Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AKIN. I very much appreciate the tremendous cooperation that so existed on the Armed Services Committee. I'm sensitive to your concerns about the overly broad in its drafting. I hate red tape and paperwork and am very open-minded to work along these lines. I think our concerns are very much the same on this issue. And I look forward to working with you.

Unfortunately, in trying to get the thing drafted the way we wanted, we ran out of time today. So we're just going to go ahead and offer the amendment, but I look forward as we have time in the weeks ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. The bill that we sent to the Senate and subsequently sent to the President for his signature is supposed to mean exactly what it says. It's in English language. It's clear, and we expect the Department of Defense to follow it to the letter, and those duties are very precise.

To send a message that cannot be fulfilled, sadly, that this amendment requires, is just wrong.

So, consequently, I oppose this and hope that it will not pass.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. AKIN. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to H. Res. 572, I offer amendments en bloc No. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc printed in House Report 111-182 consisting of amendments numbered 10, 11, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 56, and 58 offered by Mr. SKELTON:

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVL

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 1230. MODIFICATION OF REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED: Strategic Direction of United States Activities Relating to Security and Stability in Afghanistan.—Subsection (c) of section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 385) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as subparagraph (C); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The specific substance of any existing formal or informal agreement with NATO ISAF countries or the Taliban regarding the following:

(i) Mutually agreed upon goals.

(ii) Strategies to achieve such goals, including strategies identified in The Comprehensive Military Strategic Plan agreed to by the Heads of State and Government from Allied and other troop-contributing nations.

(iii) Resource and force requirements, including the requirements as determined by NATO military authorities in the agreed 'Combined Joint Statement of Requirements' (CJSR) of NATO ISAF country and each individual NATO ISAF country; and

(iv) Commitments and pledges of support regarding troops and resource levels.";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"(2) NON-NATO ISAF TROOP-CONTRIBUTING COUNTRIES.—A description of the specific substance of any existing formal or informal agreement with non-NATO ISAF troop-contributing countries regarding the following:

(A) Mutually agreed upon goals.

(B) Strategies to achieve such goals.

(C) Resource and force requirements.

(D) Commitments and pledges of support regarding troops and resource levels.";

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED: PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF PROGRESS TOWARD SUSTAINABLE LONG-TERM SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking "individual NATO ISAF countries" and inserting "each individual NATO ISAF country"; and

(B) by inserting in the most recent NATO ISAF Troop Placemat" after "including levels of troops and equipment";

(2) by redesigning subparagraphs (C) through (K) as subparagraphs (D) through (L), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) With respect to non-NATO ISAF troop-contributing countries, a listing of contributions from each individual country, including levels of troops and equipment, the effect of commitments on the operations, and unfulfilled commitments."; and

(4) in subparagraph (I) (as redesignated)—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (i); and

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

"(ii) The location, funding, staffing requirements, current staffing levels, and activities of each Provincial Reconstruction Team led by a nation other than the United States.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section, as amended, is further amended in subparagraph (J) as redesignated by striking "subsection (c)(4)" and inserting "subsection (c)(5)".

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVL

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 2846. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS FOR MANAGEMENT OF ENERGY DEMAND OR REDUCTION OF ENERGY USAGE DURING PEAK PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 17B of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"2919. Participation in programs for management of energy demand or reduction of energy usage during peak periods

"(a) PARTICIPATION IN DEMAND RESPONSE OR LOAD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall permit and encourage the Secretaries of the military departments, heads of Defense agencies, and the heads of Defense functions, in consultation with the Department of Defense to participate in demand response programs for the management of energy demand or the reduction of energy usage during peak periods conducted by—

"(1) an electric utility;

"(2) independent system operator;

"(3) State agency; or

"(4) third-party entity (such as a demand response aggregator or curtailment service provider) implementing demand response programs on behalf of an electric utility, independent system operator, or State agency;

"(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INCENTIVES.—Financial incentives received from an entity specified in subsection (a) shall be received in cash and deposited into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt. Amounts received shall be available for obligations only to the extent provided in advance in an appropriations Act. The Secretary or head of the Defense Agency or other instrumentality shall pay for the cost of the design and implementation of these services in full in the year in which they are received from amounts provided in advance in an appropriations Act.

"(c) USE OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INCENTIVES.—Of the amounts provided in advance in an appropriations Act derived from subsection (b) above, 100 percent shall be available only to the military department where the proceeds were derived, and at least 25 percent of that appropriated amount shall be designated for use in energy management initiatives by the military department where the proceeds were derived.

(b) CLEIREAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2919. Participation in programs for management of energy demand or reduction of energy usage during peak periods.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The text of the amendment is as follows:

The end of title V (page 180, after line 11), add the following new section:

SEC. 594. EXPANSION OF MILITARY LEADERSHIP DIVERSITY COMMISSION TO INCLUDE RESERVE COMPONENT REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 596(b)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4476) is amended by striking subparagraphs (C), (D), (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

(C) A commissioned officer from each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Reserves who serves or has served in a leadership position with either a military department command or combatant command.

(D) A retired general or flag officer from each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Reserves.

(E) A retired noncommissioned officer from each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Reserves.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. DRIBBUS

The text of the amendment is as follows:

The end of title V (page 175, after line 11), add the following new section:
The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 155, after line 4), add the following new section:

SEC. 57. NO PERMANENT MILITARY BASES IN AFGHANISTAN.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. HARE

The text of the amendment is as follows:

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 180, after line 11), add the following new section:

SEC. 594. EXPANSION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY HEALING AND RESPONSE PROGRAM INITIATIVE.

Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 122) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (15) as paragraphs (3) through (14), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) SUICIDE PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY HEALING AND RESPONSE PROGRAM.—"
and advocate for the recovery of remains from Tarawa; and
(4) encourages the Department of Defense to review this research and, as appropriate, pursue new efforts to conduct field studies, new research, and undertake all feasible efforts to recover, identify, and return remains of members of the Armed Forces from Tarawa.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title V (page 180, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 594. REPORT ON PROGRESS IN COMPLETING DEFENSE INCIDENT-BASED REPORTING SYSTEM.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report detailing the progress of the Secretary with respect to the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. Minnick

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII (page 252, line 16), add the following new section:

SEC. 716. REPORT ON RURAL ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the health care of rural members of the Armed Forces and individuals who receive health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States. The report shall include recommendations of resources or legislation the Secretary determines necessary to improve access to health care for such individuals.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. SARBANS

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 830. PROCUREMENT PROFESSIONALISM ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) GAO-CONVENED PANEL.—The Comptroller General shall convene a panel of experts, to be known as the Procurement Professionalism Advisory Panel, to study the ethics, competence, and effectiveness of acquisition personnel and the governmentwide procurement process, including the following:

(1) The role played by the Federal acquisition workforce at each stage of the procurement process, with a focus on the following:
   (A) Personnel shortages.
   (B) Expertise shortages.
   (C) The relationship between career acquisition personnel and political appointees.
   (D) The relationship between acquisition personnel and contractors.
   (E) The legislative, regulation, official policy, and informal customs that govern procurement personnel.

(2) Targeted education and professional development opportunities available to acquisition professionals.

(3) Opportunities to pursue higher education and professional certification, including scholarships and student loan forgiveness.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF PANEL.—The Comptroller General shall be the chairman of the panel.

(c) COMPOSITION OF PANEL.—

1. MEMBERSHIP.—The Comptroller General shall appoint highly qualified and knowledgeable persons to serve on the panel and shall ensure that the following groups receive fair representation on the panel:
   (A) Officers and employees of the United States.
   (B) Persons in private industry.
   (C) Federal experts.

2. FAIR REPRESENTATION.—For the purposes of the requirement for fair representation under paragraph (1), persons serving on the panel under subparagraph (A) of that paragraph shall not be counted as persons serving on the panel under subparagraph (A) or (B) of the same paragraph.

3. PARTICIPATION BY OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.—The Comptroller General shall ensure that the opportunity to submit information and views on the ethics, competence, and effectiveness of acquisition personnel to the panel for the purposes of the study is accorded to all interested parties, including officers and employees of the United States.

4. INFORMATION FROM AGENCIES.—The panel may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States any information that the panel considers necessary to carry out a meaningful study of administration of the rules described in subsection (a).

5. REPORT.—

   (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of the study to—
   (A) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;
   (B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;
   (C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate; and
   (D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

6. AVAILABILITY.—The Comptroller General shall publish the report in the Federal Register and on a publically accessible website (acquisition.gov).

7. DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘‘Federal labor organization’’ has the meaning given the term ‘‘labor organization’’ in section 7103(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY Ms. SCHATOWSKY

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 291, after line 2), add the following new section:

SEC. 830. ACCESS BY CONGRESS TO DATABASE OF INFORMATION REGARDING THE INTEGRITY AND PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN PERSONS AWARDED FEDERAL CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.

Section 872(b)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 455) is amended by striking ‘‘Chairman and Ranking Members of the Committees of Congress having jurisdiction’’ and inserting ‘‘any Member of Congress’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V (page 134, after line 24), add the following new section:

SEC. 524. SECURE ELECTRONIC DELIVERY OF CERTIFICATE OF RELEASE OR DISCHARGE FROM ACTIVE DUTY (DD FORM 214).

Section 596 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 1168 note) is amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

1. SECURE METHOD OF ELECTRONIC DELIVERY.

2. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Department of Defense, shall develop and implement a secure electronic method of forwarding the DD Form 214 to the appropriate office specified in subsection (a) if demonstrated problems arise.’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII (page 611, after line 21), add the following new section:

SEC. 2528. LAND CONVEYANCE, FERNDALE HOUSING AT CENECVILLE NAVAL FACILITY TO CITY OF FERNDALE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—At such time as the Navy vacates the Ferndale Housing, which previously supported the now closed Centerville Beach Naval Facility in the City of Ferndale, California, the Secretary of the Navy may convey, at fair market value, to the City of Ferndale (in this section referred to as the ‘‘City’’), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of land, and improvements thereon, for the purpose of permitting the City to utilize the property for low- and moderate-income housing for seniors, families, or both.

(b) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance, all right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements and appurtenant easements thereto, shall be revoked and returned to the United States, and the United States shall have the right to immediately enter upon such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCES.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including, but not limited to, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the
conveyance. If amounts are collected from the city in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary, the Secretary may carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) Treatment of amounts received.—Amounts received as reimbursements under subparagraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) Additional term and conditions.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. 9. RECOGNITION OF AND SUPPORT FOR STATE DEFENSE FORCES.

(a) Recognition and support.—Section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) Recognition.—Congress hereby recognizes forces established under subsection (c) as an integral military component of the homeland defense of the United States, while reaffirming that those forces remain entirely State regulated, organized, and equipped and recognizing that those forces will be used for homeland security purposes exclusively at the local level and in accordance with State law.

"(e) Assistance by Department of Defense.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may coordinate homeland security efforts with, and provide assistance to, a defense force established under subsection (c) to the extent such assistance is requested by a State or by a force established under subsection (c) and subject to the provisions of this section.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense may not provide assistance under paragraph (1) if, in the judgment of the Secretary, such assistance would—

"(A) impede the ability of the Department of Defense to execute missions of the Department;

"(B) take resources away from warfighting units;

"(C) incur nonreimbursed identifiable costs; or

"(D) consume resources in a manner inconsistent with the mission of the Department of Defense.

"(f) Use of Department of Defense property and equipment.—The Secretary of Defense may authorize qualified personnel of a force established under subsection (c) to use and operate property, arms, equipment, and facilities of the Department of Defense as needed in the course of training activities and State active duty.

"(g) Transfer of excess equipment.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may transfer to a State or a force established under subsection (c) any personal property of the Department of Defense that the Secretary determines is—

"(A) excess to the needs of the Department of Defense;

"(B) suitable for use by a force established under subsection (c).

"(2) The Secretary of Defense may transfer personal property under this section only if—

"(A) the property is drawn from stock held by the Department of Defense at the time of the amendment;

"(B) the recipient force established under subsection (c) accepts the property on an as-is, where-is basis;

"(C) the transfer is made without the expenditure of any funds available to the Department of Defense for the procurement of defense equipment; and

"(D) all costs incurred subsequent to the transfer of the property are borne or reimbursed by the recipient.

