account for more than half of the world's total. We spend as much as the next 17 countries put together, most of them our allies. And we spend more in real terms now than we did on average when we did have a formidable adversary—the Soviet Union—that was spending about as much as we were and arguably constituted an existential threat to America. No such threat exists today, nor can we see a comparable one in the future, China's rise notwithstanding.

Guaranteeing perfect security is impossible. But U.S. dominance in every dimension of military power is clear. In recent years we have been building "strategic depth" into this dominance without regard to its costs—to our treasury and to our other priorities. A responsible rollback of our military budget is achievable with no sacrifice to our security.

The specifics of this judicious rollback are contained in the Unified Security Budget (USB) published by the Institute for Policy Studies and the Center for American Progress, a budget I helped compile. Not only does this USB cut a trillion dollars over 10 years, it rebalances the budget so that the steel and the glove are in better proportions.

It is time for wise men and women to put partisanship aside, ignore the siren calls of defense contractors, stop taking counsel of their fears and get down to business with the national security budget. No aspect of the federal budget should be exempt from helping the nation get its fiscal act together. This soldier of 31 years knows that national security—including the Pentagon—can join this effort with no danger to the republic.

□ 1650

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. I rise in support of the amendment.

There's a news report out today that suggests that very soon the United States will have over 1,000 bases of various kinds around the world, and it raises the question as to whether or not we're overextending. As the budget keeps growing, the tendency is to keep overextending.

We already know that our basic force is being taxed with an overextension of duty. So if you introduce a notion of fiscal discipline here that will not in any way undermine the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, but fiscal discipline that will send a message to this administration: Don't go overextending. We know what our core mission is. We know that we have the ability to defend this country. Be careful you don't overextend.

This amendment, which has bipartisan support, is something that is an important moment for this House because, on one hand, the budget that is being prepared through DOD appropriations is sufficient enough for a strong defense, and, on the other hand, we're saying part of a strong defense is fiscal accountability. The two actually go hand in hand.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues and good friends, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. DICKS.

First of all, I'd like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this very important legislation. Their efforts to strengthen our national defense and support our men and women in uniform have been tireless, and they truly should be commended. Moreover, I'm very pleased that they make key investments in areas of great interest and concern to me, the first of which is the Virginia class submarine, as well as cybersecurity.

I believe that our technological edge is critical to ensuring that our warfighters not only can do what we ask them to do in the future, but can do so as safely and efficiently as possible. In addition to the Virginia class submarine and cybersecurity, no family of technologies shows as much promise to this end as directed-energy weapons.

With that, I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman and welcome the opportunity to engage with him.

Mr. LANGEVIN. In this vein, I'd like to talk about the decades of investment that this Congress and the Department of Defense have made into directed-energy weapons research. More specifically, I'd like to direct them to a recent report by the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessment that clearly showed many directed-energy technologies have actually matured to the point that cultural factors, not technological maturity, are the most significant barriers to operational deployment.

To this end, I offered an amendment to this year's National Defense Authorization Act that would require a report detailing how we can accelerate the deployment of the most promising directed-energy initiatives; and I recognize the commitment that this bill before us today continues in terms of investing in directed-energy weapons technology, and I would encourage the committee to support these efforts in future appropriations measures.

With that, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The committee is aware of the Department's research into directed-energy capabilities and shares the gentleman from Rhode Island's interest in ensuring that our warfighters have the capabilities they need to operate in the complex environments of the future.

I would assure the gentleman that the committee will continue to make every effort to ensure that the Department of Defense is adequately and effectively resourced to meet the challenges of the future, including the transformational technologies such as directed energy.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I, too, echo the gentleman's interest in the field of directed energy and solid-state laser technology. With the threats and environment that the warfighter and the intelligence community are facing, the addition of new technologies that provide a tactical and strategic edge should be examined more rigorously.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the chairman for his and the ranking member's commitment, and I certainly look forward to working to realize the potential of directed-energy weapons and to harvest the Nation's past investments in this family of technologies.

With that, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We appreciate the gentleman's view. And I will assure him that we'll look forward to working with him and the ranking member, Mr. DICKS, to make sure that our warfighters can realize the benefits of our Nation's research and development investments, including directed energy.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for his hard work on this issue and look forward to working with him.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the ranking member and the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for

any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me just say very, very briefly, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate-fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015. My amendment simply echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Defense Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We're very pleased to accept your amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

Mr. MULVANEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The amounts otherwise provided in title IX of this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Military Personnel, Army", by increasing such amount, by reducing the amount made available for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", and by increasing such amount, by \$4,359,624,000, \$4,359,624,000, \$1,197,682,000, and \$1,197,682,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. This is a follow-up amendment to an amendment that I had offered and we had a chance to debate, and once again I thank the chairman for the opportunity yesterday to discuss the issue before the amendment was ruled out of order.

As you recall, very briefly, \$5.6 billion this year has been moved out of the base defense budget and into the war budget. It violates a policy that we have tried to follow in this House since 9/11, and actually violates a policy that the bill, itself, says we should not violate going forward, beginning in 2014.

□ 1700

I simply tried to draw attention to that in yesterday's amendment which was ruled out of order.

This amendment deals with the exact same thing, and it simply takes that \$5.6 billion out of the budget and puts

it right back in, which sounds like a strange thing to do, but it's the only way within the rules to draw attention to the fact that this \$5.6 billion is in the war budget when it actually should be in the base defense budget.

This is not a spending amendment; this is a good-governance amendment. This is not a spending amendment; it is an accountability amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. Mr. JORDAN from Ohio and Mr. WELCH from Vermont are amongst those joining me in sponsoring this particular amendment.

Again, this is a good-government amendment, and I would think that it would have bipartisan support. I ask for its support.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Not later than 30 days after a contract is awarded using funds appropriated under this Act, the relevant contractor and subcontractor at any tier (and any principal with at least 10 percent ownership interest, officer, or director of the contractor or subcontractor or any affiliate or subsidiary within the control of the contractor or subcontractor) shall disclose to the Administrator of General Services all electioneering communications, independent expenditures, or contributions made in the most recent election cycle supporting or opposing a Federal political candidate, political party, or political committee, and contributions made to a third-party entity with the intention or reasonable expectation that such entity would use the contribution to make independent expenditures or electioneering communications in Federal elections.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, Representative ESHOO and I have submitted this very straightforward amendment for a very simple reason. We believe that it's simply fair and it's good for public disclosure to require defense contractors to publicly show and disclose their political contributions. Money, secret money in par-

ticular, can breed corruption. Sunlight will banish it away.

When government contractors make political contributions, there's no doubt that the officeholder knows who gave the money. The only ones in the dark are the American public. This can lead to pay-to-play corruption where contractors donate to candidates they believe will benefit them, and this would misserve our democracy. We need full disclosure so that the public can ensure that contracts are awarded based on merit rather than money.

Now, some have expressed a concern in the past with disclosure pre-contract. A pre-contract disclosure requirement could be a problem because they fear that agencies would choose contractors for partisan reasons. While I think this is an overstated concern and I don't agree with it, our bill doesn't do that. Our amendment requires disclosure post-contract to avoid any fear of that.

So I just want to say that we are in an era where the public needs to trust Congress and government more than it does. In order to promote real trust and real confidence, we need to implement amendments that will promote transparency and that will let the public know that we are doing the right thing with the public dollar, particularly as it relates to the defense industry.

Let me close by saying I think this amendment is a first step. I'm a proud cosponsor of the DISCLOSE Act by Representative VAN HOLLEN, which requires reporting of all corporate campaign activity.

Also, we won't be able to truly tackle money in politics until we overturn Citizens United, in my opinion. The public agrees with that as a proposition by 82 percent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, this is the, I believe, sixth time that I've come to the floor during this Congress to call for disclosure and full transparency throughout the Federal Government. So this is not my first time on the floor on this issue. I've risen on many bills, and I will continue to because I think it's really critical to help restore the confidence of the American people in their government and how it operates.

I maintain the view, and it's shared by the majority of the American people, that transparency in the use of our tax dollars is absolutely critical. I want to pay tribute to my colleague, Mr. ELLISON, for offering this amendment, and together we support it and offer it to the full House.

I believe that with public dollars come public responsibilities. There are thousands of companies who do business with the Federal Government, and they receive billions of dollars—of public dollars—for their services and products. And I think that all of our constituents deserve to know whether and how they spend these dollars and whether they are used to influence our elections.

The amendment I'm offering with Congressman ELLISON will provide this transparency by requiring that post-award contractors or subcontractors—which is very important, we don't want to interfere with the contracting process whatsoever, but once they have been awarded a contract—disclose all political contributions. This should be the norm of the day.

Disclosure is extraordinarily powerful because it puts the American people in the driver's seat. Constituents deserve to know who is involved in their elections and what their purpose might be. I think it's sad that just a few days ago the United States Senate killed the DISCLOSE Act. It was a sad day for the Congress. But I think the American people are taking note.

Anyone who supports the Citizens United decision, which I don't, legalizing corporate expenditures, should know that eight out of nine Supreme Court Justices endorsed prompt disclosure. Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote:

Disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way.

Now, Republicans supported disclosure before they were against it, and I would hope that my Republican colleagues would come back into the fold. There's no reason to oppose transparency and disclosure unless someone really wants to hide anything. And I don't think any of us wants to hide behind the hiding. It just is not good government. The American people, the people that we are here to represent and have the privilege of representing, deserve more information and not less.

We can bring this about by adopting this policy. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, but I do have a question for the Chairman, if I could.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. STEARNS. The gentlelady from California (Ms. ESHOO) was talking about an amendment that was ruled out of order.

Is it germane for her to be talking about an amendment that is ruled out of order?

□ 1710

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman offered a pro forma amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Is the gentleman prepared to go forward with his amendment?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, that does not exist as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that prohibits funds made available through this act to implement a new enrollment fee for TRICARE for Life beneficiaries.

The Department of Defense may have the authority to raise fees and implement new enrollment fees unless specified by Congress prohibiting such authority. Last year, through the FY 2012 DOD authorization and appropriations process, the administration increased enrollment fees for TRICARE prime beneficiaries for the first time since 1995. My amendment will ensure the administration does not implement a first time ever enrollment fee for TRICARE for Life beneficiaries.

For fiscal year 2013, the administration proposed additional fees and cost-sharing increases, a new annual enrollment fee for TRICARE for Life, aggressive increases in pharmacy copayments, and a cap of \$3,000 per family.

On April 17, 2012, I expressed my opposition to these proposals that were made by this administration on the House floor to raise such fees for our servicemembers and veterans. I quoted the President in a speech he gave about veterans being "shortchanged." Then Senator Barack Obama said on May 18, 2006: "When a young man or woman goes off and serves the country in the military, they should be treated with the utmost dignity and respect when they come home." Mr. President, this

is at least one thing I can fully agree with you on.

Passage of this bill will mark the third consecutive annual decrease in total DOD funding, including Overseas Contingency Operations, since FY 2010. I understand budget cuts need to be made and obviously we need to get our fiscal house in order, but, my colleagues, we owe our veterans quality health care for their service and their sacrifice. We promised to take care of our troops when they came home. As a veteran myself, I can appreciate knowing that our country's support for our troops is not limited to strictly the battlefield.

It is unconscionable that this administration seeks to raise health care costs on more than 9.3 million veterans and their families that are currently eligible for TRICARE when there are other excesses that can surely be cut. For example, we should limit funds to Pakistan before giving DOD the option to raise costs on our veterans. We heard adequately yesterday on Members' opposition to Pakistan for closing supply routes since November 2011 that are necessary for providing our troops in Afghanistan necessary supplies and resources. So I ask Members of this Congress to consider alternative avenues to cut spending before we require 3.3 million veterans that are eligible for TRICARE for Life to sacrifice even further.

I'd like to submit for the RECORD letters of support from the Veterans of Foreign War, VFW, and the American Legion for my amendment prohibiting funds from this act to be used to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program. The Military Association of America also is in support of this effort.

Mr. Chairman, the administration's proposal to increase health care costs on our military represents a very serious breach of faith, as it taxes the oldest cohort of military retirees and their families.

So I conclude by asking my colleagues to support my amendment. By doing so, we honor the promises made to our brave men and women who have sacrificed so much for the freedom that we all enjoy.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

Washington, DC, July 19, 2012.

HON. CLIFF STEARNS,

House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEARNS: The American Legion offers its full support to the Stearns Amendment to H.R. 5856.

The proposed amendment to the 2013 Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 5856) would mandate that no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program.

