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 Speaker, at a time when the Republican majority has, in another wasted effort, repealed health care reform for the 33rd time, at a time when we will not see on this floor a vote to extend tax cuts for the middle class, now the Republican majority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 gentlelady'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 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 heartbreaking 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 scrutiny 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 gentlelady 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-prioritze 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, Subcommittee on Strategic 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 oiler 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 Medevedev—''[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 military 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 limits 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 nondefense 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman 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 oftentimes unknowingly recruited.

The Department of Defense claims it's just a tool to screen students' enlistment eligibility and determine their interests and skills for nonmilitary 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 Sates, 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 inclusionary 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 nonviolent 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 proceedings 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. Simply 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 commander 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. ROHRABACHER. 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 significantly 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 motives 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, ongoing 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 probably 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 fulfils 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 rollcall 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 recisions 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 echos 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 particular, 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 concerns 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 retires 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, we, 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
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)

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)

NOES—166

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
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
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Cantor
Davis (IL)
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Stark
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

□ 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 commitments 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

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey

NOES—326

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
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
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
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 (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—18

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Cuellar
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hayworth
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

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
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
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)

NOT VOTING—17

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 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
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
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)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling

Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
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
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
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
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—5

Barton (TX)
Hayworth
Long
Paul
Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—19

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Lowey
Olver
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1826

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
Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
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)

NOES—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Gutierrez
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Sullivan
Wasserman Schultz

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
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Camp
Capuano
Carney
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Farr
Flores
Frank (MA)
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Harris
Heinrich
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lummis
Markey
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Posey
Quigley
Ribble
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schock
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—292

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
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)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman 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
Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
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
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Buchanan
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

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 commitments 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 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 137, noes 278, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—137

Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—278

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
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
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
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
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lowey
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

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
Amodei
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
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
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)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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

NOES—167

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brooks
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chandler
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
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
Hochul
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
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
Olson
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
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Bono Mack
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

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:

[Roll No. 496]

AYES—238

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Flores
Frank (MA)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McGovern
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Webster
Welch
West
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Barber
Barrow
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capuano
Carnahan
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Herger
Hinchey
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Myrick
Neal
Nugent
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Watt
Waxman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

□ 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
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
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)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
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
Schrader
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
Olver
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)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
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
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
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 (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
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
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
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
Pascrell
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
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Brown (FL)
Buerkle
Deutch
Filner
Fleischmann
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Stivers
Wasserman Schultz

□ 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 Cooperstown, 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 OBVERSE 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.—