"(3) Subject to paragraph (2)(D), the Secretary may transfer property under this section without charge to the recipient force established under subsection (c).

"(h) Federal/State training coordination.—(1) Participation by a force established under subsection (c) in a training program of the Department of Defense is at the discretion of the State.

"(2) Nothing in this section may be construed as requiring the Department of Defense to provide any training program to any force.

"(3) Any such training program shall be conducted in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the State or the force on which such training assistance shall provide for payment of such costs.

"(4) Any direct costs to the Department of Defense of providing training assistance to a force established under subsection (c) shall be reimbursed by the State. Any agreement under paragraph (3) between the Department of Defense and a State or a force established under subsection (c) shall provide for payment of such costs.

"(j) Federal funding of State defense forces.—Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be made available to a State defense force.

"(k) Liability.—Any liability for injuries or damages incurred by a member of a force established under subsection (c) while engaged in training activities or State active duty shall be the sole responsibility of the State, regardless of whether the injury or damage was incurred on United States property or involved United States equipment or whether the member was under direct supervision of United States personnel at the time of the incident.

"(l) Definition.—With respect to this section, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.''

(b) Definition of State.—(1) Definition.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(n) State Defined.—In this section, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.''

(2) Conforming amendments.—Such section is further amended in subsections (a), (b), and (c) by striking 'a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands' each place it appears and inserting 'a State'.

(c) Stylistic amendments.—Such section is further amended—

"(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "PROHIBITION ON MAINTENANCE OF OTHER TROOPS..." after "(a)";

"(2) in subsection (b), by inserting "USE WITHIN STATE BORDERS..." after "(b)";

"(3) in subsection (c), by inserting "STATE DEFENSE FORCES AUTHORIZED..." after "(c)";

"(4) in subsection (k), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting "EFFECT OF USE IN DEFENSE FORCES..." after "(k)";

"(5) in subsection (l), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting "PROHIBITION ON MAINTENANCE OF RESERVE FORCES..." after "(l)";

"(d) Clerical amendments.—
While I will not oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi contained in this bloc, I claim the time in opposition to express a concern I have about the amendment as drafted.

Mr. TAYLOR's amendment would authorize the Navy to use $35 million from procurement of lightweight torpedoes, known as Mark-46, to convert two commercial ferries for military uses as intratheater lift platforms. These two commercial vessels were built through Maritime Administration title 11 loan guarantee, which may soon be in default.

A separate amendment in the base bill directs the Maritime Administration to consult with the Navy before disposing of these vessels should the Maritime Administration receive title to them through default on the loan. The Navy has stated that they may have an interest in the vessels, but would likely have to make significant improvements to these vessels to render the vessels appropriate for military use. This will require some study and planning on the part of the Navy.

Should the Navy determine that these vessels have military utility, I would support the Navy leasing and converting these commercial ferries. But I do ask the chairman and the gentleman from Mississippi to work with me in conference with the other body to find an alternate offset for this effort.

Although the GAO has indicated that there may be nearly $50 million in excess funds for the Lightweight torpedo program, the Navy is currently in negotiations with the supplier to procure at least 38 more upgrade kits with $23 million of this money.

In addition, the Navy is moving to a full and open competition for these upgrade kits starting in fiscal year 2010. A $35 million reduction is more than a third of the Navy's request and would substantially limit the Navy's ability to complete this program and continue to buy more upgrade kits.

The Navy is using the pressure of this future competition to get the best price possible on these additional upgrade kits this year. These upgrade kits are necessary to improve the capability of these torpedoes against quiet, diesel electric submarines.

Therefore, I will support the amendment, but hope we can work together to find a more suitable offset in the conference.

I reserve the balance of my time.
My passion is to ensure that our armed services are representative of America and that the leadership pipeline reflects our Nation’s diversity. And this amendment simply ensures that when the study and composition of this Commission is formulated, that the Members and Reserve components are included.

No component should be left behind in the DOD’s shift to increase diversity in the Armed Forces. We can and we must do better for the sake of future generations that will join the ranks to ensure minority representation, leadership and promote equality.

Mr. MCKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield 1 minute to our friend and colleague, the outstanding new Member from Florida (Mr. Grayson).

Mr. GRAYSON. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for allowing these amendments to go forward. This is a great bill; and in particular, I am heartened to see that we have a good amendment in here that will finally get ahold of the subject of cost overruns.

I worked in defense procurement for 20 years. I worked fighting war profiteers for 5 years before I came here; and one of the dirty dark secrets of defense contracting is the fact that contractors buy in. That’s a term that is used by contractors to explain the situation where they compete for a time and materials contract or they compete for a cost reimbursement contract. They propose a certain cost or price, knowing full well they cannot meet that price. They get the contract, and they overcharge the government. It’s a cost overrun. It happens every day of the week, and we need to get a fix on it so we can end it.

The first amendment that I have offered on this bill, which is the subject of my current statement, is to have the GAO identify cost overruns on a systematic basis and report to Congress in 90 days. I’m hopeful that that will give us a good fix on the scope of this problem and explain to us what we can possibly do to end this terrible tragedy which ends up cheating the taxpayer and cheating the troops.

Mr. MCKEON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. Lipinski).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to thank Chairman SKELTON for accepting my amendment.

My amendment encourages DOD to act to recover the remains of 564 brave men who died in the Battle of Tarawa but are still unaccounted for. In 1943, 1,100 men were lost in 76 hours as this island was taken from the Japanese. The violence and speed of the battle resulted in makeshift graves that are now missing. Acting now to find and relocate the bodies is particularly important because development on the small island threatens the search. Most importantly, retired Marine William Niven has recently documented the likely locations of many of the unaccounted-for remains.

Flight 6262 that the DOD has also used ground-penetrating radar to find remains. But unfortunately DOD has no plans to conduct new research. I would like to commend Chicago Alderman James Balcer, a decorated Vietnam Veteran, for his leadership on this issue.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a resolution passed in the Chicago City Council, urging action on the recovery of our brave servicemen on Tarawa.

Whereas, On November 20, 1943, the 2nd Division of the United States Marine Corps and a part of the Army’s 27th Infantry Division fought in one of the bloodiest battles of World War II on the Pacific atoll of Tarawa; and

Whereas, The American invasion force, consisting of four battleships, 12 destroyers, 36 transports, 150 aircraft carriers, 12 heavy and four light cruisers, 66 destroyers, and 36 transports, the largest American force that had ever been assembled for a single operation in the war, stormed the Japanese-held island fortress of Betio on the atoll; and

Whereas, During the 76 hours of fierce combat, 1,100 United States Marines were killed in action and over 2,200 were wounded in an operation that decimated over 4,500 Japanese defenders; and

Whereas, The 2nd Marine Division buried their dead in 43 temporary graveyards, recorded their location and departed Tarawa the following month; and

Whereas, Military records indicate that the surface of the island of Betio was subsequently graded by the United States Navy during the war, and temporary grave markers were replaced with proper ones; and

Whereas, However, when the United States Army went to Tarawa after the end of the war to reclaim the bodies, it recovered only 402 bodies; apparently because many of the replacement markers were incorrectly located; and

Whereas, In addition to the 402 reclaimed bodies, 118 of those Marines killed in action at Tarawa were buried at sea and 88 were listed as missing in action during the war, leaving the bodies of nearly 500 Marines killed in action unaccounted for; and

Whereas, Recently a not-for-profit organization called History Flight began an endeavor to determine the location of the missing remains of the Marines, spending thousands of hours researching military archives, and visiting Betio to conduct interviews and to employ ground-penetrating tests with ground-penetrating radar; and

Whereas, The research produced results that found the remains of some missing Marines on Betio and found strong evidence that, although some of the bodies have been accidentally disinterred since World War II, more bodies of the Marines who died on Betio can be found.

Mr. MCKEON. I have no further speakers, so I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady who is the Chair of the Water Resources Subcommitteee, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Johnson).

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I rise in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. Thanks to the chair, the gentleman from Texas, Ike Skelton and ranking member Mckeen.

My amendment requires the Department of Defense to report to the Congress on the need for and availability of mental health care services for servicemembers and their families that are stationed overseas. Many face depression and post-traumatic stress syndrome and suicide risks while trying to recover and readjust their lives.

We’ve heard more of this because we’ve had so many military members have to go back to the same war more than one time, and only a small percentage of them have been able to get any support.

I thank our chairman for accepting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2647, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.” Thanks to the chair, the gentleman from Texas, Ike Skelton and ranking member Mckeen.

My amendment requires the Department of Defense to report to the Congress on the need for and availability of mental health care services for servicemembers and their families that are stationed overseas.

Upon leaving the battlefield, soldiers’ physical wounds are only half of their problems.

Mr. Chair, before being elected to public service, I was employed as the Chief Psychiatric Nurse at the VA Hospital in Dallas, Texas.

I have 15 years of hands-on experience with patient care, specialized in mental health.

My experience has taught me that mental health patients need to be treated with mercy, communication, information, and understanding.

My amendment today simply requests that the Defense Department report back to Congress on whether our health care workers abroad are adequately trained in detecting and treating mental illness and if we have the adequate resources and centers to treat these patients.

While fighting two wars, we have more veterans than ever before returning home.
Many face depression, PTSD, and suicidal risk while trying to recover and readjust to their lives at home. So far, only a small percentage of service members who have been inflicted with PTSD or depression have been given the proper ongoing care. Patients do not receive immediate evaluations or treatment. They have to wait far too long to be given a sufficient amount of care. It is, therefore, vital for the Department of Defense to have the availability and quality of care of mental health centers abroad. By gaining a proper understanding of the situation, we will be able to make the changes needed to aid our servicemembers through their recovery process. This is why we must work towards fully understanding mental illnesses and continue to improve upon the care and treatment of mental health patients.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. At this time I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank Chairman SKELTON for yielding. I want to salute him for his work on this bill and on including an amendment that we crafted that would promote efficiency and effectiveness within the Federal acquisition process. This amendment would create a procurement professionalism advisory panel.

My interest in this comes from two perspectives. One was serving on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee last session and seeing many instances of fraud and abuse that we can do something about, and also working with contractors in my district who want to make sure that their partner on the other side of the table, the Federal Government, is strong and has good procurement. This advisory panel will focus on whether the government’s procurement personnel have adequate resources, are adhering to high ethical standards, are receiving high-quality professional development and otherwise are being the best they can be, which will ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the procurement process.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. I yield and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEINER. First of all, let me express my great gratitude to the chairman and ranking member for including language that I had suggested and also into improving general transparency in the bill.

The language that I inserted, that hopefully will be a part of the manager’s amendment when passed, will ask the GAO the fundamental question, not only how much do the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq cost to our Federal taxpayers, but how much do they cost localities like mine where literally hundreds of thousands of hours have been lost by patriotic New Yorkers, particularly in homeland security jobs like police, fire and EMS, going off to fight on the frontlines, and yet the city taxpayers still wind up paying for it. Hundreds of thousands of hours have been lost.

Now obviously the primary cost of the war is the lost lives and the injured men and women who serve for us, and we should always keep them in our thoughts and our prayers. But there also is a growing cost to localities, particularly ones with profound numbers of employ巨e workers.

Mr. SHERRY. Wait a minute. I am not sure we have to do.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I rise to note my concerns about the Grayson amendment to H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. As Chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with jurisdiction over procurement issues, I share Mr. GRAYSON’s desire to ensure that our procurement process uses taxpayer dollars most efficiently and obtains the lowest possible prices. However, I am concerned that the Grayson amendment, along with the Administration’s acquisition reform policies, would remove the ability of acquisition professionals to determine the “Best Value” for the taxpayers’ dollars, and would significantly weaken the hands of the Congress. President Obama made it clear in his Memorandum of March 4, 2009, Government Contracting, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, that acquisition professionals should be entrusted to determine the “best value” for taxpayer dollars in each procurement: “The Federal Government has an overriding obligation to American taxpayers. It should perform its functions efficiently and effectively while ensuring that its actions result in the best value for the taxpayer.” The Administration made it clear that acquisition professionals “must have the flexibility to tailor contracts to carry out their missions and achieve the policy goals of the Government.” The Grayson amendment would unnecessarily restrict “Best Value” analysis. The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) defines “Best Value” as “the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government’s estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement.” It states pre-determined factors for consideration in an acquisition, our current system places that judgment in the hands of the acquisition professionals. These professionals tailor the evaluation factors for each individual acquisition to the particular needs of that acquisition. This process results in the “Best Value” for each taxpayer dollar. The FAR requires that price must always be considered in every source selection. But importantly, its importance must be considered in comparison to other criteria, including past performance, compliance with solicitation requirements, technical excellence, management capability, personnel qualifications, and prior experience. Additionally, all the factors and significant subfactors that will affect contract award and their relative importance must be stated clearly in the solicitation.