As you know, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have turned aside the Pentagon's call for higher health care fees, to include a first-ever TRICARE for Life enrollment fee, in the 2013 Defense Authorization bill. However, the president

has threatened a veto of the defense bill, in part, because it does not include increased health care fees for members of the military. As such, the threat of higher health care fees continues.

By resolution, The American Legion requests that all proposals to implement any increases in military retirees' Tricare enrollment fees, deductibles, or premiums be reconsidered; especially before all efforts have been exhausted to remove waste, fraud, and abuse from the Tricare program.

Once again, The American Legion fully supports this amendment and we appreciate your leadership in addressing this critical issue that is important to America's service members, veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

FANG A. WONG,  
National Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF FLORIDA VETERANS  
OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED  
STATES,

Florida, July 18, 2012.

HON. CLIFF STEARNS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEARNS: On behalf of the nearly 90,000 members of Florida's Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Auxiliaries, it gives me great pleasure to endorse your proposed amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act for 2013 that if adopted would prevent the Department of Defense from implementing an enrollment fee for TRICARE for Life.

It has been the long standing position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that TRICARE in its present form is a contract between America and her military retirees. That contract is just as binding now as the contract a young service member signs when he or she joins the military. The Administration's proposal is a most egregious break of faith as it "taxes" the oldest cohort of military retirees and their families.

Once again thank you for your enduring support of Florida's veterans, military retirees, active service members and their families.

Respectfully,

WAYNE E. CARRIGNAN,  
State Commander.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Stearns' amendment would prohibit funds from being used to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program.

The Department of Defense does not currently have the authority to establish such a fee, but did submit a legislative proposal to do so. The House-passed National Defense Authorization Act chose not to adopt the legislative request that would give the Department this authority.

While this Defense Appropriations bill does not have jurisdiction on TRICARE issues, we support strongly what Mr. STEARNS intends to do, so we accept the amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague from Florida.

I just want to say to the distinguished former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, chairman emeritus, and also the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, that I appreciate his endorsement. Notwithstanding that, I would say to him that his acceptance is good, but I think the floor should have a vote on this.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract using procedures that do not give to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans (as that term is defined in section 3(q)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3))) that are included in the database under section 8127(f) of title 38, United States Code, any preference available with respect to such contract, except for a preference given to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as that term defined in section 3(q)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(2))).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, for generations, brave young men and women from across the United States have answered the call of duty in service of our Nation. Now, as the conflicts on foreign fields continue to wind down, we must ensure that we do not lose sight of the need to care for and provide for our returning veterans.

Our Nation has learned from generations of veterans that war does not end when the camps are packed in, the planes are grounded, the ships are docked, and our soldiers set foot on American soil.

General Washington once reminded us that the willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation. However, during these difficult economic times, our veterans are still

faced with challenges as they return to civilian life.

In March of this year, the Bureau of Labor and Statistics reported that among veterans who have served in the post 9/11 era, the unemployment rate is 12 percent higher than the national average. Among young male veterans under the age of 24, the unemployment rate is 29 percent—nearly one-third are unemployed. One unemployed veteran is one too many, but these statistics demonstrate an economic reality which is quite unacceptable.

It is important to understand that this hardship comes not from a lack of willingness to work by our veterans but rather from a lack of opportunity. Consider that according to the most recent census, over 2.4 million of our Nation's veterans are now small business owners. Veteran-owned companies now make up 9 percent of all U.S. firms. The Small Business Administration now estimates that one in seven veterans is self-employed or is a small business owner. And finally, nearly a quarter of veterans say they're interested in starting or buying their own business. So our veterans continue to do their part.

□ 1720

It is clear that our Nation's veterans are ready and willing to invest in our economy if we provide them with the opportunities they seek and, quite frankly, with the opportunities that they deserve.

With the President's announcement earlier this year that all of our young men and women will be home from Afghanistan within the next 2 years, as a community and as a country, must begin working now to ensure that we are providing our returning servicemen and -women with job opportunities as they seek to reintegrate into civilian life.

To address this, I've offered legislation called the Fairness to Veterans Act to provide the same preferences given to other preference groups in Federal contracting. It levels the playing field for veteran-owned businesses to help get our economy moving and our veterans back to work. This amendment furthers the goal of the Fairness to Veterans Act.

As our Nation struggles to achieve an economic recovery, we should be looking to utilize the talent and leadership skills of our Nation's veterans. These men and women volunteered to selflessly serve our country and, in order to succeed, must display self-discipline and leadership. It is character traits like these that should be nurtured and fostered to help our economy grow again.

Ultimately, all of our efforts in the House must be focused on putting our constituents back to work, and this legislation will do just that by creating new opportunities for our veterans. With the passage of this amendment, we will be one step closer to leveling the playing field for our veterans.

The guidelines included in this amendment will provide veteran-owned businesses with the access they need to grow and to create jobs. The skill sets possessed by our highly trained veterans are unmatched across the globe. In fact, our fighting men and women are, unquestionably, the most highly trained, highly skilled workforce in history. It is critical that we fully utilize their expertise to put our economy back on the right track.

The men and women of the military have risked their lives in service to us. This amendment is our opportunity to begin to repay that incredible debt.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in furtherance of working with staff to institute this policy of fairness to veterans in a way that will benefit our returning veterans and benefit our country.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that what he wants to do, I want to share with him and to help him do that.

I had to, under the rules, reserve the point of order, but I would hope that the gentleman would let us be part of this effort to accomplish what it is he wants to do within the rules.

I withdraw my reservation on his request to withdraw.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with you.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person or other entity listed in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) as having been convicted of fraud against the Federal Government.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. My amendment is simple. It says, if you seek to be a Department of Defense contractor and you have previously defrauded the Federal Government, you shouldn't be able to receive a contract from the DOD.

According to the Congressional Research Service, in fiscal 2010, the Department of Defense obligated \$366 billion to contracts, which is 54 percent, more than half of the total of Department of Defense obligations. There are rules and regulations in place that prevent Federal contracts from going to entities that have broken the law.

Under the Federal acquisitions regulation, Federal agencies are required to

award contracts only to responsible sources. And Federal acquisition regulation subpart 9104-1 states that a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics is one of the general standards of responsibility. But the term “responsible” is not explicitly defined anywhere in the law, and I know that we cannot try to define new terms using the amendment process, and that’s not what we’re trying to do here.

The fact is that someone could commit fraud against the government and still get a contract with the Department of Defense, and that’s wrong. We have to make clear that companies who’ve defrauded the taxpayers should not be able to get more DOD contracts.

I’d like to point out that the underlying bill being debated here contains a specific prohibition against the use of Department of Defense funds in contracts with anyone who has an unpaid tax liability. Again, a party bidding on government contracts is supposed to affirm that they have no unpaid tax liability.

So the point of this amendment is to make it absolutely clear that contract fraud against the American taxpayer will not be tolerated. According to groups like the Project on Government Oversight, which is only able to track the number of known and disclosed settlements, there have been dozens of instances of contractors committing government contract fraud since 1995. And of those dozens that are known to have committed this fraud, a total of \$544 million in fines was paid. That’s a tiny amount, really, when you’re talking about in terms of fines, compared to the billions appropriated for Department of Defense contracts in the last decade.

Bottom line, if you defraud the taxpayer, you should lose your privilege to receive more taxpayer money. So I would urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will not oppose this amendment because I want to make sure that the Defense Department does not hire bad contractors. And I agree with Mr. KUCINICH strongly on this issue.

The only comment that I would make is we’ve just seen this amendment just a few minutes ago, and we have not really had time to analyze it, so if we could make any further explanation. But I’m not going to oppose the amendment. I suspect it’s going to pass. It probably should because none of us want the Defense Department to hire bad contractors.

Good job, Mr. KUCINICH.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to negotiate, enter into, or implement any agreement with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan that includes security assurances for mutual defense, unless the agreement—

(1) is in the form of a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate (or is intended to take that form in the case of an agreement under negotiation); or

(2) is specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For purposes of this section, an agreement shall be considered to include security assurances for mutual defense if it includes provisions addressing any of the following:

(1) A binding commitment to deploy United States Armed Forces in defense of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, or of any government or faction in Afghanistan, against any foreign or domestic threat.

(2) The number of United States Armed Forces personnel to be deployed to, or stationed in, Afghanistan.

(3) The mission of United States Armed Forces deployed to Afghanistan.

(4) The duration of the presence of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Thank you very much.

Even though the chairman has a point of order, I want to explain why I think this amendment is important. I am working with ROSA DELAURO on this amendment.

This amendment simply says that any long-term security agreement with Afghanistan must be conducted as a treaty or authorized by Congress.

In 2008, this Congress was outraged that a long-term security agreement would be concluded without input from Congress. I wonder where the outrage is today? We’re in worse financial shape than we were in 2008, and I would hope that Congress would see that we have a need and a responsibility.

This agreement, signed last month, was submitted to the Afghan Parliament, but not to the United States Congress. Where is the outrage?

My colleague, Ms. DELAURO, led the effort in the House in 2008 to return Congress to its constitutional responsibility. We must decide when and where our men and women go to fight.

I would like to commend Ms. DELAURO for having the courage to help lead this effort again today. No matter who is the President, it is the responsibility of Congress to commit U.S. troops and fund this agreement.

Mr. Chairman, there are estimates that say we will be up to 30,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan until 2024. This will cost over \$500 billion.

□ 1730

Yet, if we don’t support legislation like we are talking about today, we will have no say, no say at all. I don’t know why the taxpayers aren’t outraged by what is happening with this national security agreement with Afghanistan. The fact remains we simply don’t have what the numbers are going to be and what the cost is going to be with this national security agreement with Afghanistan.

We in Congress have a responsibility. Our responsibility is to make sure that we have checks and balances with any administration. When our country is in such a bad financial situation, hopefully we will not allow a 10-year agreement to just slide by Congress with \$500 billion at stake and with maybe even more of our young men and women being killed.

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of more minutes.

I have a very dear friend who is the former Commandant of the Marine Corps. I have an arrangement with him that I will not use his name in a public forum, but if any of my friends here today—the chairman or the ranking member—asks me his name, I’ll come up and tell you. I sent him an email after we signed this security agreement with Afghanistan.

I said to the former Commandant: What do you think about this agreement?

I got three paragraphs back, but I will read just a couple of sentences. He wrote:

Simply put, I am not in favor of the agreement signed. It basically keeps the United States in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt regime. It continues to place our troops at risk.

I know that my friend from Connecticut will speak in just a moment, and I look forward to her words.

I hope that the Congress in 2013, no matter who the President is, will bring this issue back. Let’s have a debate in the House of Representatives, and let’s say to the American people that we will meet our responsibility: that we will not send troops, that we will not send money to Afghanistan unless the Congress, itself, approves it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for you and for the ranking member. I am sorry he is leaving. He has been a great Member of the Congress. I hope, Mr. Chairman, if we all get back in 2013 that we will have an opportunity to bring this issue to the floor of the Congress and to debate the role of Congress when any President, Democrat or Republican, reaches a security agreement that obligates our troops and the taxpayers. We must meet our constitutional responsibility.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes

legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized.

Ms. DELAURO. The bipartisan amendment that Congressman JONES and I offer ensures that any security agreement between the United States and Afghanistan will not be legal unless it comes in the form of a treaty or is specifically authorized by a law.

The gentleman's point of order argues that this amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to know the definition of "any agreement with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan that includes security assurances for mutual defense." While this definition is not written into statute, it is common sense.

I also believe our responsibility under the Constitution takes precedence over this point of order. As it is, this point would cut into the heart of our constitutional duties as a Congress under article I, section 8. The power to declare war has been entrusted to the Congress and to the Congress alone.

At the recent NATO summit in Chicago, President Obama and NATO leaders announced an end to combat operations in Afghanistan in 2013 and the transition of lead responsibility for security to the Afghan Government by the end of 2014. But even though Bin Laden is dead and al Qaeda has been decimated, the administration has also announced an agreement with the Government of Afghanistan that would keep an untold number of American troops there until 2024, which is 12 years from now.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would ask the gentlewoman to confine her remarks to the issue of the point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. Whether you agree or disagree with the policy, it is imperative for our form of government that Congress be consulted on any such agreement that maintains our troops abroad or, for that matter, any defense or Status of Forces agreement that is made by the United States. It is our task as representatives of the people to debate the critical issues and to make the ultimate decision of whether to put or keep our troops in harm's way.

This amendment will simply ensure in our relationship with Afghanistan that no defense agreement will be enacted without the ultimate consent of Congress, as is mandated by our Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Again, the gentlewoman needs to address the point of order and not the policy issue.