I believe that the goal of Mr. GRAYSON’s amendment is to prevent situations where price receives minimal consideration in the acquisition process. I share this concern, and the Committee has received information that price has not always been considered a dominating factor. Reforms are needed to ensure that price is treated as a critical criterion that is not given short shift in the best value analysis.
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However, the Grayson amendment would set a rigid numerical formula for consideration of price, which may not be appropriate in all circumstances. By requiring price to be "at least equal to all other factors combined," this amendment would render our procurement process to the lowest price technically acceptable or sealed bids methods of the past, which failed to achieve the maximum yield for each tax dollar spent. Furthermore, this amendment would require the head of every agency who finds other factors more important than price (such as time of delivery, etc.) to issue a waiver. This would be an overwhelming and unnecessary distraction for agency heads.

Mr. Chair, my concern about this amendment is about getting the best value for each tax dollar spent. I would like to continue to work together with Mr. GRAYSON to address his very legitimate concerns about the importance of price as an evaluation factor in the procurement process. However for the reasons discussed above, I cannot support this amendment in its present form.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendment #2 which includes an amendment I offered with my colleagues Congressmen BRALEY, TONKO and SCOTT MURPHY.

Mr. Chair, my district is home to the Rock Island Arsenal, the largest government-owned weapons manufacturing arsenal in the western world.

The Arsenal Support Program Initiative, commonly known as ASPI, has made a critical impact on the economic development of the Rock Island Arsenal and surrounding communities by bringing in new business and creating over 500 jobs.

Mr. Chair, ASPI was designed to help maintain the viability of our nation's arsenals by encouraging businesses to utilize and invest in the industrial base. It is also important to note that the Army supports ASPI because the program yields substantial cost savings for the government and contributes to the increased use of the industrial base by promoting public-private partnerships.

Mr. Chair, the underlying bill authorizes funding for the en bloc amendment #2 which includes an amendment I offered with my colleagues Congressmen BRALEY, TONKO and SCOTT MURPHY.

Mr. Chair, the question is whether the en bloc amendment #2 which includes an amendment I offered with my colleagues Congressmen BRALEY, TONKO and SCOTT MURPHY.

Mr. SKELTON. What was the ruling on the previous recommendation?

The Acting CHAIR. Notice was given to take amendment No. 20 at a different place in the order.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 111-182.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I have an amendment at the desk that was made in order by the rule of the day.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. CUMMINGS:

After section 3505 insert the following new section (and redesignate accordingly):

SEC. 3506. DEFENSE OF VESSELS AND CARGOS AGAINST PIRACY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Protecting cargoes owned by the United States Government and transported on United States-flag vessels through an area designated by the Coast Guard or the International Maritime Bureau of the International Chamber of Commerce as an area of high risk of piracy is in our national interest.

(2) Protecting United States-citizen mariners employed on United States-flag vessels transiting an area designated by the Coast Guard or the International Maritime Bureau of the International Chamber of Commerce as an area of high risk of piracy is in our national interest.

(3) Weapons and supplies that may be used to support military operations should not fall into the hands of pirates.

(b) EMBARKATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Defense shall embark military personnel on board a United States-flag vessel carrying Government-impelled cargoes if the vessel is—

(1) operating in an area designated by the Coast Guard or the International Maritime Bureau of the International Chamber of Commerce as an area of high risk of piracy; and

(2) determined by the Coast Guard to be at risk of being boarded by pirates.

(c) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply with respect to an area referred to in subsection (b)(1) on the earlier of—

(1) September 30, 2011; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary of Defense notifies the Congress that the Secretary believes that there is not a credible threat to United States-flag vessels carrying Government-impelled cargoes operating in such area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also extend my deep thanks to Chairman SKELTON for working so closely with me on this amendment, and I applaud his leadership of the House Armed Services Committee.

As chairman of the subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, I have convened two hearings to examine maritime piracy, including one in May after two U.S.-flagged vessels, the Maersk Alabama and the Liberty Sun, both of which were carrying U.S. food aid, were attacked by Somali pirates. The attack against the Maersk Alabama left American Captain Richard Phillips hostage to the pirates. He was rescued only after U.S. military forces were deployed to the scene.

Incidents of piracy in the Horn of Africa region are increasing. According to the International Maritime Bureau, in 2008 there were 111 actual and attempted Somali pirate attacks, resulting in the hijackings of 42 vessels. By mid May of this year, there had already been 114 actual and attempted Somali pirate attacks, resulting in 29 successful hijackings. Nonetheless, despite the obvious threat to United States mariners, the Department of Defense has been inexplicably reluctant to directly secure U.S.-flagged vessels transiting the Horn of Africa region, even when they are carrying government-owned cargoes.

While I have no doubt that our military would respond immediately if another U.S.-flagged vessel were attacked, the timeliness of their response could be hindered if Navy assets are far from the scene. Further, it is clearly preferable to prevent an incident from occurring rather than to respond to a hostage situation. However, the DOD has repeatedly argued, including in the testimony before my subcommittee, that the area in which Somali pirates operate is so vast the Navy simply cannot prevent every attack by conducting patrols and, therefore, essentially merchant vessels should protect themselves. This perspective assumes that the only way the military can protect merchant shipping from pirates is to stage vessels across the entire million-square-mile theater of operations. Frankly, there are other ways to protect our merchant fleet.

The United States Maritime Administration estimates that approximately 54 U.S.-flagged vessels transit the Horn of Africa region during the course of a year. Of these, about 40 will carry U.S. Government food aid cargoes, and 44 have the ability to carry U.S. military cargo. Only a handful of these vessels, fewer than 10 in a 3-month period, are estimated to be at serious risk of attack by pirates due to their operating characteristics. Therefore, my amendment would require the Department of Defense to embark military security personnel on U.S.-flagged vessels carrying United States Government cargoes when they transit pirate-infested waters if they are deemed to be at risk of being boarded by pirates.

Mr. Chair, U.S. maritime labor unions collectively testified before my subcommittee in support of the immediate provision to U.S.-flagged vessels by the government of "the formal protection necessary to prevent any further acts of piracy against them." In keeping with that position, the Transportation Trades Department of The
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, just before I yield to our chairman, I want to just say to the gentleman we are talking about only providing security to U.S. flagged vessels carrying United States cargo, operated by United States citizens. Surely we can provide that.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee (Mr. SKILTON).

Mr. SKILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. There may be a requirement to redraft part of it at a future date, but I think the purpose and the intent are correct.

Piracy is here. It's an age-old problem. From the Marines' hymn the phrase "to the shores of Tripoli," that was a successful antipiracy effort on behalf of the United States Marines. We have to do our very best to protect America, American vessels, Americans that are sailing the ships, and particularly government cargo that's on them. So I applaud Mr. CUMMINGS for making this substantial step in the right direction in combating piracy.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would urge the body to pass this amendment. I think it's a very important amendment. We have heard the testimony in our subcommittee and this is an appropriate way to address it. It's a reasonable way.

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

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

The gentleman from Maryland's amendment would require the Secretary of Defense to place military personnel on U.S.-flagged vessels operating in high-risk piracy areas of the world's oceans. The gentleman's intention is good. All Americans are outraged about the recent outbreak of piracy. There is no simple military solution. But we also must recognize that commercial shipping lines bear responsibility to secure their cargoes and should not be given free protection by U.S. military personnel everywhere in the world. The solution to piracy cannot simply be a military one. Additionally, the sad fact is that the bulk of U.S. cargo and U.S. citizens travel on ships that are not U.S.-flagged vessels and would not be protected by this amendment.

Further, the Navy and Marine Corps do not have a sufficient number of Embarkation Security Teams, known as ESTs, which receive specialized training, to protect even the relatively small number of U.S. flagged vessels. Based on operational tempo and dwell times, set by the Chief of Naval Operations, it's clear that expanding the deployment of ESTs would not negatively impact other existing operational commitments. For this reason and others, the Navy does not support placing ESTs on U.S. flagged vessels for protection from pirates nor does the command of Fifth Fleet, Vice Admiral Gortney.

The Navy has also pointed out that embarking U.S. servicemembers on nonsovereign immune vessels presents legal issues, including possible criminal and civil liability for the servicemembers.

Therefore, while I will not oppose this amendment because the underlying purpose is good, I would ask the chairman and the gentleman from Maryland to work with me in conference with the other body to develop a lasting solution that protects United States' interests and does not place an undue burden on the Navy.
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Video recording is the standard within the United States for interrogations of all types in all agencies and for prosecutors.

Well, what about the Department of Defense? Is it appropriate there? Earlier this year a task force convened by Secretary Gates reviewed our detainee policies issued its report. This is known as the ‘Walsh Report.’ The report was unequivocal. It said: ‘We endorse the use of video recording in all camps and for all interrogations. The use of video to confirm humane treatment could be an important enabler for detainee operations. Just as internal controls provide standardization, the use of video recordings provides the capability to monitor performance and to maintain accountability.’

But more than this, more than maintaining the standards for behavior in the interrogation room, it strengthens our ability to collect intelligence and understand what’s going on. The amendment would strengthen previous laws passed by Congress regarding the treatment of detainees, and it would maximize our intelligence collections from such interrogations.

In fact, the origin of this amendment came from my questioning of interrogators. When I asked how they get maximum information of nuances of language, languages that the interrogators might not have real fluency with. Who reviews the tapes? I said. And they said, There are no tapes. By having tapes, we can get the maximum benefit of the interrogation.

This amendment was endorsed by major human rights organizations. It’s been certified by CBO not to result in additional spending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield, if he wishes, such time as he may consume to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, as a former prosecuting attorney, I speak in favor of this amendment. It serves several purposes. First, it protects our men and women in uniform who are conducting interrogations of detainees from frivolous claims of alleged abuse or coercion. Second, the videotapes will act as a deterrent for private contractors or other agencies who are conducting interrogations of the Department of Defense detainees from straying from those requirements of the Army field manual in the treatment of detainees. It is a way to ensure that it is done right. And when you have a correctly conducted interrogation, in all probability the results will be positive. I certainly think this is a major step in the right direction. Videotaping is good.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I particularly want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, our friend, Mr. SKELTON, for his support of this amendment. It is identical to the amendment passed by the House during consideration of the 2009 Defense Authorization last year with the exception of some changes in the findings which I think strengthen the case for this amendment. A similar intelligence-focused, CIA-unique video recording provision was included in the fiscal year 2010 Intelligence Authorization Act that was vetoed out of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence last week.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment’s purpose is simple. It is to improve the intelligence operations of our Armed Forces by ensuring the video recording of each strategic interrogation of any person who is in the control or detention of the Department of Defense.

Let me be clear: this amendment does not impede combat operations. The bill explicitly states that troops in the field in contact with the enemy shall not be required to videotape or otherwise record tactical questioning.

It does require the Secretary of Defense to promulgate and provide to the Congress guidelines under which video recording of detainees shall be done. It does require that the recordings be properly classified and maintained securely just as any foreign intelligence information should be. It does require that the recordings be maintained for an appropriate length of time. What is the appropriate length of time? Because multiple studies have documented the benefits of video recording or electronically recording interrogations. Law enforcement organizations across the United States routinely use the practice both to protect the person being interrogated and the officer conducting the interrogations. It is the standard of best practice.

Some U.S. attorneys are on record as favoring this requirement for the FBI. And the Border Patrol does routinely videotape or electronically record key interactions and interrogations with those in their custody. Video recording is the standard within the United States for interrogations of all types in all agencies and for prosecutors.

We have been down this road before. Last year Mr. HOLT proposed a similar amendment to our bill. In response we received statements from the Army and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence stating their opposition to mandatory videotaping and interrogations. Today the Office of the Secretary of Defense has informed us that the Department strongly opposes this amendment.