Ms. DELAURO. I will conclude by saying that I urge the Chair to overrule the point of order and to allow this amendment to receive an up-or-down vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment addresses funds in other acts and includes language requiring a new determination of the Secretary. It, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with Chairman YOUNG.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I rise to seek the chairman's support in addressing an issue of which he is deeply and painfully aware: the rapidly increasing numbers of cases of amputations, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury suffered by our brave young men and women returning from combat theaters. Of course, these conditions can have a devastating impact on military dependents. They are also having an increasingly devastating impact on the military health care system that serves our soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, and their families.

There is no one who has worked harder than the chairman of our subcommittee to ensure that the very best medical care is available to the 9 million Americans who have earned the benefits of our military health care system. Yet I remain concerned that newer, innovative practices are not being sufficiently integrated into the military medical system.

One such innovative practice is systems medicine. By more rapidly and accurately quantifying wellness and deciphering disease, systems medicine will promote translational research by linking the Department's research and development programs, initiatives, and laboratories with its clinical care programs, initiatives and facilities.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The former chairman of this subcommittee is absolutely correct.

Current strains on our military and fiscal resources are causing unprecedented challenges in maintaining a viable, cost-effective military health care system. He has probably heard me discuss this more than he has wanted to over the years, but it is a serious, important issue. It is essential that new, innovative approaches be more quickly included in military medical practice.

Mr. DICKS. I ask the chairman to join me in urging the Department to implement systems medicine into the medical practices of all service branches.

To facilitate the training of DOD medical personnel in systems medicine,

the Defense Department should consider systems medicine pilot projects that address post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and amputee health, along with other high-priority concerns that impact all aspects of total readiness, including mental resilience.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Again, I just want to thank the gentleman for highlighting this issue today. Obviously, I plan to continue to work with him in order to do the best we can to make this happen.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, as we begin to wind down the debate on this defense bill, I wanted to take just a moment to pay tribute to this dynamic duo that we have—BILL YOUNG and NORM DICKS. The collective experience, wisdom, and knowledge of this defense bill and the actions of our military is almost unprecedented in this House.

□ 1740

They have put forward a great bill in the highest bipartisan traditions of the House, and all of us in this body say "thank you" for the great service of these two stalwarts in this body. They have conducted themselves during this debate in the highest traditions of this House. They have collaborated together in a bipartisan way to help defend this country. I think I speak for all Members of the House of Representatives in saying "thank you" to these two great stalwarts of this body.

This will be the last defense bill that NORM DICKS will take part in. He is departing this body in retirement, and we will miss his wisdom and his camaraderie and his knowledge of the needs of our country and its defense. I think I speak for all of the House when I say "thank you" to NORM DICKS for great service to his country, to this body, and to the defense of our country especially. We will miss his presence. We will miss his expertise. We will miss the fact that he is a jolly good fellow, among other things.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate my chairman yielding just for a moment.

I would like to associate myself with your remarks regarding these two fabulous leaders and the jobs they have done over the years on our behalf and for our national security. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman, and I can't help but mention the great service the former chairman of this committee has rendered to the body, as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Thank you for yielding, and I wanted to say the same thing.

Mr. LEWIS chaired this subcommittee, as well as the full committee. He did an outstanding job. Many innovations came about during his 6 years as chairman of this subcommittee. He is with us today, and he will continue to be with us. The House is losing another great talent, another great dedicated public official. I thank you for calling attention to his service.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. The three of you have grayer hair than I do, and that means you have wisdom and experience along with it.

I just want to say that I've enjoyed working with all three of you. BILL YOUNG and I have worked together for many years. JERRY LEWIS and I have worked together many years. We've taken many trips to Afghanistan and Iraq to try to be with the troops and find out what was going on. We've had a good group.

It bothers me greatly when there's this sense out there that we can't work together. This committee works together. I'm proud of that, and I'm proud to be associated with my colleagues.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, Chairman YOUNG has mentioned briefly the service of our friend from California (Mr. LEWIS), who, as we all know, served as chairman of the full committee for a period of time, and, of course, chairman of this great subcommittee. We're going to miss his presence because he is seeking greener pastures out there as well in retirement.

JERRY LEWIS has been a stalwart Member of this body for many years and he has rendered great service to his country, certainly to this House, and most importantly, I think, on this subcommittee, because this subcommittee is in charge of defending our country, and there is no higher calling for any of us than to say we've been a part of that.

Mr. Chairman, I wind my remarks up. We've had some 60 or 70 amendments on this bill, and I think the debate that took place is in the highest traditions of this body. I wish Mr. LEWIS and Mr. DICKS happy retirements and other pursuits in life, and we wish you Godspeed.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. One issue that didn't come up today was this question of

what are we going to do at the end of this year with sequestration, and there was some discussion of an amendment that didn't happen because of points of order and other possible reasons.

I really believe that somehow we've got to avoid sequestration and that collectively we've got to work together in the next several months, because I honestly believe that the economy of this country will be severely and adversely affected if we allow sequestration not just for defense, which we're talking about here today, but for the other part of the government, the discretionary domestic part of the government. We have got to avoid this.

I would love to see an agreement reached between the parties and between the leadership so that we can get an agreement that is fair and balanced and equitable. I think with the four of us and a couple of others I can think of, I think we could put something like that together. Somehow it's got to happen, because the consequences to defense—and not only to defense, but the economy of the country is at stake here.

The CBO says that the difference in growth, if we do sequestration, if we don't deal with the tax issue, will go from 4.4 percent to 5 percent. It is a 4½ percent difference in economic growth. That means unemployment will be greater. That means the deficit will be greater. The whole idea of the Budget Control Act was to get the deficit under control.

Again, I hope that we will all continue to think about how we can come up with a solution that's bipartisan, bicameral. We have got to work with the administration. From a national security and a defense perspective, there is nothing more treacherous out there than sequestration. We've got to avoid it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The second amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The fourth amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

The fifth amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. BERG of North Dakota.

An amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 166, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

AYES—247

Adams	Flake	LoBiondo
Aderholt	Fleming	Long
Alexander	Flores	Lucas
Amash	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fortenberry	Lummis
Austria	Foxo	Lungren, Daniel E.
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Barletta	Gallegly	Marchant
Barrow	Gardner	Marino
Bartlett	Garrett	Matheson
Barton (TX)	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Bass (NH)	Gibbs	McCaul
Benishek	Gibson	McClintock
Berg	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Bilbray	Gohmert	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McKeon
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	McKinley
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	McMorris
Black	Granger	Rodgers
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Bonner	Graves (MO)	Mica
Bono Mack	Green, Gene	Miller (FL)
Boustany	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Brady (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Brooks	Grimm	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Guinta	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Guthrie	Myrick
Bucshon	Hall	Neugebauer
Burgess	Harper	Noem
Burton (IN)	Harris	Nugent
Calvert	Hartzler	Nunes
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee
Campbell	Heck	Olson
Canseco	Hensarling	Palazzo
Capito	Herger	Paul
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Cassidy	Holden	Pearce
Chabot	Huelskamp	Pence
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Peterson
Chandler	Hultgren	Petri
Coble	Hunter	Pitts
Coffman (CO)	Hurt	Platts
Cole	Issa	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Jenkins	Pompeo
Costello	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Cravaack	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
Crenshaw	Jones	Rahall
Critz	Jordan	Reed
Cuellar	Kelly	Rehberg
Culberson	King (IA)	Reichert
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Renacci
Denham	Kingston	Ribble
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
DesJarlais	Kissell	Rivera
Dold	Klaine	Roby
Donnelly (IN)	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Dreier	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Landry	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Rohrabacher
Ellmers	Latham	Rokita
Emerson	LaTourette	Rooney
Farenthold	Latta	Roskam
Fincher	Lewis (CA)	Ross (AR)
Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	

Ross (FL)  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Scalise  
 Schilling  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster

Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Stearns  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner (NY)  
 Turner (OH)  
 Upton

Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

ments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the fourth amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 326, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

AYES—87

Ackerman  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Baldwin  
 Barber  
 Bass (CA)  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Boswell  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Frank (MA)  
 Fudge

NOES—166

Garamendi  
 Gonzalez  
 Green, Al  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hahn  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hayworth  
 Heinrich  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hochul  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Israel  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Sarbanes  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lujan  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Markey  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal

Amash  
 Baldwin  
 Bass (CA)  
 Becerra  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Braley (IA)  
 Campbell  
 Capuano  
 Carnahan  
 Carson (IN)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Jones  
 Keating  
 Kucinich  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Markey  
 Cummings  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Doyle  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah

NOES—326

Ackerman  
 Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Amodei  
 Andrews  
 Austria  
 Baca  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barber  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Benishek  
 Berg  
 Berkeley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boswell  
 Boustany  
 Brady (PA)

Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Garamendi  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heck  
 Heinrich  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hochul  
 Holden  
 Hoyer  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Kaptur  
 Kelly  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kissell  
 Kline  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Landry  
 Langevin  
 Lankford  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lipinski

NOT VOTING—18

Akin  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Boren  
 Brown (FL)  
 Buerkle  
 Cantor  
 Davis (IL)  
 Deutch

Akin  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Boren  
 Brown (FL)  
 Buerkle  
 Cantor  
 Davis (IL)

NOT VOTING—18

Deutch  
 Filner  
 Fleischmann  
 Hirono  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)

□ 1815

Mr. THOMPSON of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and ADERHOLT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 487, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commit-

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1819

Mr. ROKITA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 488, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the fifth amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—171

Ackerman	Green, Al	Peterson
Amash	Green, Gene	Petri
Andrews	Griffith (VA)	Pingree (ME)
Baca	Grijalva	Posey
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Price (NC)
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Quigley
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Berman	Higgins	Rangel
Blumenauer	Himes	Renacci
Bonamici	Hinchev	Ribble
Boswell	Hinojosa	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Holt	Richmond
Braley (IA)	Honda	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Hoyer	Rokita
Capps	Huelskamp	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Royce
Carnahan	Jones	Rush
Carney	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kildee	T.
Chaffetz	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Labrador	Shakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Langevin	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Clay	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cleaver	Levin	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Coble	Lofgren, Zoe	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Lujan	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Lynch	Sherman
Conyers	Maloney	Sires
Costa	Markey	Slaughter
Costello	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Cummings	McClintock	Speier
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stearns
DeGette	McGovern	Sutton
DeLauro	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Miller (NC)	Tierney
Doyle	Miller, George	Tonko
Duffy	Moore	Towns
Duncan (TN)	Moran	Tsongas
Edwards	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Ellison	Nadler	Velázquez
Engel	Napolitano	Visclosky
Eshoo	Neal	Walz (MN)
Farr	Oliver	Waters
Fattah	Pallone	Watt
Frank (MA)	Pascrell	Waxman
Fudge	Pastor (AZ)	Welch
Garamendi	Paul	Wilson (FL)
Gibson	Pelosi	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Goodlatte	Peters	

NOES—243

Adams	Gerlach
Aderholt	Gibbs
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)
Altmire	Gohmert
Amodei	Gosar
Austria	Gowdy
Bachmann	Granger
Bachus	Graves (GA)
Barber	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Griffin (AR)
Barrow	Grimm
Bartlett	Guinta
Barton (TX)	Guthrie
Bass (NH)	Hall
Benishkek	Hanabusa
Berg	Hanna
Berkley	Harper
Biggett	Harris
Bilbray	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Hayworth
Bishop (UT)	Heck
Black	Heinrich
Blackburn	Hensarling
Bonner	Herger
Bono Mack	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Hochul
Brady (TX)	Holden
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Buchanan	Hunter
Bucshon	Issa
Burgess	Jenkins
Burton (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Jordan
Canseco	Kantor
Cantor	Kelly
Capito	King (IA)
Carter	King (NY)
Cassidy	Kingston
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)
Chandler	Kissell
Coffman (CO)	Kline
Cole	Lamborn
Conaway	Lance
Cooper	Landry
Courtney	Lankford
Cravaack	Larson (CT)
Crawford	Latham
Crenshaw	LaTourette
Critz	Latta
Cuellar	Lewis (CA)
Culberson	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	LoBiondo
Davis (KY)	Loeb sack
Denham	Long
Dent	Lucas
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer
Diaz-Balart	Lummis
Doggett	Lungren, Daniel
Dold	E.
Donnelly (IN)	Mack
Dreier	Manzullo
Duncan (SC)	Marchant
Ellmers	Marino
Emerson	Matheson
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)
Fincher	McCaul
Fitzpatrick	McHenry
Flake	McIntyre
Fleming	McKeon
Flores	McKinley
Forbes	McMorris
Fortenberry	McMorris
Fox	Rodgers
Frank (AZ)	McNerney
Frelinghuysen	Meehan
Galleghy	Mica
Gardner	Miller (FL)
Garrett	Miller (MI)
	Miller, Gary

NOT VOTING—17

Akin	Fleischmann
Bishop (NY)	Hirono
Boren	Israel
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)
Buerkle	Jackson Lee
Deutch	(TX)
Filner	Lowe

□ 1822

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 489, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 5, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—407

Ackerman	Carney	Ellmers
Adams	Carson (IN)	Emerson
Aderholt	Carter	Engel
Alexander	Cassidy	Eshoo
Altmire	Castor (FL)	Farenthold
Amash	Chabot	Farr
Amodei	Chaffetz	Fattah
Andrews	Chandler	Fincher
Austria	Chu	Fitzpatrick
Baca	Cicilline	Flake
Bachmann	Clarke (MI)	Fleming
Bachus	Clarke (NY)	Flores
Baldwin	Clay	Forbes
Barber	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Barletta	Clyburn	Fox
Barrow	Coble	Frank (MA)
Bartlett	Coffman (CO)	Franks (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Bass (NH)	Cole	Fudge
Becerra	Conaway	Galleghy
Benishkek	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Berg	Conyers	Gardner
Berkley	Cooper	Garrett
Berman	Costa	Gerlach
Biggett	Costello	Gibbs
Bilbray	Courtney	Gibson
Bilirakis	Cravaack	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gonzalez
Black	Critz	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Crowley	Gosar
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gowdy
Bonner	Culberson	Granger
Bono Mack	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis (KY)	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Griffin (AR)
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Griffith (VA)
Brooks	DeLauro	Grijalva
Broun (GA)	Denham	Grimm
Buchanan	Dent	Guinta
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Gutierrez
Burton (IN)	Dicks	Hahn
Butterfield	Dingell	Hall
Calvert	Doggett	Hanabusa
Camp	Dold	Hanna
Campbell	Donnelly (IN)	Harper
Canseco	Doyle	Harris
Cantor	Dreier	Hartzler
Capito	Duffy	Hastings (FL)
Capps	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (WA)
Capuano	Duncan (TN)	Heck
Cardoza	Edwards	Heinrich
Carnahan	Ellison	Hensarling

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

Herger	McKinley	Ryan (WI)
Herrera Beutler	McMorris	Sánchez, Linda
Higgins	Rodgers	T.
Himes	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta
Hinchey	Meehan	Sarbanes
Hinojosa	Meeks	Scalise
Hochul	Mica	Schakowsky
Holden	Michaud	Schiff
Holt	Miller (FL)	Schilling
Honda	Miller (MI)	Schmidt
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Schock
Huelskamp	Miller, Gary	Schrader
Huizenga (MI)	Miller, George	Schwartz
Hultgren	Moore	Schweikert
Hunter	Moran	Scott (SC)
Hurt	Mulvaney	Scott (VA)
Israel	Murphy (CT)	Scott, Austin
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Scott, David
Jenkins	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Serrano
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Sessions
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Sewell
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Sherman
Jones	Noem	Shimkus
Jordan	Nugent	Shuler
Kaptur	Nunes	Shuster
Keating	Nunnelee	Simpson
Kelly	Olson	Sires
Kildee	Owens	Slaughter
Kind	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Pascrell	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Pastor (AZ)	Southerland
Kinzing (IL)	Paulsen	Speier
Kissell	Pearce	Stark
Kline	Pelosi	Stearns
Kucinich	Pence	Stutzman
Labrador	Perlmutter	Sullivan
Lamborn	Peters	Sutton
Lance	Peterson	Terry
Landry	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Lankford	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Latham	Pompeo	Tierney
LaTourette	Posey	Tipton
Latta	Price (GA)	Tonko
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Towns
Levin	Quayle	Tsongas
Lewis (CA)	Quigley	Turner (NY)
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Turner (OH)
Lipinski	Rangel	Upton
LoBiondo	Reed	Van Hollen
Loeb sack	Rehberg	Velázquez
Lofgren, Zoe	Reichert	Vislosky
Lucas	Renacci	Walberg
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Walden
Luján	Richardson	Walsh (IL)
Lummis	Richmond	Walz (MN)
Lungren, Daniel	Rigell	Walters
E.	Rivera	Watt
Lynch	Roby	Waxman
Mack	Roe (TN)	Webster
Maloney	Rogers (AL)	Welch
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	West
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
Marino	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Markey	Rokita	Wilson (FL)
Matheson	Rooney	Wilson (SC)
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Ross (AR)	Womack
McCaul	Ross (FL)	Woodall
McClintock	Rothman (NJ)	Yoder
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
McDermott	Royce	Young (FL)
McGovern	Runyan	Young (IN)
McHenry	Ruppersberger	
McIntyre	Rush	
McKeon	Ryan (OH)	

NOES—5

Barton (TX)	Long	Smith (WA)
Hayworth	Paul	

NOT VOTING—19

Akin	Filner	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Fleischmann	Oliver
Blumenauer	Hirono	Polis
Boren	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Jackson Lee	Stivers
Buerkle	(TX)	Wasserman
Deutch	Johnson (IL)	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 490, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 178, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—235

Adams	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Alexander	Ellmers	Kingston
Amodei	Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)
Austria	Farenthold	Kissell
Bachmann	Fincher	Kline
Bachus	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Barletta	Flake	Lance
Barrow	Fleming	Landry
Bartlett	Flores	Lankford
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Latham
Bass (NH)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Benishak	Fox	Latta
Berg	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Biggart	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bilbray	Gallegly	Long
Bilirakis	Gardner	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Lummis
Black	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Blackburn	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Bonner	Gohmert	Mack
Bono Mack	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Boustany	Gosar	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	Marino
Brooks	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Burton (IN)	Grimm	McKeon
Calvert	Guinta	McKinley
Camp	Guthrie	McMorris
Canseco	Hall	Rodgers
Cantor	Hanna	Meehan
Capito	Harper	Mica
Carter	Harris	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Chaffetz	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Coble	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Coffman (CO)	Hensarling	Myrick
Cole	Herger	Neugebauer
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Nugent
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Nunnelee
Culberson	Hunter	Olson
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Palazzo
Denham	Issa	Paulsen
Dent	Jenkins	Pearce
DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)	Peters
Dold	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
Dreier	Jordan	Petri
Duffy	Kelly	Pitts

Platts	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Poe (TX)	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Pompeo	Scalise	Tiberi
Posey	Schilling	Tipton
Quayle	Schmidt	Turner (NY)
Reed	Schock	Turner (OH)
Rehberg	Schrader	Upton
Reichert	Schweikert	Walberg
Renacci	Scott (SC)	Walden
Ribble	Scott, Austin	Walsh (IL)
Rigell	Sensenbrenner	Webster
Rivera	Sessions	West
Roby	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Shuler	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Wittman
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Rooney	Southerland	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Young (AK)
Ross (FL)	Stutzman	Young (FL)
Royce	Terry	Young (IN)

NOES—178

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Neal
Altmire	Fudge	Oliver
Amash	Garamendi	Owens
Andrews	Gibson	Pallone
Baca	Gonzalez	Pascrell
Baldwin	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Barber	Green, Gene	Paul
Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Becerra	Hahn	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Price (GA)
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Higgins	Quigley
Boswell	Himes	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Hinchee	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Richardson
Butterfield	Hochul	Richmond
Campbell	Holden	Roskam
Capps	Holt	Ross (AR)
Capuano	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Cardoza	Hoyer	Royal-Allard
Carnahan	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Kaptur	T.
Chu	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schiff
Clay	Labrador	Schwartz
Cleaver	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Conyers	Levin	Sherman
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costa	Lipinski	Slaughter
Costello	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Critz	Lujan	Stark
Crowley	Lynch	Sutton
Cuellar	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tonko
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
DeGette	McCollum	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McDermott	Velázquez
Dicks	McGovern	Vislosky
Dingell	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Meeks	Walters
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud	Watt
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Edwards	Miller, George	Welch
Ellison	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Moran	Woolsey
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Farr	Nadler	
Fattah	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—18

Akin	Fleischmann	Polis
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	Reyes
Boren	Hirono	Stivers
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Sullivan
Buerkle	Jackson Lee	Wasserman
Deutch	(TX)	Schultz
Filner	Lowey	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1829

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 491, I inadvertently voted “no”. It was my intention to vote “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 491, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN OF COLORADO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 292, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

AYES—123

Amash	Edwards	Markey
Baca	Farr	McClintock
Bachmann	Flores	McDermott
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	McGovern
Bass (CA)	Gibson	McMorris
Bass (NH)	Gohmert	Rodgers
Becerra	Goodlatte	Meehan
Benishek	Griffith (VA)	Michaud
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Miller (MI)
Bonamici	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Moore
Camp	Harris	Mulvaney
Capuano	Heinrich	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Himes	Nadler
Chabot	Holt	Napolitano
Chandler	Honda	Neal
Chu	Huelskamp	Nunes
Cicilline	Huizenga (MI)	Oliver
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Pallone
Clay	Jones	Paul
Coble	Keating	Perlmutter
Coffman (CO)	Kind	Peters
Cohen	Kingston	Petri
Conyers	Kucinich	Pingree (ME)
Cooper	Labrador	Posey
Cummings	Landry	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ribble
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher
Doggett	Loeb sack	Rokita
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross (FL)
Duffy	Lujan	Royce
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Ryan (OH)

Ryan (WI)	Stark
Sánchez, Linda T.	Stearns
Schakowsky	Sutton
Schock	Tiberi
Schrader	Tierney
Serrano	Tonko
Sherman	Upton
Slaughter	Van Hollen
	Velázquez

NOES—292

Ackerman	DesJarlais
Adams	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Dicks
Alexander	Dingell
Altmire	Dold
Amodei	Donnelly (IN)
Andrews	Dreier
Austria	Duncan (SC)
Bachus	Ellison
Barber	Ellmers
Barletta	Emerson
Barrow	Engel
Bartlett	Eshoo
Barton (TX)	Farenthold
Berg	Fattah
Berkley	Fincher
Berman	Fitzpatrick
Biggert	Flake
Bilbray	Fleming
Bilirakis	Forbes
Bishop (GA)	Portenberry
Bishop (UT)	Foxx
Black	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen
Bonner	Fudge
Bono Mack	Gallegly
Boswell	Garamendi
Boustany	Gardner
Brady (PA)	Garrett
Brady (TX)	Gerlach
Brooks	Gibbs
Broun (GA)	Gingrey (GA)
Buchanan	Gonzalez
Bucshon	Gosar
Burgess	Gowdy
Burton (IN)	Granger
Butterfield	Graves (GA)
Calvert	Graves (MO)
Campbell	Green, Al
Canseco	Green, Gene
Cantor	Griffin (AR)
Capito	Grimm
Capps	Guinta
Cardoza	Guthrie
Carnahan	Hall
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa
Carter	Hanna
Cassidy	Harper
Castor (FL)	Hartzler
Chaffetz	Hastings (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Hastings (WA)
Cleaver	Hayworth
Clyburn	Heck
Cole	Hensarling
Conaway	Herger
Connolly (VA)	Herrera Beutler
Costa	Higgins
Costello	Hinchey
Courtney	Hinojosa
Cravaack	Hochul
Crawford	Holden
Crenshaw	Hoyer
Critz	Hultgren
Crowley	Hunter
Culler	Hurt
Culberson	Israel
Davis (IL)	Issa
Davis (KY)	Jenkins
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Denham	Johnson (OH)
Dent	Johnson, E. B.