According to DOD, the provision would cause three main problems: it would severely restrict the collection of intelligence through interrogations. It would undercut the Department’s ability to recruit sources. And it would impose an unreasonable administrative and logistical burden on the warfighter. A provision like this would create a public record that would go straight into terrorists’ counter-resistance training programs.

I strongly, as I said, oppose this amendment.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in great deference and respect for my chairman and Mr. HOLT in this different opinion.

I think there’s a great significant difference between collection of data in interrogations conducted in a law enforcement arena in which the evidence is gathered to go into a court of law to be presented with a proper chain of evidence and that the sources and methods are not necessarily needed to be protected versus the interrogations that go on every day in the battle against Islamic jihadists. I don’t believe that those interrogations routinely should be videotaped.

We are in an argument right now with respect to data, photographs and videos, taken between September 11, 2001, and January 2, 2009, as to whether or not that data should be made public. I, for one, believe it should not be made public.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a amendment at the desk, No. 39. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

At the end of subtitle H of title V (page 175, after line 11), add the following new section:

SEC. 586. OVERSEAS VOTING ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT; DUTIES.—There is hereby established the Overseas Voting Advisory Board (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Board”).

(b) MEMBERSSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall conduct studies and issue reports with respect to the following issues:

(A) The ability of citizens of the United States who reside outside of the United States to register to vote and vote in elections for public office.

(B) Methods to promote voter registration and voting among such citizens.

(C) The effectiveness of the Director of the Federal Voting Assistance Program under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, including registering to vote and casting votes in elections.

(D) The effectiveness of the administration and enforcement of the requirements of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act.

(E) The need for the enactment of legislation or the adoption of administrative actions to ensure that all Americans who are away from the jurisdiction in which they are eligible to vote because they live overseas or serve in the military (or are a spouse or dependent of someone who serves in the military) are able to register to vote and vote in elections for public office.

(2) REPORTS.—In addition to issuing such reports as it considers appropriate, the Board shall transmit to Congress a report not later than March 31 of each year describing its activities during the previous year, and shall include in that report such recommendations as the Board considers appropriate with respect to legislative or administrative action, including the provision of funding, to address the issues described in paragraph (1).

(3) COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON ANNUAL REPORT.—During the fiscal year, the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and Senate, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may each hold a hearing on the annual report submitted by the Board under paragraph (2).

(c) MEMBERS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Board shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, of whom:

(A) 1 shall be appointed from among a list of nominees submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) 1 shall be appointed from among a list of nominees submitted by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives;

(C) 1 shall be appointed from among a list of nominees submitted by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(D) 1 shall be appointed from among a list of nominees submitted by the Minority Leader of the Senate;

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—An individual may serve as a member of the Board only if the individual has experience in election administration and has an extended period of time overseas (as a member of the uniformed services or as a civilian), except that the President shall ensure that at least one member of the Board is a citizen who resides overseas while serving on the Board.

(d) STAFF.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO APPOINT.—Subject to rules prescribed by the Board, the chairperson may appoint and fix the pay of such staff as the chairperson considers necessary.

(2) APPLICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Board shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES BY DIRECTOR.—Upon request of the chairperson of the Board, the Director of the Federal Voting Assistance Program under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act shall, from amounts made available for the salaries and expenses of the Director, reimburse the Board for any travel expenses paid on behalf of a member under subparagraph (A).

(e) QUORUM.—3 members of the Board shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(f) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Board shall designate one member to serve as Chairperson.

(g) POWERS.—

(1) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Board may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Board considers appropriate. The Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(2) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Board may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, request of the Chairperson of the Board, the head of any Federal department or agency, or the head of any Federal department or agency to the Board, to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(h) AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 111–182.
The Chair recognizes the distinguished Chairman SKELTON for his support of this amendment.

The Amendment was made as follows:

(4) Administrative Support Services.—Upon the request of the Board, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Board, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Board to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(5) Authorization of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section for fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment would establish an overseas voting advisory board to provide increased overseas voting participation, even with extreme and increased cost to the taxpayer.

For example, in 2004, the Integrated Voting Assistance Program, created by the Voting Assistance Program, cost over $600,000 with only 17 overseas voters participating. In 2006, the Voting Assistance Program did even worse by spending over $1.1 million on the same voting system, but it accounted for an increase of only eight votes placed in the system.

In 2008, the Voting Assistance Program Web site to help active members in the military to vote wasn’t even put up and operative until July, just 4 months prior to the November election. From July 23 through November 4, 2008, of the roughly 1.6 million servicemembers across the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps, only 780 servicemembers requested ballots through the program. This really is disgraceful and disrespects the sacrifices made by our fighting men and women.

Mr. HONDA and I have offered this amendment to address the issues to overseas military and civilian voting now long before the next election. This panel will provide oversight for the Federal Program that has strangled in a mission to ensure greater ballot access for Americans overseas and our military. The program’s longtime director resigned her post in 2008, and at that time it appeared that the next director would be chosen in a closed process.

Along with many Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, we sent a letter to Defense Secretary Robert Gates urging him to conduct a fair and open hiring process for the program.

I am pleased that Secretary Gates did a national search and selected Mr. Robert Carey to be the next program director. I know and I respect his experience, and I believe he will bring fresh ideas and workable solutions to improve ballot access for all Americans living abroad.

And while he is very capable and will certainly bring long-awaited and much-needed overhaul of the program, the advisory panel will add additional strength, expertise, and depth and support for his efforts.

By passing this amendment, which will establish an oversight board, including men and women serving in the military and Americans living abroad, who are our unofficial ambassadors. With the global economy, more and more Americans will be living abroad, and we need to make sure that their voices and votes are counted.

While the State Department cannot give an exact number, there are estimated to be between 4 and 6 million Americans living abroad. There are also hundreds of overseas United States military bases, and the people living in these places are not counted, whether they got back in time. So I really appreciate the effort she makes on their behalf and, therefore, I support and urge all of our Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendments en bloc printed in House Report 111-182 consisting of the following numbered amendments: 13, 14, 47, 25, 32, 33, 36, 43, 44, 51, 52, and 54 offered by Mr. SKELETON.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 209, page 121, add the following new section:

Sec. 209. Additional reporting requirements for inventory relating to contracts for services.

(a) Additional reporting requirements.—Section 230(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(b) With respect to such contracts for services—"(i) the ratio between the number of individuals responsible for awarding and overseeing such contracts to the amount obligated or expended on such contracts; and

(ii) the number of individuals responsible for awarding and overseeing such contracts who are themselves contractors.

(e) Effective date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2011 and fiscal years thereafter.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADE

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII (page 294, after line 8), insert the following new section:
SEC. 708. POST-DEPLOYMENT MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a demonstration project to assess the feasibility and efficacy of providing a member of the Armed Forces with a post-deployment mental health screening that is conducted in person by a mental health provider.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The demonstration project shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A combat stress evaluation conducted in person by a qualified mental health professional not later than 120 to 180 days after the date on which the member returns from combat theater.

(2) Follow-up by a case manager (who may or may not be stationed at the same military installation as the member) conducted by telephone at the following intervals after the initial post-deployment screening:

(A) Six months.

(B) 12 months.

(C) 18 months.

(D) 24 months.

(3) REQUIREMENTS OF COMBAT STRESS EVALUATION.—The combat stress evaluation required by subsection (b)(1) shall be designed to:

(A) Provide members of the Armed Forces with an objective mental health and traumatic brain injury standard to screen for suicide risk factors;

(B) Ease post-deployment transition by allowing members to be honest in their assessments;

(C) Battle the stigma of depression and mental health problems among members and veterans; and

(D) Ultimately reduce the prevalence of suicide among veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall consult in the demonstration project in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Secretary of Defense may also coordinate the program with any accredited college, university, hospital-based or community-based mental health center the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) SELECTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The demonstration project shall be conducted at two military installations, one active duty and one reserve duty component demonstration station, selected by the Secretary of Defense. The installations selected shall have members of the Armed Forces on active duty and members of the reserve components that use the installation as a training and operating base, with members routinely deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and other assignments related to the global war on terrorism.

(e) PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure an adequate number of the following personnel in the program:

(1) Qualified mental health professionals that are licensed psychologists, psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, licensed professional counselors, or clinical social workers.

(2) Suicide prevention counselors.

(f) TIMELINE.—The demonstration project shall expire on September 30, 2012.

(g) REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees—

(1) a plan to implement the demonstration project, including site selection and criteria for choosing the site, not later than June 1, 2010;

(2) an interim report every 180 days thereafter; and

(3) a final report detailing the results not later than January 1, 2013.
**H.4875. Combat Medevac Badge**

"(a) ISSUANCE.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall issue a badge of appropriate design, to be known as the Combat Medevac Badge, to any officer or enlisted member of the Air Force who, while a member of the Air Force, served in combat on or after June 25, 1950, as a pilot or crew member of a helicopter medical evacuation ambulance during the period beginning on June 25, 1950, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall issue the Combat Medevac Badge—

(1) to each such person who is known to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) to each such person with respect to whom an application for the issuance of the badge is made to the Secretary after such date of enactment and within such time period, as the Secretary may require.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title V (page 175, after line 11), add the following new section:

SEC. 586. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON INTERNA-L FAMILY ABDUCTION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the intra-familial abduction to foreign countries of children of members of the Armed Forces constitutes a grave violation of the rights of military parents whose children are abducted and poses a significant threat to the psychological well-being and development of the abducted children.

(b) FAMILY, CHILD ABDUCTION EFFECTING ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL.—

(1) DEFENSE OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the programs, projects, and activities carried out by the Department of Defense to assist members of the Armed Forces whose children are abducted.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include information concerning the following:

(A) The total number of children abducted from military parents, with a breakdown of the number abducted from each country that is a party to the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and each country that is not a party to the Hague Convention.

(B) The total number of children abducted from military parents, with a breakdown of the number of children returned from each country that is a party to the Hague Convention and the number of children who are not parties to the Hague Convention, including the average length of time per country that the children were separated from their military parent, whether the Department of Defense helped facilitate any of the returns, specific actions taken to facilitate the return, and other Department of Defense efforts to help.

(C) Whether these numbers are shared with the Department of State for inclusion in the Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

(D) An assessment as to how international child abduction affects the readiness of military personnel.

(E) An assessment of the effectiveness of the centralized office within the Department of Defense for implementing measures to prevent international child abductions and to provide assistance to military personnel, including—

(i) the coordination of international child abduction-related issues between the relevant agencies and departments with the Department of Defense;

(ii) the education of appropriate personnel;

(iii) the coordination with family support offices and other applicable agencies, both within and outside the United States, as such system is developed and within such time period, as the Secretary may require.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II (page 67, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 227. STUDY ON DISCRIMINATION CAPABILITIES OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into an arrangement with the JASON Defense Advisory Panel under which JASON shall carry out a study on the technical and scientific feasibilities of discrimination capabilities of the missile defense system of the United States, as such system is designed and conceived as of the date of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the following:

(1) The Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII (page 244, after line 8), insert the following new section:

SEC. 708. REPORT ON JOINT VIRTUAL LIFETIME ELECTRONIC RECORD.

Not later than December 31, 2009, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report on the progress that has been made on the establishment, announced by the President on April 9, 2009, of a Joint Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record for members of the Armed Forces to improve the quality of medical care and create a seamless integration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The report shall—

(1) explain what steps compose the Secretary’s plan to fully achieve the establishment of the seamless record system between the two departments;

(2) identify any unforeseen obstacles that have arisen that may require legislative action; and

(3) explain how the plan relates to the mandate in section 1635 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.
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Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, can we excuse the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by the majority and the minority.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) wishes to propose a colloquy, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to gain a better understanding of the status of the policy and law on the service of gay men and lesbians in the military, commonly referred to as Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell. This policy, established in 1993, disrupts unit cohesion as gay and lesbian servicemen and women worry constantly—’who knows what’—about their private lives.

Given the objective of the President to repeal the law and the evidence that the law and policy harmed military readiness and morale, what will be the strategy of the Committee on Armed Services for assessing this law?

Mr. SKELTON. Thank the gentleman for raising this issue. It’s fair to say that much has happened since the law was adopted back in 1993, and I propose that the committee will continue to engage in a deliberative process to hear perspectives from all sides of the debate, but particularly to understand the perspectives of the civilian and military leadership of the Department of Defense and the perspectives of ordinary servicemembers.