Walden	Price (NC)
Walsh (IL)	Quayle
Waters	Rahall
Waxman	Schilling
Welch	Schmidt
Woodall	Schwartz
Woolsey	Schweikert
Yarmuth	Scott (SC)
	Scott (VA)
	Scott, Austin
	Scott, David
	Sensenbrenner
	Sessions
	Roe (TN)
	Rogers (AL)
	Rogers (KY)
	Rogers (MI)
	Rooney
	Ros-Lehtinen
	Roskam
	Ross (AR)
	Rothman (NJ)
	Roybal-Allard
	Runyan
	Ruppersberger
	Rush
	Sanchez, Loretta
	Sarbanes

Johnson, Sam	Smith (NE)
Jordan	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Smith (TX)
Kelly	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Southerland
King (IA)	Speier
King (NY)	Sultzman
Kinzinger (IL)	Sullivan
Kissell	Terry
Kline	
Lamborn	
Lance	
Lankford	
Larson (CT)	
Latham	
LaTourette	
Latta	
Levin	
Lewis (CA)	
Lewis (GA)	
Lipinski	
LoBiondo	
Long	
Lucas	
Luetkemeyer	
Lungren, Daniel E.	
Lynch	
Mack	
Maloney	
Manzullo	
Marchant	
Marino	
Matheson	
Matsui	
McCarthy (CA)	
McCarthy (NY)	
McCaul	
McCollum	
McHenry	
McIntyre	
McKeon	
McKinley	
McNerney	
Meeks	
Mica	
Miller (FL)	
Miller (NC)	
Miller, Gary	
Moran	
Murphy (PA)	
Myrick	
Neugebauer	
Noem	
Nugent	
Nunnelee	
Olson	
Owens	
Palazzo	
Pascrell	
Pastor (AZ)	
Paulsen	
Pearce	
Pelosi	
Pence	
Peterson	
Pitts	
Platts	
Poe (TX)	
Pompeo	
Price (GA)	

NOT VOTING—16

Akin	Filner	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Fleischmann	Polis
Boren	Hirono	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Stivers
Buerkle	Jackson Lee	Wasserman
Deutch	(TX)	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1832

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 492, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 183, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

AYES—232

Adams Graves (GA) Nunnelee  
 Aderholt Graves (MO) Olson  
 Alexander Griffin (AR) Palazzo  
 Amodei Griffith (VA) Paulsen  
 Austria Grimm Pearce  
 Bachmann Guinta Pence  
 Bachus Guthrie Peterson  
 Barletta Hahn Petri  
 Barrow Hall Pitts  
 Bartlett Hanna Platts  
 Barton (TX) Harper Poe (TX)  
 Bass (NH) Harris Pompeo  
 Benishek Hartzler Posey  
 Berg Hastings (WA) Price (GA)  
 Biggert Hayworth Quayle  
 Bilirakis Heck Reed  
 Bishop (GA) Hensarling Rehberg  
 Bishop (UT) Herger Reichert  
 Black Herrera Beutler Ribble  
 Blackburn Huelskamp Richardson  
 Bonner Huizenga (MI) Rigell  
 Bono Mack Hultgren Rivera  
 Boustany Hunter Roby  
 Brady (TX) Hurt Roe (TN)  
 Broun (GA) Issa Rogers (AL)  
 Bucshon Higgins Rogers (KY)  
 Burgess Johnson (IL) Rogers (MI)  
 Burton (IN) Johnson (OH) Rokita  
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Rooney  
 Camp Jordan Ros-Lehtinen  
 Canseco Kelly Roskam  
 Cantor King (IA) Ross (AR)  
 Capito King (NY) Ross (FL)  
 Carter Kingston Royce  
 Cassidy Kinzinger (IL) Runyan  
 Chabot Kissell Ryan (WI)  
 Chaffetz Kline Scalise  
 Clyburn Lamborn Schilling  
 Coble Lance Schmidt  
 Coffman (CO) Landry Schock  
 Cole Lankford Schweikert  
 Conaway Latham Scott (SC)  
 Cravaack LaTourette Scott, Austin  
 Crawford Latta Sensenbrenner  
 Crenshaw Lewis (CA) Sessions  
 Cuellar LoBiondo Shimkus  
 Culberson Long Shuler  
 Davis (KY) Lucas Shuster  
 Denham Luetkemeyer Simpson  
 DesJarlais Lummis Smith (NE)  
 Diaz-Balart Lungren, Daniel Smith (NJ)  
 Dold E. Smith (TX)  
 Dreier Mack Southerland  
 Duffy Manzullo Stearns  
 Duncan (SC) Marchant Stutzman  
 Ellmers Marino Sullivan  
 Emerson McCarthy (CA) Terry  
 Farenthold McCarthy (NY) Thornberry  
 Fincher McCaul Tiberi  
 Fitzpatrick Tipton  
 Flake McHenry Turner (NY)  
 Fleming McIntyre Turner (OH)  
 Flores McKeon Upton  
 Forbes McKinley Walberg  
 Foxx McMorris Walden  
 Franks (AZ) Rodgers Walsh (IL)  
 Frelinghuysen Meehan Webster  
 Gallegly Mica West  
 Gardner Miller (FL) Westmoreland  
 Garrett Miller (MI) Whitfield  
 Gerlach Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)  
 Gibbs Mulvaney Wittman  
 Gingrey (GA) Murphy (PA) Wolf  
 Gohmert Myrick Womack  
 Goodlatte Neugebauer Yoder  
 Gosar Noem Young (AK)  
 Gowdy Nugent Young (FL)  
 Granger Nunes Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman Braley (IA) Clarke (NY)  
 Altmire Brooks Clay  
 Amash Buchanan Cleaver  
 Andrews Butterfield Cohen  
 Baca Campbell Connolly (VA)  
 Baldwin Capps Conyers  
 Barber Capuano Cooper  
 Bass (CA) Cardoza Costa  
 Becerra Carnahan Costello  
 Berkley Carney Courtney  
 Berman Carson (IN) Critz  
 Bilbray Castor (FL) Crowley  
 Blumenauer Chandler Cummings  
 Bonamici Chu Davis (CA)  
 Boswell Cicilline Davis (IL)  
 Brady (PA) Clarke (MI) DeFazio

DeGette Labrador  
 DeLauro Langevin  
 Dent Larsen (WA)  
 Dicks Larson (CT)  
 Dingell Lee (CA)  
 Doggett Levin  
 Donnelly (IN) Lewis (GA)  
 Doyle Lipinski  
 Duncan (TN) Loeb sack  
 Edwards Lofgren, Zoe  
 Ellison Lujan  
 Engel Lynch  
 Eshoo Maloney  
 Farr Markey  
 Fattah Matheson  
 Fortenberry Matsui  
 Frank (MA) McCollum  
 Fudge McDermott  
 Garamendi McGovern  
 Gibson McNerney  
 Gonzalez Meeks  
 Green, Al Michaud  
 Green, Gene Miller (NC)  
 Grijalva Miller, George  
 Gutierrez Moore  
 Hanabusa Moran  
 Hastings (FL) Murphy (CT)  
 Heinrich Nadler  
 Higgins Napolitano  
 Himes Neal  
 Hinchey Olver  
 Hinojosa Owens  
 Hochul Pallone  
 Holden Pascrell  
 Holt Pastor (AZ)  
 Honda Paul  
 Hoyer Pelosi  
 Israel Perlmutter  
 Johnson (GA) Peters  
 Johnson, E. B. Pingree (ME)  
 Jones Price (NC)  
 Kaptur Quigley  
 Keating Rahall  
 Kildee Rangel  
 Kind Renacci  
 Kucinich Richmond

NOT VOTING—16

Akin Filner  
 Bishop (NY) Fleischmann  
 Boren Hirono  
 Brown (FL) Jackson (IL)  
 Buerkle Jackson Lee  
 Deutch (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1835

Mr. GARRETT changed his vote from  
 “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

Stated against:  
 Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 493, I was  
 away from the Capitol due to prior commit-  
 ments to my constituents. Had I been present,  
 I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from California (Mr.  
 GARAMENDI) on which further pro-  
 ceedings were postponed and on which  
 the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.  
 The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 137, noes 278,  
 not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—137

Amash Frank (MA) Pallone  
 Andrews Pascrell  
 Baldwin Garamendi Paul  
 Bass (CA) Grijalva Perlmutter  
 Becerra Gutierrez Peters  
 Benishek Hahn Petri  
 Berman Hanabusa Pingree (ME)  
 Blumenauer Blumenaue Hastings (FL) Price (NC)  
 Bonamici Bonamici Heinrich  
 Boswell Boswell Higgins Rahall  
 Brady (PA) Himes Rangel  
 Braley (IA) Hinchey Richardson  
 Butterfield Hinojosa Richmond  
 Capps Holt  
 Capuano Honda Roybal-Allard  
 Carnahan Johnson (IL) Rush  
 Carney Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Linda  
 Carson (IN) Jones T.  
 Castor (FL) Keating Sanchez, Loretta  
 Chu Kildee Sarbanes  
 Cicilline Kind Schakowsky  
 Clarke (MI) Kucinich Schiff  
 Clarke (NY) Larsen (WA) Schrader  
 Clay Larson (CT) Scott (VA)  
 Cleaver Lee (CA) Serrano  
 Clyburn Lewis (GA) Sewell  
 Cohen Loeb sack Sherman  
 Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Sires  
 Costello Lynch Slaughter  
 Courtney Maloney Speier  
 Crowley Markey Stark  
 Cummings Matsui Sutton  
 Davis (CA) McCollum Thompson (CA)  
 Davis (IL) McDermott Thompson (MS)  
 DeFazio McGovern Tierney  
 DeGette Meeks  
 DeLauro Michaud Towns  
 Doggett Miller (NC) Tsongas  
 Doyle Miller, George Velazquez  
 Duncan (TN) Moore Waters  
 Edwards Moran Watt  
 Ellison Murphy (CT) Waxman  
 Engel Nadler Welch  
 Eshoo Napolitano Wilson (FL)  
 Farr Neal Woolsey  
 Fattah Olver Yarmuth

NOES—278

Ackerman Coffman (CO) Gowdy  
 Adams Cole Granger  
 Aderholt Conaway Graves (GA)  
 Alexander Connolly (VA) Graves (MO)  
 Altmire Cooper Green, Al  
 Amodei Costa Green, Gene  
 Austria Cravaack Griffin (AR)  
 Baca Crawford Griffith (VA)  
 Bachmann Crenshaw Grimm  
 Bachus Critz Guinta  
 Barber Cuellar Guthrie  
 Barletta Culberson Hall  
 Barrow Davis (KY) Hanna  
 Bartlett Denham Harper  
 Barton (TX) Dent Harris  
 Bass (NH) DesJarlais Hartzler  
 Berg Diaz-Balart Hastings (WA)  
 Berkley Dicks Hayworth  
 Biggert Dingell Heck  
 Bilbray Hensarling  
 Bilirakis Donnelly (IN) Herger  
 Bishop (GA) Dreier Herrera Beutler  
 Bishop (UT) Duffy Hochul  
 Black Duncan (SC) Holden  
 Blackburn Eillers Hoyer  
 Bonner Emerson Huelskamp  
 Bono Mack Farenthold Huizenga (MI)  
 Boustany Fincher Hultgren  
 Brady (TX) Fitzpatrick Hunter  
 Brooks Flake  
 Broun (GA) Fleming Israhel  
 Buchanan Flores Issa  
 Bucshon Forbes Jenkins  
 Burgess Fortenberry Johnson (GA)  
 Burton (IN) Foxx Johnson (OH)  
 Calvert Franks (AZ) Johnson, Sam  
 Camp Frelinghuysen Jordan  
 Campbell Gallegly Kaptur  
 Canseco Gardner Kelly  
 Cantor Garrett King (IA)  
 Capito Gerlach King (NY)  
 Cardoza Gibbs Kingston  
 Carter Gibson Kinzinger (IL)  
 Cassidy Gingrey (GA) Kissell  
 Chabot Gohmert Kline  
 Chaffetz Gonzalez Labrador  
 Chandler Goodlatte Lamborn  
 Coble Gosar Lance

Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee

NOT VOTING—16

Akin  
Bishop (NY)  
Boren  
Brown (FL)  
Buerkle  
Deutch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1840

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 494, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 167, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]  
AYES—247

Amash  
Amodעי  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Black  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Butterfield  
Campbell  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs

NOES—167

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barrow

Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Farenthold  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Herger  
Higgins  
Rush  
Hochul  
Hunter  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kelly

NOT VOTING—17

Akin  
Bishop (NY)  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Brown (FL)  
Buerkle  
Deutch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1843

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 495, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 178, not voting 15, as follows:

Neal  
Neugebauer  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Roe (TN)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Yoder

King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Lamborn  
Lankford  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Quayle  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Rigell  
Rivera

Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Scott, Austin  
Sewell  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Sullivan  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Towns  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Walden  
Olson  
Walz (MN)  
Webster  
West  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

[Roll No. 496]

AYES—238

Adams Graves (MO) Pearce  
 Amash Griffin (AR) Pence  
 Amodei Griffith (VA) Peters  
 Bachus Grimm Peterson  
 Baldwin Guinta Petri  
 Barletta Guthrie Pingree (ME)  
 Bartlett Hahn Pitts  
 Barton (TX) Harper Poe (TX)  
 Bass (CA) Hastings (FL) Pompeo  
 Bass (NH) Heinrich Posey  
 Benishek Hensarling Price (GA)  
 Berg Herrera Beutler Quayle  
 Berkley Higgins Rahall  
 Berman Himes Rangel  
 Biggert Hinojosa Reed  
 Bilirakis Holt Renacci  
 Black Honda Ribble  
 Blackburn Huelskamp Richardson  
 Bonamici Huizenga (MI) Fudge  
 Boswell Hultgren Rivera  
 Boustany Hurt Roby  
 Brady (PA) Issa Roe (TN)  
 Brady (TX) Jenkins Rogers (AL)  
 Brooks Johnson (IL) Rohrabacher  
 Broun (GA) Johnson (OH) Rokita  
 Buchanan Jones Ros-Lehtinen  
 Bucshon Jordan Roskam  
 Burgess Keating Ross (FL)  
 Burton (IN) Kind Royce  
 Campbell King (IA) Runyan  
 Cantor Kingston Kline  
 Capito Kucinich Ryan (WI)  
 Capps Labrador Scalise  
 Cardoza Lamborn Schakowsky  
 Carney Lance Schiff  
 Carson (IN) Landry Schilling  
 Cassidy Lankford Schmidt  
 Chabot Latham Schrader  
 Chaffetz Chu LaTourette Schweikert  
 Chu Latta Scott (SC)  
 Coble Coffman (CO) Lee (CA) Scott, Austin  
 Cohen Lipinski Sensenbrenner  
 Conyers Loeb sack Serrano  
 Costa Long Sessions  
 Cravaack Luetkemeyer Sherman  
 Crawford Lummis Shuler  
 Crowley Mack Shuster  
 Cuellar Manzullo Sires  
 Cummings Marino Smith (NE)  
 Davis (CA) Markey Smith (WA)  
 Davis (IL) Matheson Southerland  
 DeFazio Matsui Speier  
 DeGette McCarthy (CA) Stearns  
 Denham McCarthy (NY) Stutzman  
 DesJarlais McClintock Sullivan  
 Doggett McGovern Sutton  
 Dold Meeks Terry  
 Dreier Mica Thompson (CA)  
 Duffy Michaud Thompson (MS)  
 Duncan (SC) Miller (MI) Thompson (PA)  
 Duncan (TN) Miller, Gary  
 Eshoo Miller, George  
 Farenthold Moore  
 Fincher Moran  
 Flake Mulvaney  
 Flores Murphy (CT)  
 Frank (MA) Murphy (PA)  
 Gardner Nadler  
 Garrett Napolitano  
 Gerlach Neugebauer  
 Gibbs Noem  
 Gibson Nunes  
 Gingrey (GA) Nunnelee  
 Gohmert Palazzo  
 Gonzalez Pallone  
 Goodlatte Pascrell  
 Gosar Pastor (AZ)  
 Gowdy Paul  
 Graves (GA) Paulsen Young (IN)

NOES—178

Ackerman Blumenauer Clarke (MI)  
 Aderholt Bonner Clarke (NY)  
 Alexander Bono Mack Clay  
 Altmire Braley (IA) Cleaver  
 Andrews Butterfield Clyburn  
 Austria Calvert Cole  
 Baca Camp Conaway  
 Bachmann Canseco Connolly (VA)  
 Barber Capuano Cooper  
 Barrow Carnahan Costello  
 Becerra Carter Courtney  
 Bilbray Castor (FL) Crenshaw  
 Bishop (GA) Chandler Critz  
 Bishop (UT) Cicilline Culberson

Davis (KY) Johnson, Sam  
 DeLauro Kaptur Reichert  
 Dent Kelly Rigell  
 Diaz-Balart Kildee Rogers (KY)  
 Dicks King (NY) Rogers (MI)  
 Dingell Kinzinger (IL) Rooney  
 Donnelly (IN) Kissell Ross (AR)  
 Doyle Langevin Rothman (NJ)  
 Edwards Larsen (WA) Roybal-Allard  
 Ellison Larson (CT) Ruppertsberger  
 Ellmers Levin Ryan (OH)  
 Emerson Lewis (CA) Sanchez, Linda  
 Engel Lewis (GA) T.  
 Farr LoBiondo Sanchez, Loretta  
 Fattah Lofgren, Zoe Sarbanes  
 Fitzpatrick Lowey Schock  
 Fleming Lucas Schwartz  
 Forbes Luján Scott (VA)  
 Fortenberry Lungren, Daniel  
 Foxx E. Scott, David  
 Franks (AZ) Lynch Sewell  
 Frelinghuysen Maloney Shimkus  
 Fudge Marchant Simpson  
 Gallegly McCaul Slaughter  
 Garamendi McCollum Smith (NJ)  
 Granger McDermott Smith (TX)  
 Green, Al McHenry Stark  
 Green, Gene McIntyre Thornberry  
 Grijalva McKeon Tiberi  
 Gutierrez McKinley Tierney  
 Hall McMorris Tonko  
 Hanabusa Rodgers Turner (NY)  
 Hanna McNeerney Turner (OH)  
 Harris Meehan Upton  
 Hartzler Miller (FL) Visclosky  
 Hastings (WA) Miller (NC) Walz (MN)  
 Hayworth Myrick Watt  
 Heck Neal Waxman  
 Herger Nugent Westmoreland  
 Hinchey Olson Whitfield  
 Hochul Olver Wilson (FL)  
 Holden Owens Wilson (SC)  
 Hoyer Pelosi Wittman  
 Hunter Perlmutter Wolf  
 Israel Platts Young (AK)  
 Johnson (GA) Price (NC) Young (FL)  
 Johnson, E. B. Quigley

NOT VOTING—15

Akin Filner Polis  
 Bishop (NY) Fleischmann Reyes  
 Boren Hirono Stivers  
 Brown (FL) Jackson (IL) Wasserman  
 Buerkle Jackson Lee Schultz  
 Deutch (TX)

□ 1848

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 496, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 17, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

AYES—399

Ackerman Denham Keating  
 Adams Kelly  
 Aderholt DesJarlais Kildee  
 Alexander Diaz-Balart Kind  
 Altmire Dingell King (IA)  
 Amash Doggett King (NY)  
 Amodei Dold Kingston  
 Baca Donnelly (IN) Kinzinger (IL)  
 Bachmann Doyle Kissell  
 Bachus Dreier Kline  
 Baldwin Duncan (SC) Duffy  
 Barber Duncan (TN) Labradore  
 Barletta Edwards Lance  
 Barrow Ellison Landry  
 Barton (TX) Ellmers Langevin  
 Bass (CA) Emerson Lankford  
 Bass (NH) Engel Larson (CT)  
 Benishek Eshoo Latham  
 Berg Farenthold LaTourette  
 Berkley Farr Latta  
 Berman Fitzpatrick Lee (CA)  
 Biggert Flake Levin  
 Bilbray Fleming Lewis (GA)  
 Bilirakis Flores Lipinski  
 Bishop (GA) Forbes LoBiondo  
 Bishop (UT) Fortenberry Loebsack  
 Black Foxx Lofgren, Zoe  
 Blackburn Frank (MA) Long  
 Bonamici Franks (AZ) Lowey  
 Boswell Frelinghuysen Lucas  
 Boustany Fudge Luetkemeyer  
 Brady (PA) Gallely Lummis  
 Brady (TX) Garamendi Lungren, Daniel  
 Broun (GA) Gardner E.  
 Buchanan Gohmert Lynch  
 Bucshon Gohmert Marino  
 Burgess Gonzalez Markey  
 Burton (IN) Goodlatte Matheson  
 Butterfield Gosar Matsui  
 Calvert Granger McCarthy (CA)  
 Camp Graves (GA) McCarthy (NY)  
 Campbell Canseco McCaul  
 Cantor Canseco McClintock  
 Capito Green, Al McGovern  
 Capps Griffin (AR) McHenry  
 Cardoza Griffith (VA) McIntyre  
 Carnahan Grijalva McKeon  
 Carney Grimm McKinley  
 Carson (IN) Guinta McMorris  
 Carter Carney Rodgers  
 Cassidy Guthrie McNeerney  
 Castor (FL) Hanabusa Meehan  
 Chabot Hanna Mica  
 Chaffetz Harper Michaud  
 Chandler Harris Miller (FL)  
 Chu Hartzler Miller (MI)  
 Cicilline Hastings (FL) Miller (NC)  
 Clarke (MI) Hastings (WA) Miller, Gary  
 Clarke (NY) Hayworth Moore  
 Clay Heck Mulvaney  
 Cleaver Heinrich Murphy (CT)  
 Clyburn Hensarling Murphy (PA)  
 Coble Herger Nadler  
 Coffman (CO) Herrera Beutler Napolitano  
 Cohen Higgins Neal  
 Cole Himes Neugebauer  
 Conaway Hinchey Noem  
 Connolly (VA) Hinojosa Nugent  
 Conyers Hochul Nunes  
 Costa Holden Nunnelee  
 Costello Holt Olson  
 Courtney Huelskamp Owens  
 Cravaack Huizenga (MI) Pallazo  
 Crawford Hultgren Pallone  
 Crenshaw Hunter Pascrell  
 Critz Hurt Pastor (AZ)  
 Crowley Israel Paul  
 Cuellar Issa Paulsen  
 Culberson Jenkins Pearce  
 Cummings Johnson (GA) Pelosi  
 Davis (CA) Johnson (IL) Pence  
 Davis (IL) Johnson (OH) Perlmutter  
 Davis (KY) Johnson, Sam Peters  
 DeFazio Jones Peterson  
 DeGette Jordan Petri  
 DeLauro Kaptur Pingree (ME)

Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)

Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry

Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOES—17

Blumenauer  
Cooper  
Dicks  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Johnson, E. B.

Larsen (WA)  
McDermott  
Miller, George  
Moran  
Oliver  
Ruppersberger

Shuler  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Visclosky  
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—15

Akin  
Bishop (NY)  
Boren  
Brown (FL)  
Buerkle  
Deutch

Filner  
Fleischmann  
Hirono  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee (TX)

Polis  
Reyes  
Stivers  
Wasserman  
Schultz

□ 1852

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 497, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013”.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments

adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 717, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 90, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—326

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishak  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Cicilline  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper

Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (KY)  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Hochul  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mack

Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Hergert  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Hochul  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kildee  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mack

Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pascarella  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts

Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman

Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Waxman  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—90

Amash  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Braley (IA)  
Campbell  
Capuano  
Carney  
Chu  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Doyle  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez

Hahn  
Hinchev  
Holt  
Honda  
Huelskamp  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Jones  
Keating  
Kucinich  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Markey  
Matsui  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Paul

Akin  
Bishop (NY)  
Boren  
Brown (FL)  
Buerkle  
Deutch

Filner  
Fleischmann  
Hirono  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee (TX)

Polis  
Reyes  
Stivers  
Wasserman  
Schultz

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1911

Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and CICILLINE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 498, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497 and 498 I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 487, "no" on rollcall No. 488, "no" on rollcall No. 489, "aye" on rollcall No. 490, "aye" on rollcall No. 491, "no" on rollcall No. 492, "aye" on rollcall No. 493, "no" on rollcall No. 494, "no" on rollcall No. 495, "aye" on rollcall No. 496, "aye" on rollcall No. 497 and "aye" on rollcall No. 498.

PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ARNOLD PALMER

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 133) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol for an event to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Arnold Palmer, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 133

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used on September 12, 2012, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Arnold Palmer, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

(b) **PREPARATIONS.**—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NATIONAL BASEBALL HALL OF FAME COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT**

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2527) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, with the Senate

amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the 'National Baseball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act'.*

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

*The Congress finds the following:*

(1) *On June 12, 1939, the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum opened in Coopers-town, New York. Ty Cobb, Walter Johnson, Christy Mathewson, Babe Ruth, and Honus Wagner comprised the inaugural class of inductees. This class set the standard for all future inductees. Since 1939, just one percent of all Major League Baseball players have earned induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame.*

(2) *The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum is dedicated to preserving history, honoring excellence, and connecting generations through the rich history of our national pastime. Baseball has mirrored our Nation's history since the Civil War, and is now an integral part of our Nation's heritage.*

(3) *The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum chronicles the history of our national pastime and houses the world's largest collection of baseball artifacts, including more than 38,000 three dimensional artifacts, 3,000,000 documents, 500,000 photographs, and 12,000 hours of recorded media. This collection ensures that baseball history and its unique connection to American history will be preserved and recounted for future generations.*

(4) *Since its opening in 1939, more than 14,000,000 baseball fans have visited the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum to learn about the history of our national pastime and the game's connection to the American experience.*

(5) *The National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum is an educational institution, reaching 10,000,000 Americans annually. Utilizing video conference technology, students and teachers participate in interactive lessons led by educators from the National Baseball Hall of Fame Museum. These award-winning educational programs draw upon the wonders of baseball to reach students in classrooms nationwide. Each educational program uses baseball as a lens for teaching young Americans important lessons on an array of topics, including mathematics, geography, civil rights, women's history, economics, industrial technology, arts, and communication.*

**SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.**

(a) **DENOMINATIONS.**—*In recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:*

(1) *\$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 \$5 coins, which shall—*

*(A) weigh 8.359 grams;*

*(B) have diameter of 0.850 inches; and*

*(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.*

(2) *\$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 \$1 coins, which shall—*

*(A) weigh 26.73 grams;*

*(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and*

*(C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.*

(3) *HALF-DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—*

*(A) weigh 11.34 grams;*

*(B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and*

*(C) be minted to the specifications for half-dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.*

(b) **LEGAL TENDER.**—*The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.*

(c) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—*For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.*

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—*It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent possible without significantly adding to the purchase price of the coins, the \$1 coins and \$5 coins minted under this Act should be produced in a fashion similar to the 2009 International Year of Astronomy coins issued by Monnaie de Paris, the French Mint, so that the reverse of the coin is convex to more closely resemble a baseball and the obverse concave, providing a more dramatic display of the obverse design chosen pursuant to section 4(c).*

**SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—*The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—*

*(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with—*

*(A) the National Baseball Hall of Fame;*

*(B) the Commission of Fine Arts; and*

*(2) reviewed by the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee.*

(b) **DESIGNATIONS AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—*On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—*

*(1) a designation of the value of the coin;*

*(2) an inscription of the year "2014"; and*

*(3) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".*

(c) **SELECTION AND APPROVAL PROCESS FOR OVERSE DESIGN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—*The Secretary shall hold a competition to determine the design of the common obverse of the coins minted under this Act, with such design being emblematic of the game of baseball.*

(2) **SELECTION AND APPROVAL.**—*Proposals for the design of coins minted under this Act may be submitted in accordance with the design selection and approval process developed by the Secretary in the sole discretion of the Secretary. The Secretary shall encourage 3-dimensional models to be submitted as part of the design proposals.*

(3) **PROPOSALS.**—*As part of the competition described in this subsection, the Secretary may accept proposals from artists, engravers of the United States Mint, and members of the general public.*

(4) **COMPENSATION.**—*The Secretary shall determine compensation for the winning design under this subsection, which shall be not less than \$5,000. The Secretary shall take into account this compensation amount when determining the sale price described in section 6(a).*

(d) **REVERSE DESIGN.**—*The design on the common reverse of the coins minted under this Act shall depict a baseball similar to those used by Major League Baseball.*

**SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.**

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—*Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.*

(b) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—*The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2014.*

**SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.**

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—*The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—*

*(1) the face value of the coins;*

*(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and*

*(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, winning design compensation, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).*

(b) **BULK SALES.**—*The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.*

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) *DISCOUNT.*—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

#### SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—All sales of coins minted under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half-dollar coin.

(b) *DISTRIBUTION.*—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the National Baseball Hall of Fame to help finance its operations.

(c) *AUDITS.*—The National Baseball Hall of Fame shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) *LIMITATION.*—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

#### SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, are disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, winning design compensation, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

#### SEC. 9. BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6085

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 6085.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the coming week, I yield to the chief deputy whip.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension on Monday and Tuesday, and of particular note will be H.R. 459, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act, a bipartisan bill sponsored by Congressman RON PAUL. A complete list of the suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Beginning on Tuesday, the House will consider H.R. 6082, the Congressional Replacement of President Obama’s Energy-Restricting and Job-Limiting Offshore Drilling Plan. And finally, the balance of the week will be spent on H.R. 4078, the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act. This is a compilation of bills that are sponsored by Representatives TIM GRIFFIN, REID RIBBLE, BEN QUAYLE, DENNIS ROSS, VIRGINIA FOXX, SCOTT GARRETT, and MIKE CONAWAY.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I appreciate it. I know the majority leader could not be here this afternoon, but he said last week that we should expect legislation on the floor the week of July 30 dealing with the tax questions; in particular, the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. The gentleman may remember my discussions at that point in time. I don’t think decisions had been made.

We are hopeful on this side of the aisle that there will be hearings next week, obviously, because it’s going to be the week of the 30th it’ll be on the floor, and also there will be a markup of that bill before it comes to the floor. Can you tell us whether or not in fact there will be a hearing on that legislation and also whether, pursuant to those hearings, there will be a markup on that bill?

Mr. ROSKAM. As the gentleman knows, the 2001 and the 2003 tax rates have been well vetted and well discussed. They’re not news or breaking ground in any way, shape, or form. So my understanding is that the current thinking is to bring those directly to the floor and that there’s not a plan for a markup.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. As the gentleman understands, although they may be well known, the situation that exists today is radically different than existed in 2001 and 2003 when President Bush, who recommended both of those tax cuts, projected a \$5.6 trillion surplus, as the gentleman may recall. Unfortunately, that prediction was radically wrong. And when I say radically wrong, in fact, we increased the debt by over \$4 trillion rather than have a surplus—a \$10 trillion turnaround in the projections.

As a result, I would suggest to the gentleman and his party that the situation confronting us, as I said, is very, very different than it was in 2001 and 2003 when the Bush administration projected those surpluses, which it inherited, of course, from the Clinton administration.

In addition to that, the Republican majority has said that we’ll govern based on their pledge to America. Openness in the House is a key part of that pledge that you made.

I want to read you a quote:

“We have nothing to fear from letting the House work its will, nothing to fear from the battle of ideas.”

The Speaker of the House, Mr. BOEHNER, went on to say:

“That starts with the committees. The result will be more scrutiny and better legislation.”

He said that in October 2010. Of course, it was in the throes of a campaign. But I would hope and I tell my friend very sincerely that that premise prevails today. In light of the change of circumstances, but much more than that, in light of the significant differences between the two parties in the Ways and Means Committee, the transparency and openness to which Speaker BOEHNER referred, referencing that that would apply in committees as well, would almost dictate that you would have a markup in the committee and give members of the committee the opportunity to vote on that legislation, offer amendments, offer alternatives, and offer their opinions for the consideration of other members on the committee as to the ramifications of the actions proposed in the committee by the majority party.

□ 1920

I would ask my friend if he has a view on whether or not, notwithstanding the fact that the position of the majority is that the subject matter is well known—it is also well known there are differences of opinion on this. And what the Speaker said in his quote was, let that difference be spread across the RECORD, let Members have the opportunity to express their differences through their vote; and that premise applied to the committees. I would hope that the gentleman could assure us that, in fact, there would be a markup in the committee.

I have talked to Mr. CAMP, who is a good friend of mine and for whom I

have a great deal of respect, and asked him to have a markup. I would hope the leadership would support that effort and urge that markup to occur consistent with what Speaker BOEHNER said in October of 2010.

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the points I think that's important to focus in on is the last time this Congress dealt with the '01 and the '03 tax rates was not in '01, not in '03, but in December of 2010 when President Obama signed these into law. So this is an arena where we do reflect back, but ultimately we need to look forward. So the question is how do you create a sense of predictability by which businesses can deal with these situations?

So the gentleman is right to point out past forecasts that were incorrect. But it's also correct to point out that the White House made one error after another—this White House—one error after another as it relates to the predictions of the stimulus, for example, where unemployment was promised to peak at 8 percent, and it didn't turn out to be so.

So as we move forward, this is not new ground, these are not new concepts, and it's consistent with what then-Minority Leader BOEHNER said in the Pledge to America. This process has been open, this process has been dynamic, this process has been participatory, and this bill will be considered under the same rules and the same commitments that were made in the Pledge to America.

Moving forward, what I would like to announce to the gentleman and to the membership is that there will be an opportunity, I'm told, for the minority party to offer the President's alternative as an amendment on the floor, to have the debate. Because as the gentleman and I both know, that's really the crux of the matter. So to have an up-or-down vote, as I would characterize it, is a bad idea. I know the gentleman has a different view of that, but I think, particularly in light of this week's study from Ernst & Young, I think we should be chastened, actually, with the notion of moving forward and raising taxes on anybody.

I accept the world view of the gentleman who has been articulate in the past in communicating that. But I think that really is the crystallization of these two competing views of how to create economic growth, and I think the gentleman will be fully satisfied.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments. That is new information for us. I will tell you, please, I would still like to have a markup in the committee, which I think is consistent. No matter how much this has been discussed, there has been no markup of this bill. So while it may have been discussed for a long period of time and while there have been hearings on tax reform, there has been no

markup of this bill in the committee, as the gentleman well knows.

But I'm pleased to hear that the minority will be allowed an amendment to be made in order of our choosing to offer on this floor. I think that's a positive sign. I appreciate the gentleman's notice of that, and I will certainly notice our Members of that ability. We're pleased at that.

I will say, however, to the gentleman that I did note the Ernst & Young story. I noticed it was paid for by people who may, absent its conclusions, receive a tax increase to help us bring down the deficit. But notwithstanding that, I was sure we were going to hear about that on the floor. I'm not surprised, and you're not going to be surprised that there will be other studies referenced on the floor as well. So I thank the gentleman for his information, and I'm pleased with that.

As I said, I will note that, in fact, there will be an amendment, and hopefully that amendment will be allowed some significant period of time for debate. That is much superior to the only other alternative that we would have had, which was an MTR 5 minutes on each side. So I thank the gentleman, and I thank the leadership for that information.

Let me ask the gentleman, does the gentleman expect the farm bill to come to the floor before the August break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank my friend for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the farm bill has created a lot of concern on our side of the aisle. It's my understanding that there is concern on the gentleman's side of the aisle. Your ranking member supports the bill. It's my understanding that Leader PELOSI does not support the bill. So we're in conversation with our Members, as I'm sure you are with yours; and we're not prepared to make an announcement today in light of continuing to get Member feedback.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

For the gentleman's information, which may help you in determining whether or not you have the votes for the farm bill, I think it fair to say that we would have a majority of our party for the Senate-passed bill which passed, as the gentleman knows, with 62 votes, 12 Members of the Republican Party voting for that bill, 50 members of the Democratic Party. Obviously, it is a significant bipartisan bill. If the gentleman perhaps is talking to Mr. MCCARTHY, you can convey to him information that if that bill were to come to the floor, we would try to work with you to pass that piece of legislation.

Obviously, there are a lot of farmers in our country who are struggling right now. We have an extraordinary drought in America. They are suffering, they're at risk, and the gentleman talked about certainty. I agree with him on

certainty. By the way, because I didn't ask him when he brought it up, does that certainty mean that you would be suggesting that the tax cuts that were in effect in '01, '03 be made permanent?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROSKAM. Well, as the gentleman knows, making things permanent in this arena with this conundrum of rules and limitations—and limitations particularly in the other body—make that difficult. I, speaking on behalf of myself, think that that rate at that level permanent is a wise course. But as the gentleman knows, based on the difficulty of the rules, what I have to say on that is fairly limited based on the reality of the rules.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer.

Going back to the crisis that the agriculture community is confronted with by the drought, if the farm bill—and we would urge that the bipartisan farm bill be brought to the floor for consideration to give certainty to farmers, to give some sense to farmers as to what they might rely on in the coming year or coming years; but absent that, the gentleman did not mention, do we have any expectation that we will deal with drought emergency legislation vis-a-vis the farm community prior to our August break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROSKAM. I don't have information to announce at this point in terms of the timing. I have a high level of confidence that no one is going to be going home for very long absent a remedy and a joint response on all of our parts.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer.

Lastly, Mr. CANTOR is not on the floor, but both Mr. CANTOR and I have made representations that we are going to work together, as we do from time to time, cooperatively and effectively, I might say. We are very concerned that the Iran sanctions legislation, which is in conference, be passed by this Congress prior to our leaving on August 2 or 3—I'm not sure which days we are going to be leaving, but one of those days.

Does the gentleman have any information on the status of the Iran sanctions legislation which we passed overwhelmingly in this House and the Senate has passed? It's in conference, and I know Mr. CANTOR and I both support getting this done before we leave.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, there is every intention to move forward on that which the gentleman and the majority leader have been working so cooperatively on, and there is an expectation that that will be done before the August recess.

Mr. HOYER. I'm very pleased to hear that. I thank the gentleman for that information, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON  
H.R. 4078, REGULATORY FREEZE  
FOR JOBS ACT OF 2012

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have until midnight on July 20, 2012, to file its report to accompany H.R. 4078.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY  
23, 2012

Mr. ROSKAM. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO  
MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-  
GROSSMENT OF H.R. 5856, DE-  
PARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. ROSKAM. I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 5856, the Clerk be permitted to make technical and conforming changes, including numerical changes, in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LLOYD  
CHITTUM

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to an admirable individual from America's First District who passed away earlier this week, who is truly admirable.

Earl Lloyd Chittum of Stafford County lived an honorable life, full of service to his fellow man and faith in a higher power. Lloyd served his community in many different ways, including as a little league baseball and football coach, a member of the Falmouth Volunteer Fire Department, and a member of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors. He was also a proud member of the Fairview at River Club Church and served as a deacon at the Falmouth Baptist Church.

I knew Lloyd for many years through his roles in local government and politics, and I am honored that I was able to call him a friend.

Lloyd leaves behind a large, loving family, including his wife of 55 years, Gloria Payne Chittum.

My prayers are with his family during this time of mourning, and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Earl Lloyd Chittum.

DENOUNCING ACCUSATIONS  
AGAINST HUMA ABEDIN

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those who have come forward to denounce the unwarranted attacks on Huma Abedin, a key aid to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and a woman who has given years of service to this Nation and to the State Department.

As it happens, my wife has given her entire career to the State Department, and I know how angry I would be if she were attacked based on some twisted exaggeration of something that her relatives may have done decades ago, notwithstanding her absolutely spotless record.

No one in this House is more dedicated to combatting radical Islamist ideologies and the governments and organizations that espouse them, but the unwarranted attacks on Huma Abedin undermine our effort to do just that.

Now we face, in Egypt and elsewhere, the outrageous attack that our decision to engage with the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt is not a decision made in our own national interest, but somehow is the result of undue influence.

Let me simply say that I join Senator JOHN MCCAIN in calling for these dangerous accusations, unwarranted accusations, to be withdrawn.

STOP PREDATORY LENDING TO  
MILITARY

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to warn of the danger to our Armed Forces and their families not on the battlefield, but here on American soil.

The Military Spending Act, passed in 2006, stopped much of the predatory lending that once sunk its claws into our military families, but loopholes remain.

The rent-to-own industry constructs stores outside our military bases, while car title lenders and Internet payday lenders find ways around the law by creating open-end loans with interest topping 500 percent.

A counselor at Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri, reports that most service-members seeking financial counseling are burdened with expensive rent-to-own contracts. One soldier earning less than \$1,000 a month paid nearly \$500 a month in furniture rent.

The Senate recently held hearings on this, and the Senate version of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2013 would mandate regulating open-

end credit loans and close the loopholes.

This must change. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the House and the Senate to address this problem. We must add rent-to-own and open-ended loans to "covered" credit and stop the use of allotments for military pay for credit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the week of Monday, July 16, 2012, to Friday, July 20, 2012, on account of ongoing medical treatment in Houston, Texas.

Ms. SEWELL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 17 and 18 on account of events and commitments in the district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4155. An act to direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE  
PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 19, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 205. To amend the act titled 'An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases', approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3001. To award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

H.R. 4155. To direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2012, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6977. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sedaxane; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0615; FRL-9345-8] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6978. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and community Facilities Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reserve Account (RIN: 0575-AC66), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)-Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program-Disability Rehabilitation Research Project (DRRP)-National Data and Statistical Center for the Burn Model Systems received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)-Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program-Disability Rehabilitation Research Project (DRRP)—Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Centers received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6981. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Mississippi; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0784; FRL-9691-9] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6982. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana; Central Indiana (Indianapolis) Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0214; FRL-9689-6] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6983. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Emissions Statements [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0177; FRL-9689-5] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6984. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0785; FRL-9691-7] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6985. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Alabama; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0782; FRL-9691-8] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6986. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Regional Haze [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0150; FRL-9687-9] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6987. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Regional Haze [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0153; FRL-9688-1] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6988. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of North Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0219; FRL-9691-5] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6989. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2012-0182; FRL-9353-2] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6990. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0577; FRL-9352-7] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6991. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for the Pacific Coast Populations of the Western Snowy Plover [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2010-0070] (RIN: 1018-AX10) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6992. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indiana Regulatory Program [STATS No.: IN-160-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2011-0008] received July 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6993. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wyoming Regulatory Program [STATS No.: WY-042-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2012-0001] received July 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6994. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule

— Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 120207106-2428-02] (RIN: 0648-BB85 and 0648-BB27) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6995. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 110210132-1275-02] (RIN: 0648-XC006) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6996. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Final 2012 Spiny Dogfish Fishery Specifications [Docket No.: 120213130-2435-02] (RIN: 0648-XA973) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6997. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC013) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6998. A letter from the Deputy Office Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Regulations [Docket No.: 100222109-2171-02] (RIN: 0648-AY35) received July 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6999. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Bellingham, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0363; Airspace Docket No. 11-ANM-8] received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7000. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airways V-135 and V-137; Southwest United States [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0654; Airspace Docket No. 11-AWP-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7001. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Multiple Compulsory Reporting Points; Continental United States, Alaska and Hawaii [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0130; Airspace Docket No. 12-AWA-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7002. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Leesburg, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0445; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-27] received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7003. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Orlando, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0503; Airspace Docket No. 11-ASO-19] received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7004. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tallahassee, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0240; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-15] received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7005. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airport Concessions Disadvantaged Business Enterprise: Program Improvements [Docket No.: OST-2011-0101] (RIN: 2105-AE10) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7006. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; Driver-Vehicle Inspection Report for Intermodal Equipment [Docket No.: FMCSA-2011-0046] (RIN: 2126-AB34) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7007. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Systems for Telephonic Notification of Unsafe Conditions at Highway-Rail and Pathway Grade Crossings [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0041, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC12) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7008. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1259; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-17059; AD 2012-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7009. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0494; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-17069; AD 2012-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7010. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0084; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-089-AD; Amendment 39-17050; AD 2012-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 21, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5958. A bill to name the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge Visitor Contact Station of the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge unit of Gateway National

Recreation Area in honor of James L. Buckley (Rept. 112-608). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2834. A bill to recognize the heritage of recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting on Federal public lands and ensure continued opportunities for these activities; with an amendment (Rept. 112-609, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6029. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for increased penalties for foreign and economic espionage, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2467. A bill to take certain Federal lands in Mono County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony; with an amendment (Rept. 112-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4484. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3742. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 100 North Church Street in Las Cruces, New Mexico, as the "Edwin L. Mechem United States Courthouse" (Rept. 114-613). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MICA: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4347. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the "Robert Boochever United States Courthouse" (Rept. 112-614). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2834 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6150. A bill to reauthorize appropriations for the National Women's Rights History Project Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 6151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 6152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic

insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 6153. A bill to require the holder of a subordinate lien on the property that secures a federally related mortgage loan, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a timely decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 6154. A bill to promote the development of renewable energy on public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6156. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of the Russian Federation and Moldova and to require reports on the compliance of the Russian Federation with its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 6157. A bill to create a patient-centered quality of care initiative for seriously ill patients through the establishment of a stakeholder strategic summit, quality of life education and awareness initiative, health care workforce training, an advisory committee, and palliative care focused research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6158. A bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to specify that courses offered by lenders for their own employees may not satisfy the pre-licensing education or continuing education requirement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 6159. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require that individuals seeking training in the operation of certain aircraft be checked against the terrorist watchlist to ensure that such individuals are non-threats to aviation; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky,

Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 6160. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to incentivize the development of tamper-resistant drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6161. A bill to provide an exemption for low-revenue companies from certain SEC regulations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HECK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 6162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit health plans without a deductible for prenatal, labor and delivery, and postpartum care to be treated as high deductible plans with respect to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 735. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 violates article I, section 7, clause 1 of the United States Constitution because it was a "Bill for raising Revenue" that did not originate in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN:

H. Res. 736. A resolution expressing opposition to the use of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, argon, or other gases to euthanize shelter animals and support for State laws that require the use of the more humane euthanasia by injection method; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 737. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 6150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER of Ohio:

H.R. 6151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 6152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Sixteenth Amendment

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 6154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Currently, the federal government possesses approximately 1.8 billion acres of land. The U.S. Constitution specifically addresses the relationship of the federal government to lands. Article IV, §3, Clause 2—the Property Clause—gives Congress plenary power and full authority over federal property. The U.S. Supreme Court has described Congress's power to legislate under this Clause as "without limitation." This bill falls squarely within the express Constitutional power set forth in the Property Clause.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 6156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 6157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 6158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 6159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 6160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 6162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 6163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, which is significantly affected by genetic disorders and can be enhanced by research breakthroughs therein, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 181: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. CANSECO.

H.R. 360: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 361: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 814: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 891: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 931: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 942: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 965: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1054: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1182: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1219: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1277: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 1311: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1370: Mr. WEBSTER and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1381: Mr. COHEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1404: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1422: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1426: Mr. LATTA and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1489: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1543: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1546: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1639: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1675: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1681: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1755: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 1774: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1960: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2040: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 2082: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2094: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2108: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2139: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LOBONDO, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2382: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2479: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2547: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2557: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BASS of California, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2563: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2655: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2696: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2721: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2730: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 2741: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2746: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2787: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2925: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.

H.R. 3091: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3109: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3187: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3242: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3264: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3415: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3432: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3510: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 3591: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3634: Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 3798: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3816: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3849: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 4000: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 4091: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4169: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 4209: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4215: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4228: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4345: Mr. PITTS and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 4405: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 4818: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 5542: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LOESACK, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5684: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5741: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 5744: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 5796: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 5822: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 5846: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 5865: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 5871: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 5925: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 5943: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 5944: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 5965: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 5969: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5970: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5977: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 5978: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5980: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 6063: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 6067: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 6085: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.

H.R. 6087: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 6088: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 6089: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 6092: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 6097: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 6099: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6102: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 6118: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 6124: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 6134: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 6139: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 6140: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WEST, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COLE, and Mr. LANDRY.

H.J. Res. 110: Mr. BROOKS.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. STARK, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.J. Res. 112: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. BARTLETT.

H. Con. Res. 121: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 134: Mr. GOWDY.

H. Res. 262: Mrs. CAPITO.

H. Res. 298: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 353: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 407: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 506: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Res. 684: Mr. SIRECS.

H. Res. 690: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 713: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 725: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 727: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 729: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 732: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. LEVIN.

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 4 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN on the bill (H.R. 4010): Dennis A. Cardoza, Daniel Lipinski, Norman D. Dicks, Charles B. Rangel, John D. Dingell, Nita M. Lowey, Gary L. Ackerman, Cedric L. Richmond, Bobby L. Rush, Shelley Berkley, Earl Blumenauer, Luis V. Gutierrez, Richard E. Neal, Emanuel Cleaver, Martin Heinrich.

The following Member's name was withdrawn from the following discharge petition:

Petition 4 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN on the bill (H.R. 4010): Ben Chandler, Henry Cuellar.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5856

OFFERED BY: Mr. BROOKS

AMENDMENT No. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or a component thereof to provide the government of the Russian Federation with any information about the missile defense systems of the United States that is classified by the Department or component thereof.

H.R. 5856

OFFERED BY: Mr. JOHNSON OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT No. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any further operations in Afghanistan other than for a full and immediate withdrawal.

H.R. 5856

OFFERED BY: Mr. JOHNSON OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT No. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act for overseas operations may be used for strikes against targets by unmanned aerial vehicles.

H.R. 5856

OFFERED BY: Mr. ELLISON

AMENDMENT No. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Not later than 30 days after a contract is awarded using funds appropriated under this Act, the relevant contractor and subcontractor at any tier (and any principal with at least 10 percent ownership interest, officer, or director of the contractor or subcontractor or any affiliate or subsidiary within the control of the contractor or subcontractor) shall disclose to the Administrator of General Services all electioneering communications, independent expenditures, or contributions made in the most recent election cycle supporting or opposing a Federal political candidate, political party, or political committee, and contributions made to a third-party entity with the intention or reasonable expectation that such entity would use the contribution to make independent expenditures or electioneering communications in Federal elections.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 6085: Mr. WOMACK.