If we conclude that repeal is the appropriate course, the success of the change will hinge on our full understanding of the implications of the change and the development of a law and policy that will preserve the readiness and morale of our military forces. Certainly hearings will be at the heart of the committee’s effort to determine those necessary facts.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, can we expect hearings to be conducted this summer?

Mr. SKELTON. Our Military Personnel Subcommittee has already held one hearing with outside experts. We will clearly need to hear the perspectives of the Department of Defense as well. Since the civilian leadership responsible for personal matters within the Office of the Secretary of Defense has not yet been announced, I don’t believe it would be appropriate to begin a formal reassessment process until the new Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness has been allowed to settle into the position. But the committee will continue to hold hearings.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this point, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to the growing chorus calling for the repeal of the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell law.

As you have suggested, many years have passed since the law has been adopted, and I believe that many of the reasons that the Members of Congress found compelling in 1993 will be considered outdated by current servicemembers and the American public today.

Mr. Chairman, I know our schedule in Armed Services is challenging, but I would encourage you to consider conducting hearings at an appropriate date in the hope of correcting this policy that I believe undermines national security and military readiness.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I thank the chairman for the opportunity to discuss the issue.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and for his help and the chairman’s help in making this amendment, my amendment, part of the en bloc amendment.

This amendment requires the Department of Defense, Mr. Chairman, to report to Congress on the plight of our service members who, along with their children, suffer from intra-familial and international child abduction. The international movements of our service men and women make them especially vulnerable to international child abduction.

The amendment will require a study to pinpoint the extent of the problem within our armed services and what the DOD is doing to prevent and remedy international child abduction. This amendment will require the Department of Defense to report to Congress about what they are doing to ensure that our servicemembers are receiving preventive education, legal protections and other assistance needed to avoid and, when necessary, resolve the international abduction of their children.

I rise in support of the amendment to require the Department of Defense (DOD) to report to Congress on the plight of our service members who, along with their children, suffer from intra-familial and international child abduction. The international movements of our service men and women make them especially vulnerable to international child abduction. This amendment will require a study to pinpoint the extent of the problem within our armed services and what the DOD is doing to prevent and remedy international child abduction. This amendment will require the Department of Defense to report to Congress about what they are doing to ensure that our servicemembers are receiving preventive education, legal protections and other assistance needed to avoid and, when necessary, resolve the international abduction of their children.

I rise in support of the amendment to require the Department of Defense (DOD) to report to Congress on the plight of our service members who, along with their children, suffer from intra-familial and international child abduction. The international movements of our service men and women make them especially vulnerable to international child abduction. This amendment will require a study to pinpoint the extent of the problem within our armed services and what the DOD is doing to prevent and remedy international child abduction. This amendment will require the Department of Defense to report to Congress about what they are doing to ensure that our servicemembers are receiving preventive education, legal protections and other assistance needed to avoid and, when necessary, resolve the international abduction of their children.

The particular issue of international child abduction came to my attention with the Sean Goldman case. As many of you know, Sean Goldman was abducted to Brazil by his mother for a family vacation when Sean was four years old. His mother divorced his father and refused to return the child to the United States, which was Sean’s country of habitual residence and consequently should have been the legal jurisdiction in which custody was decided. Sean’s father has been fighting for the return of his son for five years. Sean’s mother is now deceased, and Sean’s father still cannot get him back.

Since my involvement with this case, I have been receiving calls from parents left behind in an international child abduction—the particular plight of military parents caught in this legal quagmire. Military parents are at heightened risk because they often marry when they are serving this country abroad, and may live in numerous countries, including the United States, while they build a family with their spouse. Upon divorce, one parent sometimes whisks the child away to a legal jurisdiction unfavorable to the left behind parent.

Such was the case of Commander Paul Toland, whose infant daughter was abducted by his estranged wife while he was stationed on our naval base in Yokohama, Japan. When he sought help from the Naval Legal Services Office on base, he was told to hire a local lawyer and deal with the issue himself in Japanese courts.

Whether through lack of training by the DOD or lack of attention by the personnel, this very wrong advice from the Naval Legal Services Office directed Commander Toland to
give up the legal jurisdiction of his home state and engage with a foreign legal jurisdiction that has NEVER returned a child to the United States. Commander Toland’s former wife is now deceased, his daughter lives with her ail- ing grandmother in Japan, and he still cannot get her back. The fight has been six long years, and it continues with little hope.

Attorneys familiar with this phenomena estimate that there are approximately 25-30 new cases of international child abductions affecting our service men and women every year. Our service men and women risk much in their service to our nation. The DOD must do what it can to minimize their risks. This amendment would not entangle the Department of Defense in custody disputes. Rather, this amendment will instruct the DOD to share with Congress what they are doing to ensure that our service men and women are receiving the preventative education, legal protection, and other assistance needed to avoid and resolve the international abduction of their children. This amendment asks the Department of Defense to report to Congress on the following:

1. The total number of children abducted from military parents;
2. The total number of children who were later returned to left behind military parents;
3. Whether the DOD facilitate any of the returns, and what sorts of assistance the DOD offers to military parents—such as psychological counseling, financial assistance, legal services, and leave for travel;
4. The means through which available services, information, and activities relating to international child abductions are communicated to left behind military parents;
5. The training provided to those who supply legal assistance to the left behind military parents;
6. Measures taken by the DOD to prevent abductions;
7. Which of the Status of Forces Agreements negotiated with host countries are written to protect the military parent’s ability to adjudicate abduction cases in the parent’s state of legal residence;
8. The feasibility of including in present and future Status of Forces Agreements a framework for the resolution of child abduction;
9. Identification of potential strategies for engagement with host countries with high incidence of international child abductions;
10. Whether the DOD coordinates on abductions with other departments, such as the U.S. Department of State;
11. Whether the DOD currently partners with, or intends to partner with, civilian experts on international child abduction;
12. Whether the DOD has engaged in joint efforts with the U.S. Department of State to provide assistance to service men and women who have been repeatedly deployed in military conflict.

General Odierno had a number of us over in December. Again, his number one concern was the uncomfortable and outrageous amount of suicides which is occurring in theater. I was with Gen. David Petraeus in Baghdad in a couple of weeks ago, who again stated that that is the biggest challenge facing our Armed Forces in Europe, who, again, are made up of many troops who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan. And the present system of screening for returning troops is simply to fill out a questionnaire. That is not enough.

This amendment will set up a demonstration project with a face-to-face interview with each professional. This is the type of process that we need to deal with this unprecedented challenge.

Again, I urge strong support for the amendment which includes this important component.

Mr. MIKEON. I yield, at this time, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) 4 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair- man, today I offer an amendment that will enable us to more effectively plan and execute national security and interagency operations.

To enhance our national security, we must be able to effectively integrate the military and nonmilitary elements of our national security. This requires the effective integration of all agencies of the Federal Government, not only those with traditional national security roles. However, achieving highly integrated national security interagency planning and execution requires personnel who have the knowledge, skills and attributes to plan and participate in these interagency operations. At present, there is no perma-
reforms going back to Goldwater-Nichols and championing these reforms to further integrate our national security tools moving into the 21st century. I thank Ranking Member McKinley for his work on this issue during my 4 years on the Armed Services Committee and continuing now our ranking member on the committee.

Mr. SKELTON. At this time, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for crafting a bill to keep this Nation safe and provide care for our warriors and their families. I would also like to thank you for accepting this amendment as part of the en bloc amendment. It is a very simple amendment I’m offering that is asking that the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, submit a report to Congress by the end of the year telling us what progress they have made on the establishment of a joint virtual lifetime electronic medical record. This is to bring about seamless transition from when our warriors leave the service until they enter into the VA system. It is a way for us to ensure that all of the bureaucratic troubles, the holdups and the delays in processing of their claims.

As a 24-year veteran of our Armed Forces, I know this is a critically important issue. It was backed and announced on April 9 by the President. This amendment will allow Congress to do its most critical function of oversight of the executive branch to make sure we are making progress to ensure the quality care of our veterans. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for including it in a very fine bipartisan bill.

My amendment is very simple and, I believe, would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to submit to Congress a report on the progress that has been made on the establishment of a Joint Virtual Lifetime Electronic Record for members of the Armed Forces to improve the quality of medical care and create a seamless integration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The President announced on April 9 of this year that his administration is making great progress to ensure that DoD and VA, two enormous and complex organizations with different missions, are cooperating to make sure that our troops, when they return home and become veterans, do not fail through the cracks at that moment is both one of the most difficult things to achieve and one of the best things we can do. We receive the best care possible every day. I appreciate all the efforts the House Armed Services Committee has made to this effort, and I respectfully request that my amendment be included among them.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers, and I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to the chairman.

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly thank the gentleman for that. I yield 1 minute to my friend, a very special lady, the Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and FDA, the gentle lady from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. According to the Army, 143 soldiers committed suicide in 2008, the highest rate since the Army began keeping records nearly three decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, after asking our men and women in uniform to sacrifice so much, the very least that we must do is to ensure that they get the care they deserve.

This amendment, based on the Sergeant Jonathan Schulev Military Mental Health Services Improvement Act, is about making sure our troops receive adequate pre- and postdeployment mental health evaluations. It directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project at two military installations, one Active Duty and one Reserve, to assess the feasibility and efficacy of providing face-to-face post-deployment mental health screenings between a member of the Armed Forces and a mental health provider.

The 2-year demonstration will include a combat stress evaluation conducted by a qualified mental health professional within 120 to 180 days of the date the soldier returns, and a case manager will follow up.

Let me say thank you to Chairman Skelton for his collaboration and his commitment to this issue. We have no excuse for failing the soldiers who have given this Nation everything. Let’s give them a long life, good health and quality care.

Mr. SKELTON. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, the time remaining, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 5 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. At this time, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McMAHON).

Mr. McMAHON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which I offer along with my esteemed colleague from Connecticut, the great Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, together with my great colleague from Connecticut, Joe Courtney, and my great colleague from the great State of New Mexico, Harry Teague.

Like my colleagues, I too am alarmed at the statistics coming out of the armed services. Nearly 150 soldiers took their lives last year, the highest figures since the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan began.

This amendment creates a well thought-out pilot program that would assess the feasibility of such screenings and would hopefully lead to legislation in a broader sense.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues here today to support this amendment on behalf of the men and women who serve this country so proudly.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I want to thank the chairman for the time and for the bill that he has put on the floor today. I rise in support of this en bloc amendment, particularly because it includes two amendments that were made in order under the rule. The bill as reported by the committee specifies that no funds may be obligated for the deployment of a long-range missile defense system in Europe until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to Congress certifying that the proposed interceptor that is going to be deployed has been realistically flight-tested and has demonstrated a high probability of working in an operational manner. That makes perfect sense.

In recent months, those studies have been conducted by various independent scientists, and they have shown that the radar proposed for the Czech Republic does not have enough range to perform effectively. As my colleagues know, the interceptors’ capabilities are dependent on the ability and the accuracy of the radar. That is why I believe that it is imperative that the Secretary’s report also certify about the proposed radars, and that first amendment requires just that.

The second amendment directs the JASON panel, which has been providing independent advice and consultation to the government since 1960 on matters of defense, science and technology, to conduct a study on whether the discrimination capabilities being sought by the Missile Defense Agency are achievable.

The system has to be evaluated by its ability to successfully distinguish between an enemy’s missile and any accompanying decoys countermeasures. And right now, there is little evidence to suggest that the system can make those kinds of distinctions.

Furthermore, this is a big challenge. As Dr. Phil Coyle, who was the former
director of operational test and evaluation at the Pentagon noted during a hearing that we convened, “shooting down an enemy missile going 17,000 miles per hour is like trying to hit a hole-in-one in golf when the hole is going 17,000 miles per hour. If an enemy uses decoys and countermeasures, missile defense is like trying to shoot a hole-in-one while the hole is going 17,000 miles per hour and the green is covered with black circles the same size as the hole.” The defender doesn’t know what target aimed for.”

So this report should inform Congress on whether or not the ballistic missile defense system will actually be able to employ discrimination technology.

And finally, as one who has long believed Congress must reexamine how it funds this program, I’m delighted that we are providing important oversight over the missile defense system.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this third en bloc amendment. I want to thank Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member MCKEON for including the Lobiondo, Delahunt, Coble, Taylor amendment in this bloc.

A couple of weeks ago I met with Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, Skip Bowen, to discuss benefits available to Coast Guard veterans.

He brought to my attention the fact that current law provides active duty members of the Armed Forces and Coast Guard and their dependents with access to legal assistance in connection with their personal civil affairs. The law also provides for certain DoD reservists who are called to active duty for more than 30 days. Unfortunately, the law does not provide the same eligibility to similarly situated Coast Guard reservists.

I am the sponsor of Amendment with Representatives DELAHUNT and COBLE, two Coast Guard veterans, to ensure current Coast Guard reservists have access to the same legal assistance as other DoD reservists upon release from active duty.

This legal assistance is critical in helping reservists understand their rights under the Uniformed Services Reemployment Rights Act, the Service member’s Civil Relief Act, as well as probate, housing, consumer and tax laws.

There are currently over 8,100 reservists in the US Coast Guard, members over a hundred serving on active duty in Iraq providing port and waterways security.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for working with me on this important issue and I encourage all members to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chair, I am very happy to rise in support of this amendment and thank my colleagues for their work on this very important issue, especially the distinguished Gentlelady from Connecticut, Congresswoman DELAHUNT, and also thank Chairman SKELTON and Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for the opportunity to consider this amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

As you all may know, I recently introduced H.R. 2931, the Kyle Barhelt Veterans and Service Members Mental Health Screening Act. The bill calls for mandatory confidential mental health screenings for members of the Armed Forces. By requiring the in person mental health screenings, we will reduce the incidence of suicides and substance abuse among active duty personnel and veterans.

When I introduced this bill, I named it after a young man whose life was cut too short because service as a nation failed to give him the mental health treatment he needed and deserved. It is my belief that mandating screenings by a qualified mental health professional for every member of the military is the only way to begin indentifying and treating the invisible wounds of war.

While I would have liked an across the board mental health screening mandate to be a part of this bill, I also realize that we need to walk before we run. I believe that this en bloc amendment is the start of effective mental health illness prevention and treatment for service members and veterans.

Mr. Chair, I don’t want to lose another Kyle. I don’t want to lose another fine American service member or veteran to an invisible but very real illness. I don’t want to ever have to go to another mother, father, wife, or husband or brother or sister and say “I’m sorry we didn’t do enough.”

Let’s stand together and protect the health of our service members and veterans. Support this amendment, and work with me to mandate mental health screenings for service members in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chair, we have no more speakers on this en bloc amendment. I yield back.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chair, pursuant to H. Res. 572, I offer amendments en bloc entitled No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc printed in House Report 111-182 consisting of amendments numbered 55, 57, 59, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 65, and 60 offered by Mr. SKELTON;

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. WINKIN.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI (page 133, after line 24), add the following:

SECTION 665. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON COST TO CITIES AND OTHER MUNICIPALITIES THAT COVER THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN EMPLOYEE’S MILITARY SALARY AND MUNICIPAL SALARY.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the costs incurred by cities and other municipalities that elect to cover the difference between—

(1) an employee’s military salary when that employee is a member of a reserve component and called or ordered to active duty; and

(2) the municipal salary of the employee.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 67, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS REAFFIRMING THE REQUIREMENT TO THOROUGHLY CONSIDER THE ROLE OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSES DURING THE quadrennial defense review and the nuclear posture review.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress passed and the President signed the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law: 106-58), which stated: “It is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as it is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate).”

(2) Section 118 of title 10, United States Code requires the Secretary of Defense “every four years, during a year following a year evenly divisible by four, to conduct a comprehensive examination (to be known as a ‘Quadrennial Defense Review’) of the national defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program and policies of the United States with a view toward determining and expressing the defense strategy of the United States and establishing a defense program for the next 20 years.”

(3) Among the requirements established by section 118 of title 10, United States Code, for the elements that must be included in the Quadrennial Defense Review are the following:

(A) The threats to the assumed or defined national security interest of the United States that were examined for the purposes of the review and the scenarios developed in the examination of those threats.

(B) The specific capabilities, including the general number and type of specific military platforms, needed to achieve the strategic and warfighting objectives identified in the review.

(C) The effect on force structure of the use by the armed forces of technologies anticipated to be available for the ensuing 20 years.

(4) Section 1070 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-116) requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive examination of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years “in order to clarify the national security interests of the United States and establishing a defense program for the near term.”

(5) Among the requirements established by section 1070 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 for the elements that must be included in the nuclear posture review is “[t]he role that missile defense capabilities and conventional strike forces play in determining the role and size of nuclear forces.”

(6) The Final Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, issued on May 7, 2009, concluded: ‘‘Missile defense plays a useful role in supporting the basic objectives of deterrence, broadly defined. Defenses that are
effective against regional aggressors are a valuable component of the U.S. strategic posture. The United States should develop and, where appropriate, deploy missile defenses against regional nuclear aggressors, including against limited long-range threats. These can also be beneficial for limiting damage if deterrence fails. The United States should ensure that its actions do not lead Russia or China to take actions that increase the threat to the United States and its allies and friends.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that veterans who are members of the Individual Ready Reserve (in this section referred to as the "IRR") and are not assigned to units that muster regularly and have an established supply structure are less likely to be helped by existing suicide prevention programs run by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) PERSONNEL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) Personnel conducting calls determine the emotional, psychological, medical, and career needs and concerns of the covered member.

(2) Any covered member identified as being at-risk of self-caused harm is referred to the nearest military medical treatment facility or, if a covered member is identified as being at-risk for autism, a health care professional determines that the treatment is medically necessary.

(3) The Secretary may not consider the use of any structured behavior program when making determinations under this subsection that a health care professional determines that the treatment is medically necessary.

(4) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) a person authorized to provide applied behavior analysis or other structured behavior programs is licensed or certified by a state, the Behavior Analyst Certification Board, or other accredited national certification board; and

(B) if applied behavior analysis or other structured behavior programs is provided by an employee or contractor of a person authorized to provide such treatment, the employee or contractor shall meet minimum qualifications, training, and supervision requirements consistent with business best practices in the field of behavior analysis and autism services.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than January 31 of each year, beginning in 2010, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the number of IRR members not assigned to units who have been referred for counseling or mental health treatment, as well as the units who have been referred for counseling or mental health treatment, as well as the status of each referred member.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress on the number of IRR members not assigned to units who have been referred for counseling or mental health treatment, as well as the units who have been referred for counseling or mental health treatment, as well as the status of each referred member.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subsection A of title VII (page 244, after line 8), insert the following new section:

SEC. 708. TREATMENT OF AUTISM UNDER TRICARE.

(a) In General.—Section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out section 1077(a)(18) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(c) FINDING.—

(1) The amount otherwise provided by section 1403 for TRICARE funding is hereby increased by $50,000,000 to be derived from the Service-wide Communications.

(2) The text of the amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. MCDERMOTT

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subsection C of title XII of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 12xx. MAP OF MINERAL-RICH ZONES AND AREAS UNDER THE CONTROL OF ARMED GROUPS IN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

(a) In General.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall, consistent with the recommendation from the United Nations Group of Experts on the Democratic Republic of the Congo in their December 2008 report, work with other member states of the United Nations and local and international nongovernmental organizations—

(1) produce a map of mineral-rich zones and areas under the control of armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

(2) to make such map available to the public.

The map required under this subsection shall be known as the "Conflict Minerals Map." Mines located in areas under the control of armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or any other country involved in the mining, sale, export or distribution, or derived from Advanced Aerospace Systems Integrated Sensor IS Structure, PE 68286E

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 86, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 248. AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER TO ENTER INTO AGRICULTURE-BASED TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 217(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 105-85: 108 Stat 2695) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) A federally funded research and development center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) that is in the public interest."
and Space Administration that functions primarily as a research laboratory may respond to broad agency announcements under programs authorized by the Federal Government in an effort to search, develop, demonstration, or transfer of technology in a manner consistent with the terms and conditions of such programs. The solicitation is limited to those conducted by the center under contract with or on behalf of the Department of Defense or through transfer of funds to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO
The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A of the bill, insert the following new title:

TITLE XVi—GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

SEC. 1601. SHORT TITLE.
This title may be cited as the "Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act".

SEC. 1602. RECOGNITION OF THE SUFFERING AND LOYALTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.
(a) RECOGNITION OF THE SUFFERING OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.—The United States recognizes that, as described by the Guam War Claims Act, the residents of Guam, on account of their United States nationality, suffered unspeakable harm as a result of the occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, by being subjected to death, rape, severe personal injury, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, or internment.

(b) RECOGNITION OF THE LOYALTY OF THE RESIDENTS OF GUAM.—The United States forever will be grateful to the residents of Guam for their steadfast loyalty to the United States of America, as demonstrated by the countless acts of courage they performed despite the threat of death or great bodily harm they faced at the hands of the Imperial Japanese military forces that occupied Guam during World War II.

SEC. 1603. PAYMENTS FOR GUAM WORLD WAR II CLAIMS.

(a) PAYMENTS FOR DEATH, PERSONAL INJURY, FORCED LABOR, FORCED MARCH, AND INTERNMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriated authorizations to be appropriated under this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make payments under this paragraph to persons who are eligible for a payment under section 1603 unless the payment is made under paragraph (c) as follows:

(1) RESIDENTS INJURED.—The Secretary shall pay compensable Guam victims who are not deceased before any payments are made to individuals described in paragraphs (a) and (b) as follows:

(A) If the victim has suffered an injury described in subsection (b)(2)(A), $15,000.

(B) If the victim is not described in subparagraph (A) but has suffered an injury described in subsection (b)(2)(B), $12,000.

(C) If the victim is not described in subparagraph (A) or (B) but has suffered an injury described in subsection (b)(2)(C), $10,000.

(2) SURVIVORS OF RESIDENTS WHO DIED IN WAR.—In the case of a compensable Guam decedent, the Secretary shall pay $25,000 for distribution to eligible survivors of the decedent as specified in subsection (b). The Secretary shall make payments under this paragraph after payments are made under paragraph (1) and before payments are made under paragraph (3).

(3) SURVIVORS OF DECREASED INJURED RESIDENTS.—In the case of a compensable Guam victim who is deceased, the Secretary shall pay $7,000 for distribution to eligible survivors of the victim as specified in subsection (b). The Secretary shall make payments under this paragraph after payments are made under paragraph (1) and before payments are made under paragraph (3).

(b) DEDUCTIONS IN PAYMENT.—Payments under paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 1603(a) shall be made to eligible survivors of an individual who is a compensable Guam decedent or survivor, or a compensable Guam victim who is deceased as follows:

(1) If there is living a spouse of the individual, but no child of the individual, all of the payment shall be made to the spouse.

(2) If there is living a spouse and one or more children of the individual, one-half of the payment shall be made to the spouse and one-half to the child (or to the children in equal shares).

(3) If there is no living spouse of the individual, but there are one or more children of the individual alive, all of the payment shall be made to such child (or to such children in equal shares).

(4) If there is no living spouse or child of the individual but there is a living parent (or parents) of the individual, all of the payment shall be made to the parents (or to the parents in equal shares).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this title:

(1) COMPENSABLE GUAM DECEDENT.—The term "compensable Guam decedent" means an individual determined under section 1904(a)(1) to have been a resident of Guam who died or was killed as a result of the attack and occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, or incident to the liberation of Guam by United States military forces, and whose death would have been compensable under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79–224) if a timely claim had been filed under the terms of such Act.

(2) COMPENSABLE GUAM VICTIM.—The term "compensable Guam victim" means an individual determined under section 1904(a)(1) to have suffered, as a result of the attack and occupation of Guam by Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II, or incident to the liberation of Guam by United States military forces, any of the following:

(A) Rape or personal injury (such as disfigurement, scar, loss of a limb, dismemberment, or paralysis).

(B) Forced labor or a personal injury not described in subparagraph (A) (such as disfigurement, scarring, and dismemberment).

(C) Forced march, internment, or holding to evade internment.

(3) DEFINITIONS OF SEVERE PERSONAL INJURIES AND PERMANENT INJURIES.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall promulgate regulations to specify injuries that constitute a severe personal injury or a personal injury for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, of paragraph (2).

SEC. 1604. ADJUDICATION.

(a) AUTHORITY OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is authorized to adjudicate claims and determine eligibility for payments under section 1603.

(b) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title. Such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register.

(c) CLAIMS SUBMITTED FOR PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1603 and subject to paragraph (2), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall treat a claim that is acceptable under this title on account of representational services that includes, but is not limited to, any services related to such decedent or victim, respectively, arising under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79–224), the implementing regulations issued by the Commission, and any appeals arising therefrom.

(d) DEDUCTIONS IN PAYMENT.—Payments under sections 1603 and 1604 shall be made to such child (or to such children in equal shares).

(e) DISTRIBUTION OF SURVIVOR PAYMENTS.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall cause to be distributed the payments to the survivors of the victim as specified in subsection (a)(1) and subject to paragraph (2) of section 1603.

(f) DEDUCTIONS IN PAYMENT.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall cause to be distributed the payments to the survivors of the victim as specified in subsection (a)(1) and subject to paragraph (2) of section 1603.

(g) DISTRIBUTION OF SURVIVOR PAYMENTS.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall cause to be distributed the payments to the survivors of the victim as specified in subsection (a)(1) and subject to paragraph (2) of section 1603.

(h) DISTRIBUTION OF SURVIVOR PAYMENTS.—The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall cause to be distributed the payments to the survivors of the victim as specified in subsection (a)(1) and subject to paragraph (2) of section 1603.

(10) RELEASE OF RELATED CLAIMS.—Acceptance of payment under section 1603 by a compensable Guam decedent or a compensable Guam victim shall be in full satisfaction of all claims related to such decedent or victim, respectively, that have been filed under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 79–224), the implementing regulations issued by the Commission, and any appeals arising therefrom.
United States Navy pursuant thereto, or this title.

(11) Penalty for false claims.—The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to criminal penalties for false statements) apply to claims submitted under this subsection.

SEC. 1605. GRANTS PROGRAM TO MEMORIALIZE THE OCCUPATION OF GUAM DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to section 1606(b) and in accordance with this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a grants program under which the Secretary shall award grants for research, educational, and media activities that memorialize events surrounding the occupation of Guam during World War II, honor the loyalty of the people of Guam during such occupation, or both, for purposes of appropriately illustrating and interpreting the causes and circumstances of such occupation and other similar occupations during a war.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior may not award to a person a grant under subsection (a) unless such person submits an application to the Secretary for such grant, in such time, manner, and form and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

SEC. 1606. AUTHORIZATION OF Appropriations.

(a) GUAM WORLD WAR II CLAIMS Payments AND ADJUDICATION.—For purposes of carrying out section 523(a) of title 5, United States Code, there are authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013, for—

(1) procedures to ensure that the number of vouchers provided or made available in timely manner during fiscal year 2010 in which the member of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for one voucher for every month (or part of a month) during fiscal year 2010 in which the member is a qualified individual.

(2) a voucher earned during fiscal year 2010 may be used after the end of such fiscal year.

(b) GUAM WORLD War II GRANTS PROGRAM.—For purposes of carrying out section 1605, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 1605. POSTAL BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR SENDING FREE MAIL TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SERVING IN CERTAIN OPERATIONS AND HOSPITALIZED MEMBERS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF POSTAL BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the United States Postal Service, shall provide for a program under which postal benefits are provided during fiscal year 2010 to qualified individuals in accordance with this section.

(b) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL.—In this section, the term "qualified individual" means a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a)(1) of section 3401 of title 39, United States Code, who is entitled to free mailing privileges under such section.

(c) POSTAL BENEFITS DESCRIBED.—

(1) VOUCHERS.—The postal benefits provided under the program shall consist of such coupons or other similar evidence of credit (in this section referred to as a "voucher") to permit a person possessing the voucher to make a qualified mailing to any qualified individual without charge using the Postal Service. The vouchers may be in printed, electronic, or such other format as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Postal Service, shall determine to be appropriate.

(2) QUALIFIED MAILING.—In this section, the term "qualified mailing" means the mailing of a single mail piece which—

(A) is first-class mail (including any sound-or video-recorded communication) not exceeding 13 ounces in weight and having the character of a letter, document, or parcel post not exceeding 15 pounds in weight;

(B) is sent from within an area served by a United States post office; and

(C) is addressed to any qualified individual.

(3) COORDINATION HULCK.—Postal benefits under the program are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any reduced rates of postage or other reduced or free postal benefits to which the qualified mailing may otherwise be available by or under law, including any rates of postage resulting from the application of section 3401(b) of title 39, United States Code.

(d) NUMBER OF VOUCHERS.—A member of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for one voucher for every month (or part of a month) during fiscal year 2010 in which the member is a qualified individual. Subject to subsection (f)(2), a voucher earned during fiscal year 2010 may be used after the end of such fiscal year.

(e) TRANSFER OF VOUCHERS.—A qualified individual may transfer a voucher to a member of the family of the qualified individual, a nonprofit organization, or any other person selected by the qualified individual for use to send qualified mailings to the qualified individual or other qualified individuals.

(f) LIMITATIONS ON USE; DURATION.—A voucher may not be used—

(1) for sending a qualified mailing, whether that mailing is a first-class letter or a parcel; or

(2) after the expiration date of the voucher, as designated by the Secretary of Defense.

(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense (in consultation with the Postal Service) shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the program, including—

(1) procedures under which vouchers will be provided or made available in timely manner to qualified individuals; and

(2) procedures to ensure that the number of vouchers provided or made available with respect to any qualified individual complies with subsection (d).

(h) TRANSFERS OF FUNDS TO POSTAL SERVICE.—

(1) BASED ON ESTIMATES.—The Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Postal Service, out of amounts available to carry out the program and in advance of each calendar quarter during which postal benefits may be used under the program, an amount equal to the estimated postal benefits that the Secretary estimates will be used during such quarter, reduced or increased (as the case may be) by any amounts by which the Secretary finds that a determination under this subsection for a prior quarter was greater than or less than the amount finally determined for such quarter.

(2) BASED ON FINAL DETERMINATION.—A final determination of the amount necessary to correct any previous determination under this section, and any transfer of amounts between the Postal Service and the Department of Defense based on that final determination, shall be made not later than six months after the expiration date of the final vouchers issued under the program.

(3) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—All estimates and determinations under this subsection of the amount of postal benefits under the program used in any period shall be made by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Postal Service.

(i) FUNDING SOURCE AND LIMITATION.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army for fiscal year 2010, $50,000,000 is authorized for postal benefits provided in this section.

(2) OFFSETTING REDUCTION.—Funds authorized to be appropriated in section 301 in fiscal year 2010 to provide for a program under which postal benefits are provided in this section to members of the Armed Forces are reduced as follows:

(A) for operation and maintenance for the Army, $10,000,000.

(B) for operation and maintenance for the Navy, $10,000,000.

(3) FOROperation and maintenance for the Air Force, $30,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the State of Israel is one of the strongest allies of the United States;

(2) Israel and the United States face many common enemies; and

(3) the United States should continue to work with Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli Government, and the people of Israel to ensure that Israel continues to receive critical military assistance, including missile defense systems, and other weapons, needed to address existential threats.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 572 the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR recognizes the gentleman from Missouri

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I rise today in support of my amendment in the en bloc amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act.

This amendment will require the Quadrennial Defense Review to be completed every 4 years to examine the national defense strategy, the force structure, the force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plan and other elements of the defense program to determine our strategy for the next 20 years. Additionally, we must recognize the importance of the Nuclear Posture Review, which addresses the role that missile defense capabilities and conventional strike forces play in determining the role and size of nuclear forces.

These reviews are an essential element of our national security perspective as are the Ground-based Midcourse Defense missile program, the Kinetic Energy Interceptor, the Multiple Kill Vehicle and the Airborne Laser program.

The Department of Defense is aware that the Ground-based Midcourse Defense, the GMD, is the only fielded and operational capability that can defend the U.S. against long-range ballistic missiles. However, the current budget cuts of $524 million from the program, deploying only 30 of the 44 GMD interceptors that were scheduled, we believe this logic should be questioned given the events occurring in North Korea and Iran.

Furthermore, should we reconsider the stop work order for the kinetic energy interceptor. This project is an essential part of our boost-phase ballistic missile approach, and I urge my colleagues to continue to support its development.

Congress should also support the continued development of the multiple kill vehicle. As rogue nations continue to advance their missile defense capabilities, multiple kill vehicle technology will eventually destroy countermeasures, warheads and ultimately the missiles shot from our enemies.

I support all of these projects because they are a deterrent to our enemies and they are the programs our warfighters in the field require. As we look at the missile tests and balance of power occurring in the Middle East and East Asia, this is not the time to reduce our missile defense budget and cut back on these programs. North Korea plans to launch a long-range Taepodong-2 missile in July, and is only a few years away from deploying a missile capable of hitting the United States.

We must prepare for the development and deployment of more advanced technologies by our adversaries. These missile systems should all be considered essential elements. I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the Chair for the inclusion of our amendment with regard to Israel in the underlying bill.

I would like to speak for a minute with regard to one of our strongest allies in the Middle East, and that is the State of Israel. It is critical for the strong relationship that we have, that our two countries share so much in common. We have both faced war and fought for peace and for freedom. We both continue to pursue liberty, despite ongoing threats. We both face many common enemies.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been a strong supporter of Israel’s right to exist. When you think about it, it is disturbing that we have to come here and talk about it in such terms. But the truth of the matter is, there are few countries, few peoples on Earth who are more in the cross hairs than Israel. Not even the U.N. can be allowed to intimidate Israel. In fact, the U.N. often stands with those who condemn Israel.

Israel has maintained a shining beacon of democracy in a dark part of the world, standing with the United States against the threat of Islamic extremism, and we must be unwavering in our continuous support.

In conclusion, the United States should continue to work with Israel Prime Minister Netanyahu and the Israeli Government and with the people of Israel to ensure that Israel continues to receive critical military assistance, including the military defense needed to address this existential threat.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield one minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the distinguished Chair of the Armed Services Committee. I rise in support of this en bloc amendment which includes the Castor-Bilirakis amendment, an amendment I introduced jointly with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Bilirakis).

Under the Castor-Bilirakis amendment, each member of the armed services fighting in combat operations would be provided with a monthly postal benefit that they can transfer to their families or to a charitable organization so they can afford to send care packages and other communications while they are serving bravely overseas. Just think of the benefit to our brave men and women serving in combat operations, a benefit to their morale, a boost in the morale when they receive that letter from home, when they receive that all-important care package.

This effort has been ongoing for many years. It has been included in past Defense authorization bills. It passed the House last year only to be taken out in conference. It is time to get this provision enacted as a standalone bill, H.R. 797, the Homestead Appropriations act of 2008.

This amendment recognizes the sacrifices made by servicemembers and their loved ones back home. Tough economic times have made it increasingly difficult for those who send care packages to troops to pay the resulting shipping costs. This amendment will help address that problem.

The legislation on which our amendment is based has strong bipartisan support garnering 237 cosponsors. In addition, it has gained a great deal of support from our constituents and people all across the country. It is with great humility that I rise today to honor our servicemembers and those who continue to provide support to our combat soldiers. I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I have an amendment as part of this en bloc that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that members of the Individual Ready Reserve who have served at least one tour in either Iraq or Afghanistan receive a counseling call from properly trained personnel not less than once every 90 days to look at emotional, psychological, medical and career needs.

Mr. Chairman, the military personnel from the Secretary on down, and certainly the chairman of our committee, I believe devoted a great deal of attention to suicide prevention recognition and treatment. This is necessary because the IRR is one place where it is just too easy to fall through the cracks.

Coleman Bean of East Brunswick, New Jersey, enlisted in the Army in 2001, attended Fort Benning, served with the 173rd Airborne. He served in Iraq. Afterwards, he sought treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder. Mr. Bean returned to the VA hospital and he should have been accepted by the Army. In any case, after he was discharged, like other Army members, he still had 4 years of Ready Reserve commitment. He was called back to Iraq, served, returned to New Jersey in May of 2008. He committed suicide in November of 2008. He fell through the cracks. He had no advocate, no Army machinery to help him find his way through the system. He was literally on his own.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to address what I think is a gap in our suicide treatment efforts to deal with the Individual Ready Reserve. I urge passage of this amendment.
Mr. MCKEON. We have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment helps to build support for the military bill buildup on Guam by addressing a longstanding issue. We will authorize a substantial amount of military construction in this bill, but to keep up the morale and the obligation to the people of Guam, it is only right to also resolve the issue of war claims as part of this bill. The war claims program for Guam administered by the U.S. Navy after World War II had shortcomings, and this amendment would address the resulting disparity of treatment for war claims for the Chamorros who endured the occupation of Guam.

The House passed this amendment as H.R. 44 in February, but the other body has not considered it. Adopting this amendment will provide an opportunity to resolve this issue.

And, again, many thanks to Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member MCKEON for accepting this amendment on behalf of the other body. Adopting this amendment will provide an opportunity to resolve this issue.

Mr. SKELTON. Let me take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Guam, Ms. BORDALLO, for her work on this matter. It would be remiss of me not to thank Mr. Cramer for his leadership in this effort. And I wish to thank several of our staff who, after wonderful service, are going on to new challenges in their careers:

Loren Dealy, who will handle communications for the Office of Legislative Affairs at the Department of Defense; Frank Rose who is off to work on strategic weapons and missile defense issues at the State Department; Bill Natter, who recently left to be the Deputy Secretary of the Navy; Saasha Weisberg, who is off to get a master's of public policy; Christine Lamb, who is off to get an MBA; and Ben Glerum, who will be working on a law degree.

In addition, I wish to recognize those unsung heroes who allow our staff to put together a bill of this enormous size and complexity. Those staff members who are called staff assistants: Andrew Tabler, Zach Steacy, Liz Drummond, Megan Putnam, Rose Ellen Kim, Carolina Datto, Kathleen Kelly, Mary Kate Cunningham, Scott Bousom, Trey Howard, Cindi Howard, Derek Scott and Katy Bloomberg all deserve a special thanks.

And I also want to thank Joe Hichen for a long effort with us, as well as Alicia Haley. Without their hard work, coordination, and patience, we would not be as successful as we are today.

A final thanks to the team in the Office of Legislative Counsel led by Sherry Cowman, the Legislative Attorney for the Members who provide such excellent support. We thank them, and we are very grateful for their hard work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, this is probably the last time where I have enough time to thank the staff. I would like to thank all of the members of the staff.

I said when I was on the Education Committee, we used to have everybody's names written out; and so I turned to Tom, and he said, We don't do that, sir. We give all of the credit to the Members. So rather than list all of their names, on this amendment, I would like to thank you, en bloc, all of the staff, for doing such a tremendous job to get me ready in very short time to do this work. They have done a yeoman's job, and it has been a real pleasure working with the chairman and working with the staff on this bill. I look forward to many more years to do it. Hopefully, we will change off chairman, but I won't get into that.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me say a special word of thanks to our ranking member, BUCK MCKEON. As we welcome you and you are off and running, you are doing an excellent job, and we thank you for your first-class efforts in making this come to pass. You've done wonderfully, and we should all be very grateful to you.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, earlier today, the House unani
mously passed my amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, H.R. 2647. This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the United States and Israel have a shared national interest, that the latter is one of our strongest and most important allies, and that our government should pledge our continued support of Israel's defense and well-being.

In light of this, I would like to take a moment to draw attention to the ongoing captivity of Israeli Corporal Gilad Shalit. Cpl. Shalit is an Israeli soldier and a member of the Israeli Defense Forces. Three years ago today, Cpl. Shalit and his fellow soldiers were attacked by Hamas terrorists on the Israeli side of the Gaza Strip. Two soldiers were killed, and Cpl. Shalit was kidnapped.

Since that day in 2006, Hamas, with the continued protection and support of the Palestinian leadership, has held Cpl. Shalit in captivity, in clear defiance of the Geneva Convention and basic human decency. Hamas has not allowed the Red Cross or others to visit Cpl. Shalit. Instead, Hamas released videos highlighting the plight of Cpl. Shalit, and mocking Israel and the IDF. Military and diplomatic efforts to secure the release of Cpl. Shalit have been unsuccessful, and the Palestinian government continues to exploit his condition and his family's suffering.

In 2007 and 2008, I called for the release of Cpl. Salti, as well as Sergeant Major Ehud "Udi" Goldwasser and Sergeant First Class Eldad Regev. On July 16, 2008, Hezbollah returned the bodies of SGM Goldwasser and SFC Regev in exchange for over 200 convicted terrorists and other Palestinian prisoners. Unfortunately, Cpl. Shalit is still alive, and we know that his return is a matter of urgency. The captivity and poor treatment of Cpl. Shalit, in addition to the murder of the other soldiers, is unacceptable and only further demonstrates Hamas's unwillingness to be a responsible member of the global community.

As a nation that has experienced terrorist attacks, we know that this issue is not solely about regional issues; it is about U.S. national interests.

I am proud that this Congress today chose to stand with our friends in Israel, and call for the support of our key ally. Moreover, I call on President Obama, Secretary Clinton, and Ambassador Rice to use all available measures to secure the safe and timely return of Cpl. Gilad Shalit.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my distinguished friend and colleague from New Jersey, MR. GARRETT.

Since its creation in 1948, the State of Israel, surrounded by hostile neighbors, has been forced to develop technologically advanced defense capabilities to protect its existence as a democratic, Jewish state.

While this amendment addresses the totality of the U.S.-Israel military and security relationship, I would like to focus on the provision of critical missile defense assistance to Israel.

Israel is about to become the first country in the world to have a true national missile defense, and perhaps no other country has such a pressing need for one.

Almost twenty years ago, Iraq launched 93 Scud missiles at other Middle Eastern nations, including 39 at Israel.

Most recently, in 2006, Hezbollah launched scores of Katyusha rockets at civilian targets in northern Israel, imposing a state of siege on the population.

And we cannot forget the ongoing, relentless, decade-long rocket and mortar attacks from Palestinian militant groups in Gaza against innocents in southern Israel.

In addition to killing and injuring a number of Israelis, these militants have inflicted great psychological damage on the population, including Israeli children.

But the missile danger to Israel and the United States is even greater than what has challenged us before.

Today, Israel faces threats from both Iran and Syria—which have made clear their desires to develop nuclear weapons—and from the ballistic missile delivery systems that could reach Tel Aviv, other critical U.S. allies, and U.S. forces stationed throughout the region.

Iran remains committed to developing rockets capable of delivering warheads to Tel Aviv. Syria, which has one of the largest missile stockpiles in the region, has, with Iran's help, reportedly developed a surface-to-surface missile that would enable Syria to launch attacks against U.S. forces in Iraq and civilians in Israel and into Lebanon from Iran and Afghanistan, that can then be transferred to loved ones who will be able to send letters and packages to soldiers at no cost. While our
Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. 

Mr. CONNOLLY's amendment, but this is not the amendment, Mr. Chairman, doesn't go nearly far enough. Let me try to explain in the limited time that I have.

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 has in it a section 526, which does not allow any agency of the Federal Government to use a fuel source that has one scintilla increased amount of carbon dioxide footprint other than just standard old bubble-up petroleum. The Department of Defense uses about 350,000 barrels of petroleum product every day, most of that by the Air Force in the use of jet fuel.

In this country, we have so much domestic source of nonconventional bubble-up petroleum, and I'm talking about things like shale, in particular, and the liquefaction of coal, converting coal into petroleum. In this country, Mr. Chairman, we probably have a 150-year reserve of coal, and yet we're touching it. The Department of Defense has done research on the clean liquefaction of coal, the clean mining of shale. Shale is a rock that's just soaked, it's like a sponge, it's just soaked with petroleum, and there are literally hundreds of millions of barrels of petroleum within that shale. And yet, because of this section 526 in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, we cannot use it. We cannot use that at all.

So what we have found, of course, is that most of the petroleum that we import from foreign countries is not coming from OPEC; it's coming from Canada. And that's what's the problem? That oil that we get from Canada comes from oil sand. It's got a little sand in it, and it causes a little decrease of production of carbon dioxide, a footprint that's more than conventional petroleum. So that all the amendment does from the gentleman from Virginia.

I support the amendment, but what we need to do is eliminate section 526.
And I have an amendment that I signed on with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the other gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), and that's what we should have done. That amendment should have been made in order. We need to eliminate section 526 and the bad stuff off the Department of Defense. We're talking about big bucks here, Mr. Chairman.

I do support the gentleman's amendment.

MR. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Just a comment, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the support of my friend, but I want to clarify for the record that, as a matter of fact, we already have tar sand oil. About 6 percent of the gasoline supply in the United States already has it. And we already have the liquefaction of coal used in the United States, and the bill I hope we will pass ready has it. And we already have the line supply in the United States almost up and running.

And we thank the members, BUCK McKEON, who is doing so well, and the member from Virginia (Mr. MCKEON), who is doing so well, and the gentleman and want to speak very briefly what the chairman was saying and the member from Maryland, Mr. SCHIFF. I am very grateful to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONNOLLY). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed.

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

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

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

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:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.
Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.
Amendment No. 9 by Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
Amendment No. 15 by Mr. AKIN of Missouri.
Amendment No. 34 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.
Amendment No. 20 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk redesignated 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 138, noes 278, not voting 23, as follows:
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 190, not voting 25, as follows:

[Table of votes not shown]

Messes. GARRETT of New Jersey, SPACE, BUTTERFIELD, Ms. GIFFORDS, Messers. CLEAVER and POE of Texas changed their vote from ‘‘aye’’ to ‘‘no.’’

Messrs. QUIGLEY, LARSON of Connecticut, COHEN, BOWSER, ABERCROMBIE, OBREY, and ISRAEL changed their vote from ‘‘no’’ to ‘‘aye.’’

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Aying CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) 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.
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The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye votes 171, noes 24, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—171

Aderholt
Alabama, R.

Akin
Arkansas, R.

Alexander
North Carolina, R.

Bachmann
Minnesota, R.

Bachu
Washington, D.C., R.

Bartlett
California, R.

Bean
South Carolina, R.

Bilirakis
Florida, R.

Bishop (UT)
Utah, R.

Blunt
Missouri, R.

Boehner
Ohio, R.

Bonner
Mississippi, R.

Bono Mack
California, D.

Bouancy
Louisiana, D.

Burgess
Texas, R.

Burton (IN)
Indiana, R.

Camp
Arkansas, R.

Capito
West Virginia, R.

Carlo
New York, R.

Cassidy
Louisiana, D.

Chaffetz
Utah, R.

Cole
New Hampshire, R.

Colombia
Florida, D.

Commercial
Florida, R.

Conaway
Texas, R.

Crowley
New York, D.

Cutler
Oregon, R.

Davies (AL)
Alabama, D.

Davis (KY)
Kentucky, R.

Deal
Georgia, R.

Dent
Ohio, R.

Descoteaux
Virginia, D.

Dent
Ohio, R.

Dent
Ohio, R.

Deschamps
Louisiana, R.

Diaz-Balart, L.
Florida, R.

Diaz-Balart, L.
Florida, R.

Diemme
Nevada, R.

Dingell
Michigan, D.

Dixit
Georgia, D.

Doggett
Texas, D.

Doyle
Indiana, D.

Downing
Rhode Island, R.

Drake
California, R.

Dreyer
Rhode Island, R.

Duckworth
Illinois, D.

Duncan
Texas, R.

Duncan
Texas, R.

Duncan
Texas, R.

Duncan
Texas, R.

Duncan
Texas, R.

DuFour
Louisiana, D.

Eberhard
Ohio, D.

Ehlers
Texas, D.

Eiler
Virginia, D.

Elkins
Virginia, D.

Ellison
Texas, D.

Ellsworth
South Dakota, D.

Elvers
Maryland, D.

Engel
New York, D.

Engel
New York, D.

Enzi
Wyoming, R.

Eshoo
Ohio, D.

Etheridge
North Carolina, D.

Eva
California, D.

Fahrenheit
California, D.

Fakhoury
Michigan, D.

Fattah
Pennsylvania, D.

Ferguson
California, D.

Filner
California, D.

Foster
California, D.

Frank (MA)
Massachusetts, D.

Fudge
Ohio, D.

Gallo
Georgia, D.

Gallucci
Ohio, D.

Gallup
New York, D.

Gallup
New York, D.

Gamache
New Hampshire, D.

Gardner
Florida, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.

Gates
Virginia, D.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 193, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 457] AYES—224

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and the result of the vote was not recorded. The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPROVED.