United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2009 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 9, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PASTOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Anthony L. Bennett, Mount Aery Baptist Church, Bridgeport, Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

Good morning, God, our Creator, Provider and Sustainer. It is to You, our refuge, strength, and one God who is known by many names. To You God, we give thanks for this day; a day in which we have another chance to manifest Your divine essence upon the Earth. You have given us another opportunity to demonstrate Your love for us in how we treat one another.

And so, on today, I lift the Members and staff of this, the United States House of Representatives. I pray Your wisdom and guidance will consume them so that they understand the individuals, families and, yes, even the nations that will be impacted by their decisions today. So teach them and all of us to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with our God.

In the name of Jesus, I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND ANTHONY L. BENNETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to introduce today to the Congress of the United States, Pastor Anthony L. Bennett of the Mount Aery Baptist Church in Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Pastor Bennett is accompanied today by his wife, First Lady Bennett, and their young and energetic son, Ahmad.

The Mount Aery Baptist Church draws its name from the biblical Mount Ararat where Noah's ark is believed to have come to rest after the cataclysmic floods. This is an apt metaphor because Mount Aery is a beacon, a refuge, a house of good works in a very troubled city, one of the poorest in Connecticut, in fact, one of the poorest in the Nation.

But under Pastor Bennett's leadership, the Mount Aery Church has sponsored ministries for children, for teenagers, for those at risk of dependency or recovering from dependency. He has fostered educational outreach programs that have made a difference in a very, very troubled location.

One of the most personally moving things I have experienced in the last several years was when the Mount Aery Baptist Church raised up recent high school graduates of the city of Bridgeport at a time and in a place where half of the city's high school students do not graduate from high school.

Pastor Bennett is a leader, a minister, and a pastor; and I can't help but thinking this morning that if all of us strove to match his example, we would be a better country, indeed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PUBLIC OPTION IN HEALTH REFORM

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for a strong public option as part of our health reform bill. Health care is not a place for playing political games; it is simply too precious. That is why we need to pass a meaningful bill, one that actually achieves the goal of providing everyone with affordable access to quality care.

If private competition alone could have achieved this, it would have already. I am supporting comprehensive health reform for patients, for each one of us who has a loved one who has needed care but was denied by their insurance company and couldn't afford the out-of-pocket expenses. Let's give those companies a reason to provide us with better, more affordable coverage, and give patients greater choice in who will be their insurer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the inclusion of a viable public option in our health reform legislation.

Printed on recycled paper.

HEALTH CARE REFORM IS DISASTER

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, health care reform is a disaster. The cost of the Democrat health care bill is $1.5 trillion, and we still don't know how they intend to pay for it. That is on top of the fact that the Democrats have spent nearly $1 trillion on the stimulus to create jobs that we have yet to see, plus $400 billion on a so-called emergency spending bill.

They doled out billions to the auto industry, billions to Wall Street, and a whopping $182 billion to AIG. And that is on top of the $700 billion housing rescue. And now they want a $1.5 trillion health care plan.

The problem with our health care system isn't that we don't spend enough; it is that we spend it inefficiently. We can and we must do better for our children and our grandchildren.

America, let's stop the red ink now.

HELP WITH HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, over 45 million people in America have no health insurance, and over 8 million of them are children. Millions more don't have enough health insurance; that is dramatic, but abstract.

Let me make it more real and tell you about two of these people I met in Hawaii last week. One woman told me that she is self-employed and pays all of her taxes. She works hard, but for her entire life she has taken care of herself because she can't afford health care. For years she self-treated a busted knee. It finally got to the point she had to see a doctor, but she couldn't afford it. She did something nobody should ever have to do: she used a friend's insurance card to get the care she needed.

Another man bravely told me he was homeless. He doesn't fit the stereotype. He has a college degree and works two jobs. One of his job provides him with health insurance, but he cannot afford the 20 percent copay. He needs that money to buy food for his wife and children, and to buy gasoline to drive his car to work. So he goes without regular doctor visits and hopes for the best.

These people aren't asking for a handout. They are asking for a little bit of help. It is time we provided it.

THE GREEN RELIGION SUPPRESSES FREE SPEECH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the most toxic atmosphere today is the political climate. At the EPA, scientists are not allowed to disagree with the rabid dogma about climate change.

Recently, Alan Carlin, a 35-year veteran scientist at the EPA, issued a report that challenged the theory of global warming. Carlin pointed out serious problems with the science used to draw false EPA conclusions. He revealed new research that contradicts dire predictions that mankind is destroying the world. He pointed to evidence that the Earth is actually cooling. The EPA suppressed the report.

Carlin's boss warned him that he had better not talk about the report or disagree with the EPA's green agenda.

The suppression of speech and information undermines the very foundation of self-governance. Yet there is a systematic suppression of information that contradicts what has become a green religion at the EPA.

Thousands of scientists have challenged the claims of global warming. Science is supposed to be about the uncorrupted search for the truth and the facts. The EPA's actions are reminiscent of those who said the Earth was flat and persecuted the ''heretics'' who said it was round.

And that's just the way it is.

WELCOMING AMBASSADOR VASSILIS KASKARELIS

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the new Ambassador from Greece to Washington. Ambassador Vassilis Kaskarelis has a long and distinguished diplomatic career having represented Greece at the U.N., NATO, and the E.U., among other posts. No doubt he will be an excellent partner as we move to strengthen Greek-American relations on issues like Cyprus and the ecumenical patriarch, for example, as well as on Greece's pivotal position in the geopolitics of the region and in the new global economy.

I also congratulate Greece on the recent opening of the spectacular Acropolis Museum. I was honored to represent President Obama and the United States at its inauguration. Built in stone from the region and bathed in natural light reflected from the nearby Aegean, it houses some of the world's greatest antiquities. Accordingly, it cries out for the return of the Parthenon Marbles from the British Museum.

USE WHAT YOU VOTE FOR

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, gradually the details of the Democrat health plan are leaking out to the American people. Call it whatever you like, this proposal is nothing more than a government-run health care plan if it has a government-run option. Interestingly, it exempts Members of Congress from having to join a government-run health care system.

As a physician for many years, I am amazed at the number of Congressmen who have enjoined high-quality, personalized health care in this country but are now willing to force post office-style medicine on our people.

In response to this, I have offered a resolution that will give Members of Congress an opportunity to finally be accountable for the decisions we make and how they affect the lives of ordinary Americans. Most Americans feel that Congressmen who vote for legislation creating a government-run health care plan should lead by example and enroll themselves in the same public plan. I agree with them. As a result, I have introduced House Resolution 615 with a number of cosponsors that simply says that if you vote for a government-run health care option, you agree to choose government-run health care for yourself and your family.

I ask Members of both parties to vote for my resolution.

CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY CREATES JOBS

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about how clean energy technology is creating jobs in my district and why we need the Senate to follow our lead and pass the American Clean Energy Security bill to create even more jobs in the Hudson Valley and throughout the country.

Mercury Solar in my district started 3 years ago with five employees and now employs 60 people, expecting to have 80 by year's end.

Spectra Watt, a solar cell manufacturer, will be employing 150 people in their new Dutchess County facility by next year.

Business is growing by leaps and bounds because of the market created by New York's renewable energy requirements, because of the Federal tax incentives that we passed here in Congress and because of the economic stimulus package. But more needs to be done, and that's why we need the Waxman-Markey bill, the Energy and Jobs bill, to be passed by the Senate.

It is time to invest in our future for America to reclaim first place in the field of energy technology and to create the middle class jobs of the 21st century.

I urge the Senate to quickly pass the Waxman-Markey Energy and Jobs bill.

AMERICANS DESERVE REAL PLAN, REAL RECOVERY

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of last year, it was obvious: America was sliding into a serious recession. And to this very day, the American people are struggling in this difficult economy.

Well, in February, this Democrat Congress passed a $1 trillion stimulus bill, and the results are starting to come in: 1.6 million jobs lost since the stimulus bill was signed. Unemployment was 12.4 million; it is 14.7 million today. The unemployment rate was 7.5 percent; it is 9.5 percent today, the highest in 26 years. And, remarkably, the President last week said that the recovery bill had ''done its job.'' Done its job?

Look, the American people are starting to get wise to the Democrat plan here. They understand the Democrat agenda is nothing more than more government, more debt, more spending, a national energy tax, and a government takeover of health care.

The Republican plan: fiscal discipline for Washington, D.C. and tax relief for working families, small businesses and family farms.

The American people are hurting. They deserve a real plan for a real recovery, not more spending, more taxes, more debt, and more unemployment.

□ 1015

LET'S FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. POLIS. Yesterday, the Senate voted to extend the border wall between the U.S. and Mexico and to expand E-Verify, making this flawed employment verification system both mandatory and permanent for Federal contractors.

The American people don't want to see political posturing; they want to see real, meaningful immigration reform. These provisions attempt to enforce immigration laws without getting to the heart of the issue. Building a bigger wall at the U.S.-Mexico border is going to spend millions of taxpayer dollars and will not stop illegal immigration; reforming our immigration system will.

Forcing Federal contractors to implement a costly employment verification program isn't going to stop illegal immigration. Instead, a mandatory E-Verify clause would force cash-strapped small businesses to make the painful decisions between losing government contracts and spending millions of dollars on a flawed and expensive employment verification system.

It's not that we shouldn't talk about border security or employment verification. We must. These are conversations we need to have as part of a larger debate on comprehensive immigration reform, not as amendments to an appropriations bill. Instead of trying to act tough, Members of Congress should be tough and fix our broken immigration system.

PRESCRIPTION OF THE DAY: PHYSICIAN PAYMENT REFORM

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, here's the problem: Every 6, 12, or 18 months for the last several years, doctors who participate in Medicare, a public option, have faced steep payment cuts, threatening their ability to keep their doors open.

This Congress, and many Congresses before it, instead of biting the bullet and working to find a long-term and permanent solution to the problem, passes short-term fixes, leaving America's doctors uncertain about their ability to continue serving our Nation's seniors and practicing medicine. Doctors need a stable and reasonable predictor of their Medicare reimbursement rates, and the current formula, the Sustainable Growth Rate formula, is flawed and outdated.

For the past several years I have introduced legislation that will correct this formula, and it is incumbent upon this Congress to address this issue. We need a permanent fix. Our doctors are forced to live under the ax of yearly cuts just for the privilege of seeing our Nation's seniors.

Reforms to the system are important. I urge constituents to go to the Web site healthcaucus.org, weigh in on this issue, and stay abreast on all of the health care debates that are going on in this Congress.

THE AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY AND SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the role of American energy sources as articulated in the recently passed Clean Energy and Security Act.

The leadership of the minority party claims that this legislation discriminates against energy sources such as coal, nuclear, and hydroelectric power. Nothing could be further from the truth. This act will make historic investments in coal technology. That's the reason that coal-dependent companies like Duke Energy and American Electric Power, as well as the United Mineworkers, have endorsed the bill.

The American Clean Energy and Security Act will strengthen market incentives for nuclear energy by deducting new nuclear from the baseline of renewable electricity standards. That's why Exelon and Entergy, America's first and second largest nuclear energy producers, have endorsed the bill.

The American Clean Energy and Security Act will create strong incentives for new hydroelectric generation when new turbines are placed on existing dams. That's why Pacific Gas and Electric and Seattle City Light, two utilities with substantial investments in hydroelectric, have endorsed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, don't take my word for it. These companies that rely on coal, nuclear, and hydro would not support the bill if it didn't help their industry.

HEALTH CARE'S PUBLIC OPTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to see a so-called ''public option'' as a part of any health care reform plan. The key question for any public health option is, would this plan be subsidized with taxpayer money? If not, then the public option would simply be a nonprofit insurance business which anyone could create now. But if taxpayer money will subsidize this option, and I believe it will, the public option will only serve to crowd out other choices.

A public option will not save any money; it will compete and undermine private plans. And I'm afraid many companies will end up dumping employees under the public plan. A public option is nothing more than a back door to government-owned health care which will ultimately result in rationed care and bureaucrats in charge of your health care choices.

COMBATING OBESITY IN AMERICA

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout my district, the primary concern I hear over and over again from Republicans, Independents, and Democrats, is that we need to reform our Nation's health care system. However, any meaningful reform must begin by taking control over the skyrocketing costs of health care. As a clinical dietitian for 25 years, I know that this can only be achieved with serious commitment to healthy living and combating obesity in America.

A recent study by the National Center for Education Statistics found that one out of every five American 4-year-olds is obese. I would like to repeat that. One out of every five 4-year-olds in America is obese. Why is this a problem? The CDC estimated recently that the total cost of obesity in the United States is $117 billion.

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, if we are serious about reforming our health care system, we need to get serious about combating obesity. I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring healthy living, wellness, and prevention are major components of the final health care bill. The success of our reform depends on it.

LET THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BE HEARD ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to ask that you include all of our voices in crafting responsible health care reform legislation. This issue is too large and impacts too many people to write a bill from only one side of the aisle.

In my home State of Virginia, more than 1.1 million individuals are uninsured, and health care premiums grow another 10 percent annually. Back in the First District, I formed and work with a Health Care Advisory Council comprised of local patient advocates, physicians, nurses, students, insurance providers, hospitals, community health centers, and other stakeholders in the health care reform debate. These folks have great ideas that deserve an opportunity to be heard. They are clear-cut ideas on which both sides can agree.

We must let Americans who like their health care coverage keep it and give all Americans the freedom to choose the health plan that best meets their needs. We must also focus on prevention, disease management, and wellness programs, as well as the development of new treatments and cures for life-threatening diseases.

We must also allow the Federal Government to partner with States to improve programs that guarantee access to affordable coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

Finally, we must increase transparency to improve patient access to the best health care information available.

These are things upon which Republicans and Democrats can agree in order to provide relief to the American people.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I hosted a town hall meeting in my district in Syracuse, New York. The town hall was extremely well attended, with over 400 constituents from across central New York in attendance, and everyone was interested. I think there may have even been 400 different opinions in the room. The ones who were the most passionate, of course, were the ones on both sides of it and the extreme sides of it. There was the crowd that wanted a government-run, single-payer health care system and wouldn't settle for much else, and then there were about an equal number equally convinced that the government should have absolutely no role in health care whatsoever and that any role at all would be socialism. I think most of the people in my district, though, are somewhere in the middle.

I would like to share just one story from my town hall. At the end of the evening, after some pretty heated rhetoric, a man named Doug West of Skaneateles, New York, came down to the front of the auditorium to show me his monthly insurance bill and how it went from about $350 about 6 years ago to more than $800 today. Doug is a retired engineer from a local company, and unless there are is some dramatic changes, Doug is not going to be able to afford that rising cost forever.

Doug and his family are examples of the constituents that I will be focused on in my advocacy for higher quality and more affordable health care.

DEMOCRAT HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as both the House and Senate Democrats attempt to pass a multitrillion-dollar government-run health care bill, there are some facts that have come out that we can now all see.

These three facts are now evident about the House Democrat legislation:

First, the bill will force 114 million Americans out of their current health care coverage into a new government-controlled health care plan;

Second, the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office states that the bill will cost the American taxpayers $1.5 trillion;

And third, 29 million Americans will still remain uninsured if this disastrous piece of legislation becomes law.

But 83 percent of Americans like the insurance they now have. Yes, we must reform the system to include those without insurance, but we must not throw out what is working.

The American people need real reforms, not government-run medicine.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as a mother of a young 2-year-old son, like millions of moms in America, health care is very important to me. And I want to know that I have the freedom to go to whatever doctor I choose and have the medical treatment that is best for my son, Cole.

We are facing a serious health care crisis, and we must do everything we can to fix the problem. Last week, I was back home in eastern Washington. Everywhere I went I heard about the lack of doctors and nurses, the high cost of health insurance, and the limited access to quality health care, especially in the rural areas. I also heard fears that the government may take over our health care, parents who are worried their child won't be able to see the pediatrician of their choice, or seniors who worry that the doctor they trusted for decades may drop his or her coverage because the government doesn't pay them enough to keep practicing.

During this debate, let us not forget that doctors are the true experts. We can reform our system and cover the uninsured without the Federal Government setting up shop as a health insurance company and a health care gatekeeper, and without sacrificing that important doctor-patient relationship.

REMEMBERING BOB SHORT

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Bob Short died yesterday. Most people don't know the name Bob Short, but if you go back several decades and think back to the beginning of the first book series, ''The Gospel According to Peanuts,'' you are reading Bob Short.

I got to know him later in life when he began attending my wife's church at Quapaw Quarter United Methodist Church in Little Rock, Arkansas, just a few years ago. He developed an illness several months ago, and we lost a great American, a man who had great impact on the thinking of a lot of Americans, particularly those who loved Charlie Schultz and the Peanuts comic strips. Bob Short will be missed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 31, nays 385, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—31

Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Connolly (VA)
Fleming
Foxx
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Hensarling
Johnson (IL)
King (IA)
Lamborn
Marchant
McHenry
Murtha
Olson
Pascrell
Paul
Price (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Souder
Spratt
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Young (AK)

NAYS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner

Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bishop (UT)

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews
Baird
Boucher
Cantor
Costa
Doyle
Engel
Fudge
Granger
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Ruppersberger
Shuler
Slaughter
Westmoreland

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1054

Messrs. CARNEY, McCLINTOCK, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERRY, Ms. CLARKE, Messrs. COHEN and DICKS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2997.

□ 1054

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. SNYDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 8, 2009, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 111–191 by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 74, line 22.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–191 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 printed in part A by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 2 printed in part B by Mr. BRADY of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 printed in part B by Mrs. CAPITO of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 printed in part B by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 1 printed in part B by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 6 printed in part E by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 printed in part C by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 9 printed in part D by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 printed in part D by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 12 printed in part D by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 7 printed in part B by Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICA. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding that the first amendment that will be considered is the DeLauro amendment, which is a manager's amendment that incorporates a number of provisions that do, in fact, legislate on an appropriations measure.

Is it not correct, Mr. Chair, that within the rule, H. Res. 609, providing for consideration of this measure before the House, all points of order were waived against any objection to legislating on an appropriations measure?

So, in fact, Mr. Chair, is it not correct that we are legislating on an appropriations measure with some of the provisions contained in this first amendment to be voted on by the House and, in fact, that a provision of the rule does waive any point of order against that action?

The CHAIR. The Chair does not interpret the content of the amendment.

Mr. MICA. Does it not, in fact, contain measures that are new?

The CHAIR. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICA. Point of order. This does legislate on an appropriations measure which I was denied the opportunity to do but in fact they're doing in this first amendment?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has not made a point of order.

Mr. MICA. I appeal the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIR. The Chair has not conferred recognition at this point to make a point of order. That decision is not subject to appeal.

Mr. MICA. I thank the Chair.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on

the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. DELAURO:

Page 3, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 5, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 5, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 6, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 9, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 10, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,519,000)''.

Page 11, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 11, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $519,000)''.

Page 25, line 22, after each of the dollar amounts, insert ''(reduced by $519,000)''.

Page 57, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $235,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 20, strike ''and''.

Page 57, line 23, insert before the colon the following: ''; and $235,000,000 shall be derived from tobacco product user fees authorized by section 919 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101 of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (Public Law 111–31), and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended''.

Page 57, line 25, strike ''and animal generic drug'' and insert ''animal generic drug, and tobacco product''.

Page 58, line 21, strike ''(7) not to exceed $115,882,000'' and insert the following: ''(7) $216,523,000 shall be for the Center for Tobacco Products and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (8) not to exceed $117,225,000''.

Page 58, line 25, strike ''(8) not to exceed $168,728,000'' and insert ''(9) not to exceed $171,526,000''.

Page 59, line 2, strike ''(9) not to exceed $185,793,000'' and insert ''(10) not to exceed $200,129,000''.

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

SEC. ____. There is appropriated, for the grant program for the purpose of obtaining and adding to an anhydrous ammonia fertilizer nurse tank a substance to reduce the amount of methamphetamine that can be produced from any anhydrous ammonia removed from the nurse tank as authorized by section 14203 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (21 U.S.C. 864a), hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act for ''Rural Development Salaries and Expenses'', $2,000,000.

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 161, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—266

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—161

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Baird
Fudge
Granger
Inglis
McCarthy (NY)
Murphy (NY)
Schakowsky
Slaughter
Stupak
Tonko
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 5 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1116

Messrs. SHULER and MARCHANT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WITTMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 498, I was unavoidably detained at a science and technology subcommittee hearing, as I was questioning a witness who had presented testimony on energy turbine efficiency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,000)''.

Page 8, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $50,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 27, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—404

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—27

Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Courtney
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Halvorson
Hare
Hodes
Hoekstra
Jones
Kaptur
Kissell
Kucinich
Loebsack
Maffei
Marshall
McCotter
Michaud
Nadler (NY)
Nye
Pingree (ME)
Rogers (AL)
Schauer
Sherman
Sutton
Taylor
Teague

NOT VOTING—7

Bishop (UT)
Fudge
Granger
Murphy (NY)
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1120

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 4 offered by Mrs. CAPITO:

Page 3, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $10,038,000)''.

Page 46, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $10,038,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 426, noes 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

AYES—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell

Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Connolly (VA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Moran (VA)

NOT VOTING—9

Christensen
Farr
Fudge
Granger
Honda
McDermott
Murphy (NY)
Reyes
Schakowsky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1124

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

Page 57, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $373,000,000)''.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—135

Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf

NOES—292

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Christensen
Fudge
Granger
Gutierrez
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kosmas
Murphy (NY)
Reyes
Richardson
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1127

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. BLACKBURN:

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

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 248, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

AYES—185

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Massa
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—248

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Bishop (UT)
Christensen
Fudge
Granger
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1130

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART E AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part E amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be available for the National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy project, Kiski Basin, Pennsylvania, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $200,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 307, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—122

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harper
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOES—307

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Becerra
Berkley

Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kratovil
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carnahan
Fudge
Granger
Gutierrez
Kosmas
Murphy (NY)
Speier
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1134

Mrs. CAPITO changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chair, I submit clarification of my vote on rollcall No. 503 the Hensarling Amendment No. 6, to H.R. 2997. I mistakenly voted "nay" when I intended to vote "yea."

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for the special grant for Specialty Crops in Indiana, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $235,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 320, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—111

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—320

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.

Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Delahunt
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Granger
Latham
Murphy (NY)
Speier

□ 1137

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be available for the Foundry Sand By-Products Utilization project in Beltsville, Maryland, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $638,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 319, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—115

Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—319

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Delahunt
Fudge
Granger
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1140

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for the special grant for the Agriculture Energy Innovation Center in Georgia, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 328, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

AYES—103

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bilbray
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Duncan
Ehlers

Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (NE)
Souder
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—328

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Fudge
Granger
Kagen
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Pascrell
Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1143

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for special grants for Potato Research in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $1,037,000.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 333, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

AYES—97

Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Blackburn
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hodes
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Linder
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Souder
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—333

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján

Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Buchanan
Costello
Fudge
Granger
King (IA)
Luetkemeyer
Murphy (NY)
Smith (NE)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1147

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 507, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KINGSTON:

Page 74, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, or pay the salary or expenses of personnel for the administration of, the provision of broadband loans or loan guarantees made using authorities under this Act on or before September 15, 2010.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 292, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—140

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Carter
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Pitts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—292

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rooney
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Bordallo
Fudge
Granger
Murphy (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sestak

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute is remaining on the vote.

□ 1150

Mr. BRIGHT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010".

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R.

2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 609, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it true that under this rule, we cannot get separate votes in the House on each amendment that was adopted in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair will put the question on the amendments en gros.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So is it true that we will not be able to get a separate vote on the amendments that were passed in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the question on the amendments en gros pursuant to the rule.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm assuming that is a ''no'' answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the question on adoption of the amendments will be put en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kingston moves to recommit the bill back to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back fortwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. __. REGULAR ORDER ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) On October 6, 2000, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, made the following statement regarding the appropriations process: ''We have gotten so far from the regular order that I fear that if this continues, the House will not have the capacity to return to the precedents and procedures of the House that have given true meaning to the term 'representative democracy'. The reason that we have stuck to regular order as long as we have in this institution is to protect the rights of every Member to participate. And when we lose those rights, we lose the right to be called the greatest deliberative body left in the world.''

(2) On that same day, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey went on to say, ''I believe that this incredible centralization of decision-making in the hands of staff in the House leadership offices means that for most Members representing their districts in this body is diminishing every day in terms of their ability to have a say in what goes on around here.''

(3) On July 8, 2009, the House adopted a rule governing consideration of this bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 that deviated from the regular order by making in order no more than 13 amendments and by specifically preventing 39 Members from offering amendments that they had publicly indicated a desire to have debated.

(4) The following Members were specifically denied the right to participate in the deliberations on this bill by having one or more of their amendments denied the right to be debated:

The gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. Bean;

The gentlewoman from Tennessee, Ms. Blackburn;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Brady;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Broun;

The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Butterfield;

The gentleman from California, Mr. Campbell;

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Carney;

The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Cassidy;

The gentleman from Utah, Mr. Chaffetz;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Conaway;

The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Courtney;

The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. DeFazio;

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Flake;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Gingrey;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Hall;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Hensarling;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Higgins;

The gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Hodes;

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Jordan;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Kingston;

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Kucinich;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Lee;

The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Lucas;

The gentlewoman from Wyoming, Ms. Lummis;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Mack;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. McCaul;

The gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. McMorris Rodgers;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Mica;

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Murphy;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Price;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Putnam;

The gentlewoman from New Hampshire, Ms. Shea-Porter;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Stearns;

The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Stupak;

The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Tiahrt;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Weiner;

The gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Welch; and,

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wittman.

(5) As each of these Members represents approximately 650,000 Americans, approximately 25,350,000 Americans were denied their right to be represented because the restrictive rule supported by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, failed to follow the precedents and procedures of the House;

(6) The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, was correct that a true representative democracy is impossible when 25,350,000 Americans have their representative to Congress shut-out of the legislative process;

(7) As a result of the restrictive rule implemented by the Democratic majority, the House was not allowed to vote or even debate pertinent issues such as:

An amendment that would reduce spending by 1 percent saving taxpayers $229,000,000;

An amendment to prohibit ineligible individual from receiving food stamps;

An amendment that would reduce the cost of construction projects in rural areas;

An amendment to end taxpayer subsidies for mohair producers;

An amendment to prevent Federal employees from being paid to do union activities during their official work hours;

An amendment to permit Federal agencies to purchase alternative fuels;

An amendment to terminate taxpayer funded marketing programs for private companies;

An amendment to reduce this bill and the deficit by $4,800,000,000;

An amendment to ensure that Federal contractors only hire legal workers;

An amendment to prohibit the provision of taxpayer funded rental housing to illegal aliens;

An amendment to support our dairy farmers in the northeast;

An amendment to assist farmers in Florida hit by a natural disaster;

An amendment to prohibit funds in the bill from being spent on projects named after sitting Members of Congress;

An amendment to ensure that the Federal government works with state agencies on food safety issues;

An amendment to protect whistleblower employees from retaliation for providing Congress or the public with information; and,

An amendment to terminate taxpayer subsidies for wool producers.

(8) The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, was correct that the House loses the right to be called the ''greatest deliberative body left in the world'' if it refuses to even debate, let alone vote, on these issues.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the U.S. House of Representatives that this bill should be reopened for amendment under the regular order procedures advocated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, on October 6, 2000.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

□ 1200

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. DELAURO. I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it is in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, legislating.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for the opportunity to speak on this. And I want to

talk to the Members of the House on why this motion to recommit is important to all of us.

We are on the verge of voting on a $123.8 billion bill which represents a 14 percent increase over last year's spending level in the backdrop of a nation that has an $11 trillion national debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this administration has spent nearly $2 trillion in deficit spending. Now, what this motion to recommit does is says that we were not allowed to vote on 90 different amendments offered by Democrats and Republicans, representing nearly 650,000 people each. These amendments, had we had the opportunity to vote on them, would have improved the bill. One of them, for example, was a 1 percent savings——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the motion does not change existing law; therefore, the gentlewoman's point of order is invalid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, in order to properly address the point of order, I think it is important that we look at House Resolution 609, which was adopted by the Rules Committee to set the order and the consideration of the legislation that's before the House today. It also excluded a large number of amendments that were crafted, Mr. Speaker, to the objection—the same objection that's being raised here—that in fact those amendments were legislating on an appropriations bill, which in fact is out of order because of the way this was crafted.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia has in fact offered a motion that does contain some provisions that would change the law, but only the appropriations which this part of the bill deals with. And this point has been raised against the motion to recommit.

So, in fact, what I was denied was the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to offer one of the amendments. And I believe the reading clerk—I couldn't hear, but I believe the reading clerk mentioned my name among the names of those who were denied an amendment that would legislate on appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MICA. Again, I think the point of order is that the Rules Committee crafted a rule, and we adopted previous amendments—one by the gentlelady who is now objecting—that did in fact legislate on an appropriation matter, no different from what the gentleman from Georgia is now attempting to do. The precedence of the House—Mr. YOUNG, I talked to him earlier, he said he's been here 39 years and he has never seen appropriations handled in this unfair manner.

So, again, I think the point is that the gentleman from Georgia is proceeding in good faith, in fact, in the order that has been presented by the Rules Committee on the order to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will only hear argument on whether the proposed amendment violates clause 2 of Rule XXI. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Georgia proposes an amendment addressing a policy regarding special orders of business for consideration of appropriation bills. That is not a matter of appropriation or limitation thereof; rather, it is wholly legislative in character. As such, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained. The motion is not in order.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—246

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul

Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Boehner
Carter
Fudge
Gohmert
Granger
Murphy (NY)
Pingree (ME)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1225

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, ISSA, and KRATOVIL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kingston moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2997 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 19, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 5, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 5, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 5, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 46, line 18, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 15, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 68, line 21, strike ''$1,180,000,000'' and insert ''$1,240,000,000''.

Mr. KINGSTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Ms. DELAURO. I object.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution says that the Congress shall have the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

Congress has the basic responsibility to provide water to its citizens, Mr. Speaker. To say it bluntly, this Congress has failed in its constitutional duty to provide water to its citizens.

It's been 651 days since I warned this government of the imposed drought in California, the government-imposed drought. Since then, the Democrat leadership in this country has sat back and watched the vibrant economy of the San Joaquin Valley deteriorate to a level similar to a third world country. Unemployment in the San Joaquin Valley of California is nearing 20 percent, with some communities at 40 percent. Despite this economic catastrophe, the Democrat leadership in this country has remained silent.

Thankfully, around midnight on Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, my friend from California (Mr. CALVERT) offered an amendment, during the Energy and Water Appropriations markup, which would have restored the flow of water to communities. A 30-minute debate followed this, which included absolutely outrageous and outright threatful statements.

□ 1230

One of my colleagues on the committee opined that California's water is critical to salmon and other endangered species, like the killer whale.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, killer whales, these orcas live up here north of Washington. Mr. Speaker, what do killer whales have to do with landlocked farmers way down here? How is this possible?

Then my colleague went on to say, ''The culprit is not the Endangered Species Act but climate change.'' Mr. Speaker, what does climate change have to do with 40,000 people without jobs? I find it ironic that my colleague in 2003 didn't have the same concern when he supported the energy and water bill which overturned the Endangered Species Act on the silvery minnow. In fact, 31 of my Democrat colleagues on the Appropriations Committee supported the exact same bill in 2003 to protect the silvery minnow. What has changed for my Democrat colleagues? The silvery minnow and the delta smelt are both 3-inch bait fish.

Another member of the committee declared that the Calvert amendment was a ''wish amendment.'' Wish is certainly the right word to use. My constituents wish that the Democrats in this body would do their job. The same Member went on to threaten members of the committee that if they supported the Calvert amendment, they would lose their earmarks. It's amazing what happens around this place when the clock strikes midnight and they think no one is watching what people say. My message to you is, we are watching. I put the entire hearing up on YouTube for everyone in the world to see the pathetic excuses that were made in that committee that night.

My colleagues have complained that California farmers are putting fishermen out of work. But the truth is, the Federal Government put the salmon fishermen out of work. In fact, the Federal Government paid $100 million to the salmon fishermen not to fish. It doesn't take $100 million to solve the crisis in California, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't even take a penny. Just turn on the pumps, and restore the flow of water, is all we're asking.

It's unfortunate that the Democrat majority has made it quite clear they are going to ignore their constitutional duty to provide for the general welfare of its citizens. The other night my good friend from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) said during the debate, ''The Endangered Species Act wasn't written by God. It was written by man. If we can't make exceptions to it when necessary, what kind of Representatives are we?'' The gentleman from Idaho is correct. My constituents don't want your welfare. They want the Democrat leadership in this body to do their job.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from California is correct. The people from California want water, not welfare.

I withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 160, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—266

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper

Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—160

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

DeFazio
Fudge
Granger
Green, Gene
Markey (CO)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1250

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 510 on the Agriculture appropriations bill, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly, but on behalf of my potato farmers who were not addressed by the amendment, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion to adjourn was rejected.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3081, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 617 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 617

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, except as provided in section 2, no amendment shall be in order except: (1) the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution; and (2) the amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI and except that an amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

SEC. 3. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 3081, the Chair may reduce to two minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNYDER). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. All time yielded for consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 617 provides for consideration of H.R. 3081, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2010, under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except those arising under clause 9 or clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The bill makes in order the amendment printed in part A of the committee report and the amendments printed in part B of the committee report accompanying this resolution. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes. Finally, the rule also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that we will consider today, H.R. 3081, funds the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related programs for fiscal year 2010.

This bipartisan bill reflects four key priorities: it protects our national security and combats terrorism; provides critical resources to meet global health and development challenges; ensures adequate oversight and accountability of our foreign assistance; and most importantly reforms and rebuilds America's diplomatic and development capacity.

In total, the bill provides $48.8 billion for fiscal year 2010. This is $3.2 billion less than the President's request, and $1.2 billion below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including supplemental funding, a reasonable level of funding during these unprecedented fiscal times.

To protect national security and combat terrorism, the State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill provides $2.2 billion to Israel, provides $2.7 billion in assistance for Afghanistan and $1.5 billion for Pakistan, and it provides $1.8 billion total in economic and security assistance for Egypt and Jordan, two of our key allies in the Middle East.

It also requires a report on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and it continues a reporting requirement on bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran. Further, it prevents the Export-Import Bank from providing financing to any energy producers or refiners that contribute to Iran's refined petroleum resources.

The bill also continues to take aim at the war on drugs by setting aside $319 million for Mexico and Central America for counternarcotics and law enforcement programs. It also includes $520 million for Colombia to fight narcotics and criminal gangs and to promote alternatives to drug production.

The State-Foreign Operations bill makes great strides in increasing global health by providing funding increases for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, tuberculosis and malaria prevention, safe water and hygiene, and child and maternal health programs. These global health investments are critical, not just in saving lives overseas, but in protecting the health of countless Americans from disease.

The State-Foreign Operations bill also ensures that the United States continues to meet our moral and humanitarian obligations abroad. The bill provides funding for countries facing long-term development challenges, improving foreign agriculture and food security programs and helping countries struggling with food shortages, supporting basic education needs, helping displaced people around the world with food, water, shelter and other basic needs, and providing lifesaving assistance during worldwide natural disasters.

□ 1300

It also provides $450 million for the Peace Corps. This is $77 million above the President's request, which accelerates the President's commitment to expanding the Peace Corps, one of the most valuable programs our government can fund.

The lack of capacity in our civilian agencies has resulted in an increased reliance on American troops to carry out diplomatic missions. Besides placing an additional workload on our already overburdened troops and taking their focus away from their critical core missions, it is not in the best interests of our Nation to place diplomatic missions with our military.

Secretary Clinton, Secretary Gates, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all stressed the need to increase the capacity of the State Department and USAID. As such, the bill provides resources to hire 1,000 new State Department personnel and 300 new USAID personnel so our country can take the necessary steps to begin rebuilding and restoring our diplomatic capabilities that we shortchanged and underappreciated for far too long.

Finally, the bill also improves and continues the Democrats' commitment to oversight and accountability. It provides nearly $150 million for activities of the Inspector General of the Department of State and USAID, as well as for the Special Inspectors General for both Iraq and Afghanistan reconstruction. In addition, this bill reverses years of accounting gimmickry through supplemental appropriations. Instead, it provides upfront, honest and transparent accounting of the true costs of meeting our critical foreign policy and national security initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. In these tough economic times, it is also a fair bill. And, most importantly, this is a bipartisan bill that goes a long way towards restoring the strength and capabilities of the United States both here and abroad.

I commend the chairwoman, Mrs. LOWEY, for her admirable efforts in ensuring our needs are met, both here and abroad, and to ensure that the national security and foreign policy commitments of the United States remain strong for many days to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for the time.

I would like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER for their efforts on this important legislation. This bill provides almost $50 billion in funding for a number of U.S. government programs and activities, including the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, foreign economic and military assistance, contributions to international organizations, and international broadcasting programs.

In today's world, foreign assistance is as important to our national interest as it is ethical. I am pleased that the legislation recognizes our shared democratic values and our special friendship with Israel, and includes $2.2 billion in Foreign Military Financing programs, FMF assistance, for that great friend and ally.

Our aid to Israel is especially important as the ruthless tyranny in Iran threatens to wipe it off the face of the map and rockets continue to rain down on Israel from terrorist groups, whether they be Hamas or Hezbollah. Israel is a true friend and partner of the United States, and we must now, more than ever, show unwavering support for our friends, not only through this legislation, but through every other available means.

I am deeply concerned about the funding provided in this legislation to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Without determining that the agency does not have members of Hamas on its payroll, U.N. agencies such as that, for example, such as the so-called Human Rights Council, a club of tyrannies, do not deserve American taxpayer support, just like the useless embarrassment that is the Organization of American States.

Now, there are some good things, very good things in this legislation.

The legislation provides $165 million in Economic Support Funds, for example, for Haiti, to help the authorities consolidate democratic gains and promote development.

Since the recent devastating storms hit Haiti, I have called, first on the Bush administration and then on the Obama administration, to grant temporary protected status to Haitian nationals in the United States.

I visited Haiti last month, and my visit reinforced my belief that TPS for Haiti is well overdue. Again, I call on the Obama administration to finally grant TPS for Haitians. The Obama administration needs to stop dragging its feet on this important issue.

I wish to thank the Appropriations Committee for the $20 million in Economic Support Funds for pro-democracy activities in Cuba in this bill. Those funds will support efforts for a transition to democracy and freedom in the only totalitarian dictatorship in

the Western Hemisphere, through support for dissidents, human rights activists, independent librarians and others who risk their lives each day struggling for freedom in that enslaved island, the only country in the Western Hemisphere where free elections have been denied to its people for over 50 years.

The legislation includes $1.4 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, MCC. Assistance to foreign nations from the MCC is linked to greater responsibilities from those nations. The new responsibilities those developing nations accept in exchange for the funds ensure that the assistance we provide does not go to waste and has the greatest possible impact on those who need the help the most.

I have been a longtime supporter of the MCC. But last year I learned that one recipient country may not be keeping up their end of the bargain. APR Energy, a Florida company, has an ongoing contract dispute with Tanzania, which I understand Tanzania has failed to resolve. I urge the Tanzanian government to comply with both the contract with APR Energy and their MCC compact and expeditiously resolve the dispute with APR Energy pursuant to the law and the utmost transparency.

I have concerns with the increased funding levels in two areas of the bill, the United Nations Population Fund and international family planning. In the past, this United Nations fund has been found to support and participate in programs of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. While the international family planning money doesn't go directly to fund abortions, it will go to organizations that promote and provide advocacy for abortion.

I do not think this is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. Even though the majority on the Rules Committee last night rejected the Smith-Stupak amendment on this issue, I continue to hope that the issue will be addressed in conference.

I commend the committee, the Appropriations Committee, for recognizing many other important foreign policy priorities in the bill, $21 million for the American Institute in Taiwan, for example, and over $740 million for broadcasting through such important media outlets as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and for Radio and TV Marti. I also commend the committee for maintaining the Greek language broadcasts in the Voice of America and also for wisely providing assistance to promote as much as possible the reconciliation to end the violence in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the underlying legislation, I must oppose the rule by which the majority is bringing this bill to the floor. Last month, the majority set a dangerous precedent to limit debate on appropriations bills, debate that historically was almost always considered under open rules, open debate process. Today we are set to consider the sixth of 12 appropriations bills, and every bill considered so far has been considered under a structured rule that severely limits the ability of all Members of this House to introduce amendments and have them debated.

During yesterday's Rules Committee hearing, Appropriations Ranking Member LEWIS testified that there is still time to undo the majority's new precedent restricting the ability of Members to offer amendments on appropriations bills. He asked the majority to reconsider the use of structured rules on appropriations bills, to return to regular order, to historical order, to the tradition of an open debate process on appropriations bills. He even offered his services to persuade Members to not offer dilatory amendments which would hamper the ability of Congress to complete its appropriations work on time.

Rules Ranking Member DREIER and I also offered to help Ranking Member LEWIS rein in any errant Members, any Members who wished to prolong unnecessarily the appropriations process. I really hoped the majority on the Rules Committee would heed Mr. LEWIS' thoughtful suggestion and accept his offer to help move the process along if an open debate process was returned to. However, the majority once again blocked Members from both sides of the aisle from offering amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has simply not understood the damage, unnecessarily, that it is causing this House by closing debate on appropriations bills, by breaking two centuries of precedence. How myopic. How sad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the chairwoman of the committee, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and in support of H.R. 3081. This is a very good bill. It was drafted in a bipartisan manner, and it should enjoy the support of Members of both sides of the aisle.

I know that my colleagues on the other side would have preferred an open rule. However, there is much business that needs to be completed in the month of July, and I believe this rule will allow us to complete our work in an expeditious manner.

The rule makes in order a number of amendments from the minority, including one from the ranking member of my subcommittee and one from the ranking member of the full committee. I hope that Members on both sides will recognize the importance of this bill in protecting our national security and advancing our foreign policy.

There were necessary compromises on both sides that allowed this bill to come forward today, and I want to thank all the members of my subcommittee, Republicans and Democrats, for their contributions. Most especially, in closing, I want to thank my ranking member, KAY GRANGER. Unfortunately, she called me this morning, that because of health issues, she could not be with us. She was going to try to get here in time to cast the vote.

I personally want to make it clear to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, because of the bipartisan approach, this is a good bill. It's a strong bill, and we are proud to present it to you.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join him in opposition to this rule. I think all of these deadlines that suddenly we have realized are there are not reasons to go away from the traditions of the House.

Like the gentleman, I applaud many of the efforts in the bill itself, certainly aid for our friend, Israel, the democracy, the pillar of democracy in the Middle East, and hopefully other countries in that area will rally around that example. Aid for Israel is important in this bill.

On the other hand, an amendment that I had that had 74 cosponsors as a bill in the last Congress that would limit funds transferred to any entity of the Palestinian Authority until the President certifies to the appropriate committees that the ruling Fatah Party has taken the clauses out of their constitution that called for the destruction of Israel would have added to this bill and would have added to this debate. It should have been allowed. I am disappointed it wasn't.

I am also concerned that we didn't allow the amendment that I offered on the Law of the Sea Treaty, that simply would have prevented funds in the bill from being used for a contribution to the Seabed Authority. That's an authority, a global entity, that would be responsible for collecting taxes on U.S. energy companies for deep seabed mining if the United States ratifies the Law of the Sea Treaty. Those are only two examples of many of the amendments that were offered that were rejected and that we should have found time to debate those and add them to the bill.

I oppose the rule.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of the rule for the Fiscal Year 2010 State Department and Foreign Operations appropriations bill, H.R. 3081. I sincerely want to thank the chairwoman, NITA LOWEY, and her staff for their diligent work on this appropriations bill and for their efforts and their help in securing an additional $10 million for maternal health in the manager's amendment.

I sincerely thank the gentlelady for her support and for her work and for addressing one of the most serious issues facing women on this planet. The need to act to address the global maternal mortality rate and to save

mothers' lives is very clear, and the time to act is now.

The recent words of the First Lady of Sierra Leone are haunting, but all too true for too many women in the world and their families and their communities. She stated, ''We know too well that a pregnant woman in Kigali or Freetown has one foot in the grave,'' which is why many ''say goodbye to our mothers and sisters as they go into labor.''

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, pregnancy is a time when we should be welcoming life into the world, not saying goodbye. For every woman's death we fail to prevent by boosting investments in critical maternal health programs, we fail newborns who now face an increased risk of dying themselves. We fail the family, including children pulled from schools to support their families and pick up the duties of the now deceased mother, and we fail those communities by undermining economic development and poverty reduction efforts in the wider community.

This investment into maternal health will save lives. We can and must continue to do what we can to reduce the needless suffering of millions of women around the world from childbirth and pregnancy-related complications. Too much is at stake if we fail to deliver for these woman.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last night, Mr. STUPAK and I respectfully requested that an amendment reinstating the Mexico City Policy be made in order so that the full House would have the opportunity to vote up or down on this critically important issue.

This year's Foreign Ops Appropriations bill increases population control funding by a whopping 40 percent over the 2008 levels to a record $648 million. Our amendment would simply ensure that this huge allocation of taxpayer grant money not be awarded to foreign nongovernmental organizations that perform abortions on demand or lobby for abortion on demand in developing countries.

Today, most African and Latin countries protect the lives of their unborn children, and the real threat to those laws and policies are coming from the United States and European nongovernmental organizations and the money behind them.

Indeed, prior to January, Mr. Speaker, the pro-life Mexico City Policy guaranteed that unborn children in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere not be put at risk of death by the NGOs that we fund.

Every human life is precious, Mr. Speaker, and sacred and worthy of respect. No one, no one is expendable. Thus, family planning funds and the NGOs that they empower cannot be allowed to be the Trojan Horse for a global abortion industry.

On an encouraging note, Americans agree with our efforts to reinstate the Mexico City Policy. The Gallup Poll recently found by a margin of 2–1, 65 percent to 35 percent, Americans oppose President Obama's Executive order reversing the Mexico City Policy. They support his other Executive orders, but not that one.

Another Gallup Poll found that, for the first time, 51 percent to 42 percent, Americans are identifying as pro-life. Ultrasound technology—the window to the womb—is finally shattering the myth that an unborn child is somehow not a person.

Mr. Speaker, stripped of its many euphemisms, abortion is violence against children and often harms women emotionally and psychologically and physically. Abortion methods either dismember the fragile body of a baby to death or poisons the infant or chemically induces premature labor, leaving the immature child unable to cope with his or her new environment.

You know, in Congress we often speak and enact laws and policies designed to reduce infant mortality, and that's a wonderful and necessary goal. Can we not see or appreciate or understand that abortion is infant mortality?

An unborn child's immaturity and dependence should in no way mitigate, negate, or nullify an unborn child's inherent humanity. Human rights ought to be about inclusion, not exclusion, especially of the weakest and the most vulnerable.

Finally, can we not see or appreciate or understand that birth is an event and not the beginning of a child's life? And the stunning breakthroughs over the last three decades in treating unborn children who are diagnosed with diseases or disabilities only brings into sharp focus that the child in the womb must be regarded as a patient in need of benign and compassionate interventions. Not poison shots or razor-sharp curettes that kill, but medicines and procedures that cure.

The Mexico City Policy holds children harmless in our family planning programs throughout the world. Tragically, the rule before us precludes so much as a vote on the Mexico City Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that the right to life is the most fundamental human right issue on Earth. Unfortunately, abortion and the promotion of abortion is the only violation of that basic human right that has the audacity to call itself a right.

I therefore will be voting ''no'' on the rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. CARDOZA. The gentleman is very sincere, and I appreciate his friendship and his words. I would just make one correction, and that is when he speaks of a 40 percent increase in this bill, what we are doing in this bill is increasing the transparency from a situation where all the dollars that we're spending here were in the past few years put into supplemental bills and pretended like they didn't really count. We're taking that supplemental spending and putting it in a transparent process that we can all appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I'm sure it was unwitting, but my friend from the other side of the isle misspoke. Just to make very clear, the population account, the money that was allocated in FY 2008, was approximately $460 million. It is now at $648 million. That is approximately a 40 percent increase. And then other moneys potentially could be going to these foreign nongovernmental organizations that promote abortion as well, like Planned Parenthood, Marie Stopes International, and others. So we have a very serious problem. They are American surrogates in foreign countries. They speak for us. They certainly don't speak and act for millions of pro-life Americans.

Yes, do family planning. Our amendment would leave that in tact. It would not touch the amount of money for family planning. We ought argue that abortion is not family planning and has no legitimate place in any compassionate program of health care. It is the killing of an unborn child.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for yielding.

You know, I think the American people would like to see us debate the issues that they're very concerned about on this floor, and there are many of these issues we're not going to be able to debate because of this closed rule.

I'd just like to cite a couple of amendments that I introduced that I think the American people, many of them, would really like to hear debated.

One of them was a sense of Congress bill or amendment that would expand the economic sanctions against Iran. Iran is a terrorist state developing nuclear weapons. A sense of Congress resolution saying we should put severe economic standards on them, sanctions on them, and get our allies to do it, is something that should have been debated and passed, because I think Americans are concerned about this terrorist state and they want us to stop their nuclear program and to put pressure on them.

Another amendment would have prohibited funds from being used to establish diplomatic or commercial ties in or with Iran until these changes are

made, until they stop their nuclear development program, which threatens the Middle East oil supplies, our energy supplies, and the whole world.

Finally, we had one that dealt with putting pressure on terrorist organizations until they recognize Israel's right to exist. I think all of us support Israel and we want to make sure Israel's right to exist is guaranteed. So why wouldn't we want to have an amendment on the floor which said that the organizations that are trying to destroy Israel should be put under extreme pressure to make sure that they recognize Israel's right to exist?

Finally, one of the things that really concerns me is the United Nations is going to spend almost $900,000 in legal fees for Benon Sevan. He is the man who ran the Oil-for-Food program, and it was a corrupt program. He was working with Saddam Hussein.

The man has fled the country. He has been charged with bribery and wire fraud, and the U.S. Federal and State prosecutors are looking for this guy, and they're using our taxpayer dollars to defend him, to help him with his legal fees.

What I said in this amendment is we should withhold the amount of money that would go for his legal fees from our commitment to the United Nations, and I think the American people would agree with that.

So I can't understand why the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee didn't make these in order. I hope in the future they will be a little more openminded about this, because the American people want these issues debated in the people's House.

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I want to just rise to thank Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER for their great work on this bill and focus particularly on this bill's commitment to global development issues.

I'm the chair of the Terrorism Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and have been working very, very closely with our military as we attempt to combat terrorism and violent extremist groups throughout the globe. Certainly, there is a big military component to that.

What we have increasingly learned in the military and elsewhere is that we will never win that battle and that fight if we are not equally committed to global development.

We have seen a major commitment in this bill on the central focus in our efforts right now, which is in Pakistan and Afghanistan. I applaud that effort. But also understand that this bill recognizes that it is broader than just Pakistan and Afghanistan. Throughout the Middle East, throughout Africa, throughout Southeast Asia, failed and failing states are a major contributor to instability and the rise of violent extremist groups. Getting our global development policy right is critical to stopping that effort. This bill makes that commitment.

I also want to say that this is not just a matter of more money. It is a matter of improving the quality of our global development, of coordinating it, of figuring out what works and making sure that our programs are more efficient and more effectively delivered.

On that point, I also support the committee and support the Foreign Relations Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee as well for putting pressure on the administration to make fundamental changes in the way we do global development, to make sure that it is better coordinated, more effective, and works better.

We have a lot of work to do on this front, but this appropriation bill reflects the priority of global development policy, funding it and supporting it, if we are ever to be triumphant in our efforts to stop violent extremist groups and reduce instability throughout the globe.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK).

Mr. MACK. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding time.

I rise today to speak against the rule for this bill, a rule that shuts out our ability to offer amendments on the floor is an unprecedented abuse of the rules and debate on appropriation bills.

Why is the majority so afraid to hear what we have to say? Why is the majority so afraid of what we might have to offer? Isn't this the place to have debate, real debate, on the important issues that are facing the United States and the citizens of the United States? If you can't have the debate here on the floor of the House, where can you have it?

This is where we should be debating the issues, and changing the rules and the process does the people of this country a disservice.

If I were able to offer an amendment to the Foreign Ops bill, I would offer an amendment that would make sure that aid to Honduras is not cut off. Mr. Speaker, the administration has cut funding to the people of Honduras because some have claimed that a military coup has occurred in Honduras. Instead of being responsible on the matter, the administration has gotten itself involved with the likes of Chavez, Morales, Ortega, and too quickly reacted in a knee-jerk fashion.

To cut the aid, be it humanitarian, military, or what have you, is the wrong thing to do, and if I were able to offer an amendment, I would have fought hard to make sure that aid to Honduras was not cut.

This process makes a mockery of our democratic system, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this rule and support an open process, but also support the people of Honduras.

□ 1330

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. I rise to express my support for the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations.

For the first time in a long time, we have a President with a balanced foreign policy focused on smart power that balances might and right.

Having worked in Afghanistan, I know firsthand the importance of diplomacy and the rule of law. Our success internationally depends on both the full funding and support of our military and of our diplomatic corps. Every crisis averted through good diplomacy, multinational cooperation and economic development reduces the burden on our military and our military families.

This bill also includes support language for the City of Hope project. This project is managed by the nonprofit Teamwork Ministries International based in my district in Martinsville, Virginia. Their work to help educate, nourish and train future leaders of Africa is a worthy investment to bring hope to communities and to nations around the globe. This project is a great example of dedicated yet humble Americans putting their values into action, being the face of the greatest of all nations to those who are suffering the most. I thank the team at the City of Hope project, and I thank the chairman for this great step forward for our country's security and its greatest values.

This project is making a difference in the lives of children who have been orphaned as a result of the HIV/AIDS crisis affecting Tanzania and other countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Duke University, the University of Virginia, Campbell University, Howard University, St. Mary's University of Tanzania, and Teamwork Ministries International are working together to advance the City of Hope project.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic has left millions of African children alone, homeless, and without hope. UNICEF estimates there are over 12 million orphaned children in sub-Saharan Africa, and over 1.5 million in Tanzania alone. In some communities, the majority of adults have either died or are infected with HIV/AIDS, and their children carry the burden of raising the family. These children are at a high risk of being misused and exploited at the work place as they try to earn a living to support their siblings. Many of these children wander into towns, live on the streets, and resort to stealing in order to survive. Others are kidnapped and sold as slaves.

The City of Hope is a revolutionary concept, of building facilities and initiating assistance programs not only to provide living quarters, health care, clean drinking water, food and education for children, but also to help educate and train future leaders of Africa. It is an innovative way of bringing transformation to those in despair, and bringing hope to communities and to nations.

Through construction of campuses for orphans in Tanzania providing clean drinking water, residential facilities, schools, and health care facilities, the City of Hope project will provide safe havens for children in the region. A

principal objective is to provide training in leadership skills and in microenterprise, especially agribusiness and sustainable farming, and environmentally beneficial land-use practices. This approach is intended to provide economic opportunities for future leaders in an area in which 80 percent of the economy is agricultural.

Teamwork Ministries is benefiting from the commitment of skilled professionals in such areas as medicine, nursing, nutrition and health, sustainable agricultural practices, and design of "green buildings" to conserve energy. The government of Tanzania is assigning doctors and medical staff to the City of Hope project, and Duke University School of Nursing, the University of Virginia, Campbell University, Howard University, and St. Mary's University of Tanzania are all offering their expertise.

In 2009, the first City of Hope campus in the northern Tanzanian community of Ntagatcha will be home to 300 orphaned children and will provide employment and health care to benefit adults in the local community. Teamwork Ministries' objective is to replicate the City of Hope model elsewhere, to serve communities in which the need is greatest. With adequate funding and support in the years ahead, Teamwork Ministries' goal is to establish up to 100 Cities of Hope throughout Tanzania and other sub-Saharan African countries.

I want to thank the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee Chair, Congresswoman LOWEY, and my colleague Congressman DAVID PRICE, a member of the Appropriations Committee, for their support of the City of Hope project. I believe this project, which has strong support in my Congressional District, will be a worthwhile expenditure of USAID funding.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend from Florida. I rise in opposition to the rule. I think at a time when so many controversial decisions are being made in foreign policy, we should have free and open debate. I continue my concerns about the lack of free and open debate.

At the same time, I am going to support the underlying bill, but not without deep concerns. I have concerns about the spending in the bill. I have concerns about the administration's policy in about every country except Canada, and I have some reservations even in their policy with Canada. But at the end of the day, and as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) said, for those of us who spent our entire lives working on the pro-life movement, to be forced into choices with this Mexico City policy combined with family planning is terrible.

But at the end of the day, I stand with Israel and the funding for Israel. We will have votes on other issues, but this is really our only vote of importance to supporting our friends in Israel.

Without this military funding to help provide superiority and technology in developing their military capability to keep their military superiority over neighbors who would wipe them from the face of the Earth the second they don't have that superiority, they very possibly might not survive. I have concerns about this administration's policy on Israel. It seems to me we are doing a lot of bullying of a government elected there. They elect different parties, they have different positions, and ultimately they have to make their decisions on what is best for them to survive. They are the best example of democracy in the region. They elect governments that make the different decisions, and we stand with them because we believe it is in our best interest and our obligation to stand with Israel, even if we may disagree with certain policies.

So I even have concerns about the administration's policies regarding Israel; but at the same time, fundamentally, this is our Israel vote. Because I recognize the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel, because I understand their forced diaspora and their persecution around the world, and I understand why Israel was recreated and reestablished in 1948. And I understand the anti-Semitism and rising anti-Semitism around the world, and I understand the anger and commitment to the destruction of their very nation. I think it is important with all of the other difficult issues that we show bipartisan support in this way to our friends in Israel who are in tough straits right now.

So it is reluctantly that I will vote for the bill, but I will vote for the bill and oppose the rule.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to my colleagues, Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER, for their tireless work over the years to make safe drinking water and basic sanitation more accessible to the world's poor.

In recent years, we have strengthened the United States commitment to this cause not only by increasing the amount of moneys for safe water and drinking water and sanitation, but also making sure that these moneys are appropriately spent in the proper countries, in line with the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

The continual increase in funding has allowed USAID to hire new technical staff with drinking water and sanitation expertise, to leverage host government involvement, to increase matching funds available to NGOs, and to conduct a range of tested and pilot approaches to increase water and sanitation coverage in individual host countries. It is essential that we continue on this upward trajectory, and I applaud Congresswoman LOWEY for making an additional $25 million available for this effort.

Water and sanitation have increasingly played a major role in how individuals interact with one another and how governments govern. Today, approximately 1 billion people lack access to safe drinking water, and an estimated 2.6 billion people live in environments where they do not have access to proper toilet facilities and human waste cannot be properly disposed of.

Chronic water scarcity has fueled instability and hinders economic and social development. In such places as Zimbabwe, Mexico and Gaza, the lack of access to safe drinking water has had detrimental ramifications for the people who live there. For example, over 1.6 million people die every year from easily preventable diseases, and 90 percent of the children are under 5.

I certainly commend Congresswoman LOWEY, and I would like to say that is why Congressman BLUMENAUER and I introduced the Paul Simon bill, and I urge its support.

The lack of access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation affects everything from how food is grown and prepared to the ability of girls and young women to attend school. Water and sanitation is an obvious issue of health but also one of dignity, physical safety and development.

In 2002, the world's leaders gathered together and pledged to halve the proportion, by 2015, of people who lack access to clean water and basic sanitation. The U.S. Congress took this pledge and passed the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005. We made the pledge to bring safe and affordable drinking water to the world's poor. Since its enactment in 2005, the U.S. has been able to bring inexpensive potable water to millions of people. While some parts of the world are on track to halve the percent of people who lack access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation, some regions like Africa are behind schedule. That is why Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER and I introduced the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2009. This bill is calling for the U.S. Government to elevate the pledge we made in 2002 to a diplomatic and policy priority. It would create offices within the Department of State and USAID and would increase the level of U.S. Government cooperation with local and NGO partners. Most importantly, it would bring first-time access to safe drinking water to an additional 100 million people.

As we, in Congress, debate the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Act which will rebuild our diplomatic and development activities, strengthen national security and combat terrorism and address global HIV/AIDS, let us not forget that safe drinking water and sanitation are key to the achievement of these other goals. I thank Chairwoman LOWEY for recognizing this crucial fact and increasing our commitment an additional $25 million to $335 million.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CARDOZA for the time.

I want to begin my comments by congratulating Chairwoman NITA LOWEY

for drafting the bill before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member GRANGER for working with the majority, and I also want to recognize both the majority and minority subcommittee staff for their professionalism and tireless work in producing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support of H.R. 3081, the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations bill. There are few things that we do on an annual basis that are more important and crucial to the success of U.S. foreign policy than passing this bill.

U.S. foreign policy can only be successful if we make crucial investments in the three D's: defense, diplomacy, and development. Ideally, all three, defense, diplomacy and development, should be considered equal legs of the same stool. However, this is currently not the case. This year we are going to spend somewhere north of $500 billion for defense. This bill, diplomacy and development, only totals $48 billion.

Despite the fact that the allocation for this bill is $3.2 billion below the President's request, and $1.2 billion below the comparable fiscal year 2009 level, this is a well-written and measured bill, taking into account the concerns of both the majority and the minority. However, I am worried about some of the amendments that have been made in order by the rule that would eviscerate some of the vital programs in this bill in the name of fiscal discipline.

I am worried, Mr. Speaker, because yesterday in the developing world nearly 15,000 to 20,000 people died of extreme poverty. Today in the developing world, 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty. Tomorrow in the developing world, 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty.

Extreme poverty, like malnutrition and disease, are claiming tens of thousands of lives every day, despite the fact that we know how to save many of these lives. The bill before us has the real potential to reverse these facts. Look at what has been done to date with our foreign aid: smallpox eradication began in the 1960s; control of river blindness in the 1970s; increased child immunizations in the 1980s; initiatives to fight Guinea worm, trachoma and leprosy in the 1990s; and the effort to end polio in this decade. Measurable results produced with the dollars in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out some of the highlights of this measure. This bill improves our diplomatic capabilities by funding 1,000 new foreign service professionals and improves our development capabilities by funding 300 new USAID personnel.

This bill provides funds for both our multilateral and bilateral peacekeeping operations. The bill provides increases for global health programs that fight the scourge of HIV, TB and malaria. The bill provides increases for development assistance programs. Some of these funds are educating children and providing clean drinking water and sanitation around the world.

The bill provides $224 million for Liberia, a shining example of a post-conflict country that is now on the road to recovery instead of becoming a potential failed state and a potential haven for terrorists.

Now, I understand that some of the Members plan to offer amendments to cut key increases in programs in this bill; but this is penny wise and pound foolish. Again, for our foreign policy to be successful, we can't just use sticks; we also have to use carrots. We need to invest in diplomacy and development the same way we do defense.

I am sure some will defend their amendments by saying in tough economic times we don't need to spend one dime overseas. These arguments also are shortsighted. The money we spend on development and humanitarian programs overseas is an investment in more stability, more security, and more sustainability. It is an investment in our long-term national security interests. It is an investment in a safer, freer, and more democratic world.

Not only is there a strong rational reason to support this bill and oppose all of the amendments to cut these vital programs; there is a moral one as well. When we were debating the fiscal year 2008 Foreign Operations bill, Chairman FRANK WOLF, former ranking member, said it best when he said, ''I believe this bill has the potential to do a lot of good, and I want to say that this bill will help save a lot of lives not only here but around the world. This is the work of the Lord,'' FRANK WOLF said. ''This bill,'' he said, ''is really to feed the poor, the hungry, the naked, the sick. Almost a better title of this bill,'' FRANK WOLF said, ''would be the Matthew 25 bill.''

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and to look closely at some of these amendments because some of these amendments would cut the Lord's work by 5 percent across the board. Others would cut the Lord's work by $1.2 billion. And other amendments, Mr. Speaker, eviscerate programs that are designed to help the poorest amongst the poor. Support this bill; support this rule; and support this measure.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate again my gratitude both to Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER of this appropriations subcommittee, and all of the members of the subcommittee. They have done great work.

When Chairwoman LOWEY appeared yesterday in the Rules Committee, it was really remarkable how on a bipartisan basis she received the commendation and admiration of all of us, and, quite frankly, I think in representation of the entire House. So I thank her.

And she has a wonderful ranking member, KAY GRANGER, who also works extremely diligently in a way that has made the House also admire her deeply.

I think we have had a good debate on the underlying legislation. I think it is most unfortunate that the tradition of two centuries of open debate on appropriations bills has been broken by the majority. And so, Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question on this rule so that we can amend the rule and allow an open rule.

The rule that the majority has brought forth today will only cement the dangerous and unnecessary precedent that it has already set. So let's have an open rule. Let's revert to tradition. Let's return to an open process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I urge all of my colleagues, and I am sure many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with us, that this unnecessary lessening of the House, this diminishing of each of the Members' rights is most unfortunate. And so we should return, as Ranking Member LEWIS said before the Rules Committee last evening, let's return. There is still time, let's return to the tradition of two centuries and have an open rule.

□ 1345

And we pledge, as Ranking Member LEWIS did last night before the Rules Committee, full cooperation, consistent with that tradition, after debate has begun on these appropriations bills that still remain to be considered, to work out unanimous consent agreements to limit time and allow the process to be finished in a timely way. So let's return to that tradition of two centuries and preserve the rights of each of the Members of this House.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question in order to return to those two centuries of tradition, to return to open rules on appropriations bills.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida for his words.

I concede that it is quite unfortunate that we stand here today, where we stand today, with regard to what has transpired over the past few weeks. It is not the way we want things to operate in the people's house, it's not the way my friends on the other side want to operate either.

A trust and agreement have been breached. Republicans have chosen not to be able to come to an agreement from our very first appropriation bill. There was a marker laid down with dilatory tactics which could have prevented us from tending to the people's business. While Democrats have continued choosing to try and legislate

and move forward and do what the voters and those who elected us to do, we have seen that there has been continuing obstructionist tactics.

The State-Foreign Ops appropriations bill gets to the heart of our national security interests, and it is one of the most important appropriations bills we consider each year. This bill has no place for obstructionism and partisan politics. That has to stop at the water's edge. We simply cannot risk the people's business coming to a screeching halt on such a critical national security measure.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of this institution, we must put aside our political differences and find the common ground. But until that time, we must also do what's necessary to continue doing the people's business and ensure that nothing stands in the way of providing for the safety and security of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the State-Foreign Ops Appropriations bill funds the United States' diplomatic and development priorities. It is a cornerstone of our national security. It is critical that we send a strong, united message to the world about the United States' foreign policy commitments, about our priorities, about supporting this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule and on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 617 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike the resolved clause and all that follows and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill hack to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall he considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution—The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on January 20, 2009, Barack Obama was inaugurated as President of the United States, and the outstanding public debt of the United States stood at $10.627 trillion;

Whereas on January 20, 2009, in the President's Inaugural Address, he stated, ''[T]hose of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account, to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.'';

Whereas on February 17, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009;

Whereas the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 included $575 billion of new spending and $212 billion of revenue reductions for a total deficit impact of $787 billion;

Whereas the borrowing necessary to finance the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 will cost an additional $300 billion;

Whereas on February 26, 2009, the President unveiled his budget blueprint for FY 2010;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes the eleven highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the President's budget for FY 2010 proposes to increase the national debt to $23.1 trillion by FY 2019, more than doubling it from current levels;

Whereas on March 11, 2009, the President signed into public law H.R. 1105, the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 constitutes nine of the twelve appropriations bills for FY 2009 which had not been enacted before the start of the fiscal year;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends $19.1 billion more than the request of President Bush;

Whereas the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 spends $19.0 billion more than simply extending the continuing resolution for FY 2009;

Whereas on April 1, 2009, the House considered H. Con. Res. 85, Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes the six highest annual deficits in U.S. history;

Whereas the Congressional Democrats' budget proposal for FY 2010, H. Con. Res. 85, proposes to increase the national debt to

$17.1 trillion over five years, $5.3 trillion more than compared to the level on January 20, 2009;

Whereas Congressional Republicans produced an alternative budget proposal for FY 2010 which spends $4.8 trillion less than the Congressional Democrats' budget over 10 years;

Whereas the Republican Study Committee produced an alternative budget proposal for FY 2010 which improves the budget outlook in every single year, balances the budget by FY 2019, and cuts the national debt by more than $6 trillion compared to the President"s budget;

Whereas on April 20, 2009, attempting to respond to public criticism, the President convened the first cabinet meeting of his Administration and challenged his cabinet to cut a collective $100 million in the next 90 days;

Whereas the challenge to cut a collective $100 million represents just 1/40,000 of the Federal budget;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, funds to banks stood at $197.6 billion;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding TARP funds to AIG stood at $69.8 billion;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, total outstanding TARP funds to domestic automotive manufacturers and their finance units stood at $80 billion;

Whereas on June 19, 2009, the outstanding public debt of the United States was $11.409 trillion;

Whereas on June 19, 2009, each citizen's share of the outstanding public debt of the United States came to $37,236.88;

Whereas according to a New York Times/CBS News survey, three-fifths of Americans (60 percent) do not think the President has developed a clear plan for dealing with the current budget deficit (New York Times/CBS News, Conducted June 12–16, 2009, Survey of 895 Adults Nationwide);

Whereas the best means to develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending is a real commitment to fiscal restraint and an open and transparent appropriations process in the House of Representatives;

Whereas before assuming control of the House of Representatives in January 2007, Congressional Democrats were committed to an open and transparent appropriations process;

Whereas according to a document by Congressional Democrats entitled ''Democratic Declaration: Honest Leadership and Open Government,'' page 2 states, ''Our goal is to restore accountability, honesty and openness at all levels of government.'';

Whereas according to a document by Congressional Democrats entitled ''A New Direction for America,'' page 29 states, ''Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full, and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the Minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.'';

Whereas on November 21, 2006, The San Francisco Chronicle reported, ''Speaker Pelosi pledged to restore 'minority rights'—including the right of Republicans to offer amendments to bills on the floor . . . The principle of civility and respect for minority participation in this House is something that we promised the American people, she said. 'It's the right thing to do.' '' (''Pelosi's All Smiles through a Rough House Transition,'' The San Francisco Chronicle, November 21, 2006);

Whereas on December 6, 2006, Speaker Nancy Pelosi stated, ''[We] promised the American people that we would have the most honest and open government and we will.'';

Whereas on December 17, 2006, The Washington Post reported, ''After a decade of bitter partisanship that has all but crippled efforts to deal with major national problems, Pelosi is determined to try to return the House to what it was in an earlier era—'where you debated ideas and listened to each others arguments.' '' (''Pelosi's House Diplomacy,'' The Washington Post, December 17, 2006);

Whereas on December 5, 2006, Majority Leader Steny Hoyer stated, ''We intend to have a Rules Committee . . . that gives opposition voices and alternative proposals the ability to be heard and considered on the floor of the House.'' (''Hoyer Says Dems' Plans Unruffled by Approps Logjam,'' CongressDaily PM, December 5, 2006);

Whereas during debate on June 14, 2005, in the Congressional Record on page H4410, Chairwoman Louise M. Slaughter of the House Rules Committee stated, ''If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills, which are already restricted. An open process should be the norm and not the exception.'';

Whereas since January 2007, there has been a failure to commit to an open and transparent process in the House of Representatives;

Whereas more bills were considered under closed rules, 64 total, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 49, under Republican control;

Whereas fewer bills were considered under open rules, 10 total, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 22, under Republican control;

Whereas fewer amendments were allowed per bill, 7.68, in the 110th Congress under Democratic control, than in the previous Congress, 9.22, under Republican control;

Whereas the failure to commit to an open and transparent process in order to develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending reached its pinnacle in the House's handling of H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 contains $64.4 billion in discretionary spending, 11.6 percent more than enacted in FY 2009;

Whereas on June 11, 2009, the House Rules Committee issued an announcement stating that amendments for H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 must be preprinted in the Congressional Record by the close of business on June 15, 2009;

Whereas both Republicans and Democrats filed 127 amendments in the Congressional Record for consideration on the House floor;

Whereas on June 15, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 544, a rule with a pre-printing requirement and unlimited pro forma amendments for purposes of debate;

Whereas on June 16, 2009, the House proceeded with one hour of general debate, or one minute to vet each $1.07 billion in H.R. 2847, in the Committee of the Whole;

Whereas after one hour of general debate the House proceeded with amendment debate;

Whereas after just 22 minutes of amendment debate, or one minute to vet each $3.02 billion in H.R. 2847, a motion that the Committee rise was offered by Congressional Democrats;

Whereas the House agreed on a motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 179 Ayes to 124 Noes, with all votes in the affirmative being cast by Democrats;

Whereas afterwards, the House Rules Committee convened a special, untelevised meeting to dispense with further proceedings on H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas on June 17, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 552, a new and restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas every House Republican and 27 House Democrats voted against agreeing on H. Res. 552;

Whereas H. Res. 552 made in order just 23 amendments, with a possibility for 10 more amendments, out of the 127 amendments originally filed;

Whereas H. Res. 552 severely curtailed pro forma amendments for the purposes of debate;

Whereas the actions of Congressional Democrats to curtail debate and the number of amendments offered to H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 effectively ended the process to deal with runaway Federal spending in a positive and responsible manner;

Whereas Congressional Democrats continue to curtail debate and the number of amendments offered to appropriations bills;

Whereas on June 18, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 559, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2918, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 559 made in order just one amendment out of the 20 amendments originally filed;

Whereas on June 23, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 573, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2892, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 573 made in order just 9 amendments, with a possibility for 5 more amendments, out of the 91 amendments originally filed;

Whereas on June 24, 2009, the House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 578, a restrictive structured rule for H.R. 2996, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010;

Whereas H. Res. 578 made in order just 8 amendments, with a possibility for 5 more amendments, out of the 105 amendments originally filed; and

Whereas the actions taken have resulted in indignity being visited upon the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives recommit itself to fiscal restraint and develop a clear plan for dealing with runaway Federal spending;

(2) the House of Representatives return to its best traditions of an open and transparent appropriations process without a preprinting requirement; and

(3) the House Rules Committee shall report out open rules for all general appropriations bills throughout the remainder of the 111th Congress.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to present argument on why the resolution is privileged for immediate consideration?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, rule IX regarding questions of the

privilege of the House states that questions of privilege shall be first those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings. The integrity of its proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, the unprecedented actions that have been taken by the Democrats in charge have disenfranchised every single Member of this House. Appropriations bills have been, by tradition and previously by rule, brought to the floor under what's called an ''open rule,'' which means that every single Member of the House has an opportunity to affect the bill, to represent his or her constituents.

Each of us represents basically the same number of folks, 650,000, 675,000. When Members are not allowed to bring amendments to the floor on the spending of their constituents' tax money, that disenfranchises those Members. That is an affront to the House. It presents an indignity to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the closed rule that was passed recently, yesterday, resulted in more closed rules on appropriations bills in this House of Representatives by this leadership, by these Democrats in charge, more than any in the history, not of this decade, not of this century, but in the history of this Republic. Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Republic.

Now, I know my friend from California says that this is not the way we want things to operate, but, Mr. Speaker, they control the process. They control the process. They control this tyranny. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed tyranny. It's tyranny by the majority. It's what de Tocqueville warned about over 150 years ago when he said that the majority can indeed shut down the rights of the minority. And that's exactly what is happening, which is why this resolution ought to be a privileged resolution, because what it directs the Rules Committee to do is to return to regular order; return to a process that allows each and every one of us to represent our constituents; return to a process that Mr. OBEY, then in the minority on the Appropriations Committee, said, ''We have gotten so far from the regular order that I fear that if this continues, the House will not have the capacity to return to the precedents and procedures of the House that have given true meaning to the term 'representative democracy.' The reason we have stuck to regular order as long as we have in this Institution is to protect the rights of every Member to participate. And when we lose those rights, we lose the right to be called the greatest deliberative body in the world.''

Mr. Speaker, the tyranny of this majority, the tyranny of the folks in charge right now, have resulted in an affront on this House. Those actions, these actions have clearly violated the integrity of our proceedings. Therefore, I believe that this resolution qualifies as a privileged resolution of this House.

I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

In evaluating the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia under the standards of rule IX, the Chair must be mindful of a fundamental principle illuminated by annotations of precedent in section 706 of the House Rules and Manual. That basic principle is that a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to prescribe a special order of business for the House.

The Chair finds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia, by directing the Committee on Rules to report a certain kind of resolution, proposes a special order of business. Under a long and well-settled line of precedent presently culminating in the ruling of June 25, 2009, such a resolution cannot qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

The Chair therefore holds that the resolution is not privileged under rule IX for consideration ahead of other business. Instead, the resolution may be submitted through the hopper in the regular course.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the appeal of the ruling of the Chair be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on tabling the appeal of the ruling of the Chair will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

ordering the previous question on H. Res. 617;

adopting H. Res. 617, if ordered;

suspending the rules and adopting House Concurrent Resolution 127, if ordered; and

suspending the rules and adopting House Concurrent Resolution 131, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

AYES—240

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa

Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

DeLauro
Fudge
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Johnson (GA)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (NY)
Rangel
Schakowsky
Smith (NJ)
Taylor
Waxman
Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1432

Messrs. LUETKEMEYER and LEWIS of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. KUCINICH and BERMAN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3081, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 617 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 187, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellsworth
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—28

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Boehner
Cantor
Cardoza
Cleaver
Costa
DeLauro
Dicks
Ellison
Eshoo
Fudge
Granger
Hirono
Honda
Kagen
Kanjorski
Miller, George
Murphy (NY)
Napolitano
Pomeroy
Rangel
Rogers (MI)
Salazar
Shadegg
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on the vote.

□ 1438

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 512, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I was not present during the rollcall vote No. 512 on July 9, 2009. I would like the RECORD to reflect how I would have voted:

On rollcall vote No. 512 I would have voted "aye."

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, colleagues, the gentlewoman from Missouri and I would like to invite you to see how softball is really played when women come together in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to bring the parties together and to raise money for a good cause.

We encourage you all to come out this Tuesday, July 14, at 7:30 at Guy Mason Field for the first annual historic, bicameral and bipartisan congressional women's softball game.

We have been practicing now for a month and have the assistance of several of our colleagues who are veterans

of the congressional baseball team. A few of them were out there today. We were having a great time. The women have gotten to know each other and have been engaging in bonding.

It is my privilege to yield to my friend from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. We really do hope that you will come. You will be amazed at not how badly we play at all, but how good we have become, and at how, as DEBBIE says, we have really come together as a team. We all know how to play softball. We are going to be playing some of the women of the Democratic and Republican National Committees. We are at least twice their age.

We will be doing it, as DEBBIE said, next week on Tuesday at 7:30 at Guy Mason Field. It is at 3600 Calvert Street NW at Calvert and Wisconsin behind the Vice President's house. We really, really want all of you to come.

We also want to thank all of our teammates. We have about 15 of us. We are pleased that we have also three of the men helping coach us. I think we won't let you down, and we really want you to come. There will be food there and good things to drink and eat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, we encourage everyone to come out and engage in a little off-campus, bipartisan fun and cheer on the congressional women's softball team.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I want to announce to the House that because of the importance of this event, I want to assure all Members that we are going to make sure that the schedule accommodates the event.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 200, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—200

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Pomeroy
Tierney
Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1448

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 127.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 127.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
DeLauro
Fattah
Fudge
Granger
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murtha
Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1455

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ENGRAVEMENTS IN CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 131.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 131.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 410, noes 8, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

AYES—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—8

Conyers
Edwards (MD)
Hirono
Honda
McDermott
Paul
Scott (VA)
Stark

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Farr
Moran (VA)

NOT VOTING—12

Buyer
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Kaptur
Larson (CT)
Linder
McHenry
Murphy (NY)
Murtha
Sherman
Stupak

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1501

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3081.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 617 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3081.

□ 1503

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAPUANO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to present H.R. 3081, the fiscal year 2010 appropriations bill for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs. I am deeply appreciative to my ranking member, KAY GRANGER, for her key role in drafting this bill. This reflects our bipartisan priorities and is a better product as a result of our collaboration.

After all the hard work that Ms. GRANGER put into this bill, I am deeply saddened that she's unable to be on the House floor with us today to see the passage of our bipartisan product. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my friend, Ms. GRANGER, and I know all of us wish for her a speedy recovery. Her presence is missed today on the floor, but I know her thoughts are with us, and I look forward to continuing to work closely with her as we move forward with the bill.

The bill has also benefited from the input of our very informed and engaged subcommittee members. The bill totals $48.843 billion, $3.2 billion below the request and $1.2 billion below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, including supplemental appropriations.

The bill provides an upfront and transparent accounting of the resources needed to fund our foreign policy and national security interests to end the reliance on supplemental appropriations to fund anticipated needs.

Let there be no doubt, this bill, which funds the U.S.'s diplomatic and development priorities, is a cornerstone of U.S. national security. It includes $4.7 billion for assistance to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq to help stabilize, strengthen, and rebuild these critical countries.

In conjunction with funding in the 2009 supplemental, the bill fully funds the U.S. commitments to our allies and partners in the Middle East, including a total of $2.775 billion in FMF pursuant to the MOU between the United States and our ally Israel and our commitments to Egypt and Jordan.

The bill provides $987 million to continue support for counternarcotics and alternate development programs in Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean Basin, and Colombia and Peru.

The bill continues the congressional commitment to increasing the capacity of our civilian agencies to carry out diplomatic and development missions and provides resources to hire, train, support, and provide security for 1,000 new Department of State personnel and 300 new USAID personnel.

H.R. 3081 provides $7.6 billion for global activities, including $5.7 billion for global HIV/AIDS, which is $150 million above the President's request. Not less than $750 million will support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, and the bill includes $648 million for voluntary family planning services in the developing world, of which $60 million is for the United Nations Population Fund.

Addressing pandemics and other health concerns overseas before they reach our shores is one of the best investments the United States can make to protect American citizens while saving lives overseas. To this end, the bill provides $75 million to address pandemic preparedness and response, in addition to $50 million in the supplemental appropriations act of 2009.

Now, while I continue to be personally committed to permanently repealing the global gag rule, in the interest of bipartisan cooperation, the bill does not change any provisions of law that restrict funding for abortion or otherwise condition family planning assistance.

The bill increases funding for key long-term development priorities, including $1.2 billion to improve access to quality basic and higher education and provide alternatives to madrassas where youth are often exposed to extremism; $1 billion for food security and agricultural development to respond to the global food crisis; over $1.2 billion in bilateral and multilateral assistance for clean energy, biodiversity and climate change initiatives; and $310 million to expand access to safe water and sanitation.

It includes $2.4 billion in refugee and disaster assistance to meet growing humanitarian needs, including in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

The bill also provides $450 million for the Peace Corps to jump-start the President's pledge to increase the number of volunteers.

Finally, oversight is a bipartisan priority, and in order to improve accountability, the bill provides a total of $146.5 million for the activities of the Inspectors General of the Department of State and USAID, as well as for the

Special Inspectors General for Iraq and Afghanistan Reconstruction.

I want to take a moment to thank all of the staff that have worked so hard on this bill, especially Nisha Desai, our clerk, and her team: Craig Higgins, Steve Marchese, Michele Sumilas, Celia Alvarado, Courtney Dunn. I also want to thank Ann Vaughan, Jennie Munoz, and Elizabeth Stanley on my staff for their work.

And I would also like to thank our hardworking minority staff, including Ann Marie Chotvacs, the minority clerk, and Alice Hogans, Mike Ringler, Jason Small, and Rachel Carter for all their work.

Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan foreign assistance package before you preserves our Nation's interests. I urge my colleagues to give this bill our bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm pleased to join Chairwoman LOWEY at the beginning of the consideration of this bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs. This bill funds programs that safeguard our national security and promote U.S. interests abroad.

It was first founded under the auspices of the Marshall Plan under the understanding that good diplomacy and development can dramatically reduce national security problems and troop deployments for the United States.

I want to commend Chairwoman LOWEY for her bipartisan work on this bill. She's listened to concerns of Members on this side of the aisle and worked to address them.

I also want to thank the staff both on this and the other side of the aisle for so many long hours of work on this. That's Nisha Desai-Biswal, Craig Higgins, Steve Marchese, Michele Sumilas, Cecilia Alvarado, and Courtney Dunn. I also particularly want to thank Ann Marie Chotvacs, Mike Ringler, Alice Hogans, and Jason Small.

I know that Ms. LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER, who is out today, appreciate their personal office staffs' work on this bill, especially Ann Vaughan and Rachel Carter. And I particularly want to thank my staff, particularly Rich Goldberg.

Now, on this legislation, we make one big key change, and that is with regard to the International Atomic Energy Agency's new report on the Iran nuclear program and related responses of the United States to their report. They showed that after producing low-enriched uranium at a rate of 40 kilograms per month over a 21-month period, Iran has now increased its stockpile by 60 percent in just 6 months, doubling its rate to over 80 kilograms of enriched uranium per month.

We know that Iran's greatest weakness remains her economic dependence on foreign gasoline. And we can all agree that the United States taxpayers should not be asked to help increase the supply of gasoline to Iran, especially now, especially after what we saw after the Iranian elections. Surprisingly, this is exactly what our taxpayer dollars have been doing.

In 2007 and 2008, the U.S. Export-Import Bank approved two separate loan guarantees totaling $900 million to expand the largest refinery owned by Reliance Industries Limited, an Indian company that provides roughly one-third of Iran's daily import of gasoline. In effect, the U.S. taxpayer is underwriting the increased supplies of gasoline to Iran.

This bill includes the Kirk-Sherman amendment to prohibit further use of taxpayer dollars to guarantee or insure or extend credit to any company that supplies gasoline to Iran. I think that is a very important step that leads off to legislation that Chairman BERMAN and I have put forward that we hope, later in the year from the authorizing committee, that will begin to truly squeeze Iran and her need for foreign gasoline.

□ 1515

Now with regard to the overall bill, I am disappointed that we have departed from the tradition of considering appropriations under an open rule. I first worked on the Foreign Operations bill of fiscal year 1984. I was taught appropriations at the foot of Appropriations chairmen Jamie Whitten and Bill Natcher. It was under these historic chairmen that we always considered appropriations bills under an open rule, protected under clause 2 of rule XXI that only monetary amendments could be offered.

Now we have departed from the long tradition established by Jamie Whitten and Bill Natcher. The rule that governs this bill makes in order only eight of 89 amendments, a 90 percent death rate for amendments in the Rules Committee on what used to be an open rule.

I would suggest that the partisan pressures under Speaker Wright, under Speaker Foley, were as bad or worse as now, but we are responding with highly restrictive rules that I think hurt our committee in the long run. I hope that we can address this soon and return to what I would call the Whitten-Natcher tradition.

Now let me turn to the substance of this bill, the product of work of especially Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER.

The American people are aware that we face many global challenges that are well addressed in this bill. The funds provide security assistance to our allies in support countries living in some pretty dangerous neighborhoods.

There is another reality of this bill and that is the financial crisis that we see and that we are helping countries through so that they do not collapse, triggering some sort of new global economic downturn.

The allocation given to the subcommittee, $48.8 billion, is an amount, when strictly compared to last year's base, that is very high. But the administration has pledged to eliminate the wartime supplemental spending in favor of a regular appropriations process. If it sticks to that plan, then funding levels in this bill appear to be much more reasonable, and it includes programs for State and USAID operations that I support.

I have to admit, though, I remain in doubt whether the administration really will not request a supplemental next year. In fact, I probably would lay a dollar bet with anyone that we probably will see a supplemental. I hope not. Chairman MURTHA has already suggested that supplemental funds may be needed to sustain our troops because of the 302(b) allocation that his Defense Subcommittee received that in his view may not cover all of the FY 2010 needs. In that case, I hope we could restrict funding under this bill.

Now, I know Chairwoman LOWEY and Ms. GRANGER have worked together on a number of very good governance provisions such as language to strengthen oversight of hiring, training and deployment of new staff funded by this bill; and a provision that launches a comprehensive review of roughly $8 billion in global health funding provided by this bill. Too often we forget that the United States has made the largest commitment of health funding ever in the history of mankind. It is something that the United States hasn't yet received enough credit for.

They also agree to language that closely mirrors the fiscal year 2008 bill which prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from going to organizations that support or participate in involuntary or coercive methods of family planning, and that was the bipartisan commitment that Chairwoman LOWEY just alluded to.

The bill also includes amendments from several of my colleagues offered in full committee, particularly like a provision requiring the Secretary of State to report to Congress on deals brokered with foreign nations that receive detainees from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, like Palau.

The June 10, 2009, New York Times reported that the United States has agreed to provide Palau with $200 million in return for receiving 17 suspected Uyghur terrorists from Guantanamo Bay. Now, according to the CIA Factbook, Palau has a population of only 20,796 people. Its GDP is only $164 million. Under this commitment then, the U.S. would be paying the Republic of Palau nearly $11.7 million per Uyghur terrorist.

With average incomes in the United States of $56,000, $200 million would support incomes of over 3,500 Americans; with tuition at $25,000 a year annually, it could put 7,000 students through college for a year. And $200 million also compares poorly to the cost of Guantanamo Bay itself. Guantanamo Bay, as a total facility, cost just $54 million to build. This would be

four times that amount for just 17 Uyghurs.

There is also an amendment in this bill for new oversight and sunset restrictions on funding provided to the International Monetary Fund in the fiscal year 2009 supplemental, and language affirming intellectual property rights protections for U.S. energy and environmental technologies, critical in the G–8 discussions right now and the coming Copenhagen discussions in which China and India have pledged to require compulsory licensing over all climate change and energy technology. Compulsory licensing is a code word for stealing U.S. patents. There will be no green jobs if that provision goes through in the Copenhagen treaty. I am very happy that the House voted nearly unanimously on the Larson-Kirk amendment to prevent that.

Now, Chairwoman LOWEY has also described highlights of the bill. I will simply reiterate three very important items related to our national security. This bill includes $1.4 billion for the expanded work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, a $525 million increase to support prosperity and security of our partners around the developing world, a very important program that underlies the key point you cannot have long-term development without policy reform. You can build a dam, but if the government steals everything, all you will have is an empty structure a few years later. The MCC works to address that very problem in an effective way.

When taken together with supplemental funds, this bill fully funds our security assistance request for our strategic allies in the Middle East like Israel, Egypt, and Jordan, and continues the fight against illegal drug trafficking in this hemisphere. I think especially with Ranking Member GRANGER's full backing, we have full funding for the pending request for Mexico and Central America by providing $7 million above the request, also for continued gains made in Colombia.

In summary, this bill is focused on furthering foreign policy and national security interests. It monitors the wise use of our tax dollars and achieves some fairly balanced solutions to some complex problems leading to what I hope will be a fairly bipartisan debate today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put my statement into the RECORD in support of this very good bill, H.R. 3081, and to especially thank you for working to increase funding for two very important issues: support for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and also our bilateral tuberculosis program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3081, the FY10 Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

I would also like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY, Ranking Member GRANGER, and all the staff on the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee of which I am a member for their hard work and dedication in putting this bill together.

H.R. 3081 includes many valuable provisions and much-needed resources to extend the United States' arm of diplomacy in the interest of development, progress, and peace.

This bill will provide for the hiring of more than 1000 new foreign service officers and approximately 300 new employees at USAID.

Rebuilding the capacity of these two departments will transform our ability to put America's "smart" power to work, strengthen our national security, and have a dramatic and lasting impact on individuals and communities throughout the world.

I especially want to thank the Chairwoman for working with me to increase funding for two issues that I believe are critical—support for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, and for our bilateral tuberculosis programs.

This bill includes $7.8 billion for global health programs, including $5.75 billion for HIV/AIDS initiatives, which for years have been a strong bipartisan priority.

These programs continue to save millions of lives while helping us to stop the spread of this devastating global pandemic. I am hopeful in the future we can further increase resources for these programs in order to meet their unprecedented demand.

I am also pleased that this legislation provides $450 million to meet President Obama's campaign pledge to double the size of the Peace Corps over several years.

As countries throughout the world seek assistance to combat poverty, hunger, disease, and environmental degradation, this commitment to the Peace Corps' mission of peace and friendship through service is particularly timely.

Lastly, I am greatly encouraged by the steps taken in this bill, and other appropriations measures, to avoid future reliance on supplemental appropriations that in the past have undermined efforts to obtain an honest accounting of the costs of conflict and war which our efforts in diplomacy and development seek to avoid.

I urge my colleagues to support this effort and to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. I would like to yield for a unanimous consent to my distinguished colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership on this bill, and I rise in support of this bill, and particularly commend the chairwoman for her leadership on the United Nations Population Fund, which was denied funding for 7 years under the prior administration, and will save women's lives; and her focus on helping the women under the oppressive Taliban regime in Afghanistan with over $100 million focused on female NGOs and the security of our country and the help for our allies. A great bill. I appreciate your allowing me to include my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill and commend Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER for their hard work in crafting this important bill.

I am particularly pleased that it includes $60 million for the critical work done by UNPFA (the United Nations Population Fund).

Every minute of every day, a woman dies needlessly in pregnancy or childbirth, most in the developing world—this translates into 10 million women lost per generation.

4 million newborns also die every year of similarly preventable causes. UNFPA has worked to end these deaths since it became operational in 1969.

It has provided significant assistance to improve the health and quality of life and to promote the health and rights of women worldwide.

UNFPA is the largest source of international assistance for women's reproductive health in the world and despite the past 7 years during which the previous Administration withheld funding for UNFPA, the United States Congress has demonstrated its strong support of the organization by approving U.S. financial support for UNFPA each year.

Fully 42 percent of all pregnancies worldwide suffer complications and in 15 percent of all pregnancies, the complications are life-threatening.

In too many places, maternal health still receives inadequate attention and funding.

Fortunately for women around the world, UNFPA operates in 154 countries specifically to combat maternal mortality and to promote safe motherhood.

The impact of losing U.S. funding over the past 7 years has been devastating.

For each of these years, UNFPA could have helped to prevent 2 million unintended pregnancies, 800,000 abortions, 4,700 mothers' deaths, and more than 77,000 infant and child deaths.

In 2001, the U.S. Agency for International Development estimated the global economic impact of maternal and newborn mortality at $15 billion per year in lost potential production, half associated with women and half with newborns.

Investing in UNFPA actually reduces healthcare costs, and teaching and promoting safe motherhood enables adequate time between births for women's bodies to better carry another pregnancy.

Mr. Chairman, this funding will help to restore the United States' standing in the global community while demonstrating its commitment to the lifesaving work of UNFPA.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) who has been an outstanding member of the committee and has made it a great bill because of her important work.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the chairwoman and ranking member for both of their work in crafting a bill that everyone in this House can be proud to support.

This bill commits about 1 percent of the total Federal budget to confront all

of the global challenges we face: poverty, conflict, famine, drought, disease and global climate change. If we ignore these issues, they will threaten our way of life.

This year's bill makes bold, necessary investments in areas of global health, agriculture and climate change, and it puts America back onto the path of doubling the number of Peace Corps volunteers proudly serving our country.

I look forward to working with the chairwoman and President Obama to increase our investment in child survival and maternal health and to meet America's commitment to the Millennium development goals.

Today, we start building a safer, healthier world for America's children and all of the world's children.

Mr. KIRK. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment the chairwoman and our ranking member for the hard work that they have put into this good bill. I rise in strong support.

There are a lot of reasons why I think Members should vote for this bill, but let me just mention two. One is I think when you talk about foreign policy, it is really like a three-legged stool. Part of it is defense, part of it is diplomacy, and part of it is development. You can't have one without the other two. I think what this bill does, it brings into balance these three areas. When you have the appropriate diplomacy, when you have the appropriate folks to do the development, then you free up those in the defense to focus on their mission. So I think this bill brings that into balance and I think that is a good thing overall in terms of foreign policy, in terms of national security.

And in particular, I like the Millennium Challenge Corporation. As someone who has a business background, I have watched this corporation grow, and this is the fifth year we have had it in place. I think it is a great example of how we can provide foreign assistance in a smart way. No longer do we simply write a blank check to some country and never know where the money is going to go or what the results are. Now we enter into a compact, a contract, if you will, between the country receiving the money and our country. If they want to build a power plant or build a dam, whatever, in return, they agree to try to meet certain standards in terms of openness and democracy and transparency and accountability and human rights. So they have an incentive to follow through on this contract. It is smart aid, in my view. It is the right way to give assistance, and I think this fifth year of the Millennium Challenge Corporation is a very critical time because sometimes these contracts are entered into for a long period of time. It is adequately funded this year. For those reasons, I urge Members to support this good bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to an outstanding member of our committee who has made major contributions and has helped make this bill the good bill that it is, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished chairwoman.

I rise today in strong support of this bill. First, I would like to thank Chairwoman Lowey for her amazing leadership, and as well our ranking member, KAY GRANGER, who is not with us, and my fellow subcommittee members, including Congressman KIRK, who is taking the lead on the floor today for the great leadership efforts that they have shown in ensuring that this bill puts partisan differences behind, and that this bill makes sure that we promote our Nation's foreign policy and national security interests by funding economic development, health, and education around the world, and diplomacy.

This bill also includes in particular language that would improve transparency and accountability, Mr. Chairman, at the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the Near East, commonly called UNRWA. For almost 60 years, UNRWA has provided humanitarian services to Palestinians living in refugee camps throughout the Middle East.

Unfortunately, as UNRWA has grown over the years, it has not taken nearly enough steps to ensure that it does not employ, affiliate with, or provide benefits to known terrorists. The problem with UNRWA is fundamental. There is a remarkable lack of available information.

That is why I am so grateful to Chairwoman LOWEY and our ranking member and my colleagues for including in the bill requirements that the information available regarding textbooks being used to teach the next generation of Palestinians be provided, and more money being provided for that information, and to require the State Department to undertake a review of those educational materials and UNRWA schools to ensure that there are no calls for hatred or intolerance, including anti-Semitism, in these textbooks provided by UNRWA to the Palestinian refugees.

□ 1530

In addition, the legislation requires the State Department to report on whether UNRWA is complying with current U.S. law, which states appropriately that no American taxpayer dollars be directed to terrorists or to further terrorist propaganda.

I stand in strong support of this bill. I thank my distinguished chairwoman and my colleagues for this wonderful bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I just want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for his leadership on this.

UNRWA is an organization that is utterly irresponsibly run. Any corporation in America of UNRWA's size—which is $400 million a year—would have an outside independent audit, and yet UNRWA has never had that—and in fact doesn't want it. UNRWA's staff has met with Republicans and Democrats up here and admitted that they, indeed, do make martyr payments to people that have carried out attacks against the people of Israel. And then we've seen all the video of mortar rocket attacks being used from UNRWA schools where UNRWA security personnel clearly could have prevented that.

This bill helps increase the heat on UNRWA, one of the least accountable U.N. agencies. And I really want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to an outstanding member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished chairwoman, my extraordinary colleague from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to rise in support of this bill. This is one of the finest State-Foreign Operations bills we have had in many years.

I am especially indebted to the chairwoman for allowing me to include two provisions in this bill. One is language that I have been interested in for several years since visiting India on an energy congressional delegation, learning what India is doing with respect to renewable energy and learning that there were six women in the Sunderbonds, a remote Delta region, who were lighting their entire village with a solar panel.

If you ask the Department of Defense what we need in order to promote stability and security and affluence and prosperity, they will tell you we need a robust defense budget, something I agree with. But in the Sunderbonds, they are doing it with a solar panel which charges solar lanterns, which these six women rent to other villagers. And so you have all the elements that you need for stability and security; you have the empowerment of women, you have a sustainable small business model, and you have light.

As a result of the chairwoman's support and the support of the ranking member, we have included $10 million to establish the Solar Villages Initiative in the State Department to replicate this project.

I further want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their support of the National Solidarity Program in Afghanistan. The essential lesson that Afghanistan teaches us is that order cannot be imposed from above—Alexander the Great tried it, Genghis Khan tried it, the British tried it, the Soviets tried it. We can try it, but it does not succeed.

Afghanistan is stable when order comes from the Afghan people, when

they are empowered to achieve their own solutions. And as a result of the chairwoman's support and the support from the minority, we have included $175 million for the multidonor National Solidarity Program, which is the leading program rebuilding Afghanistan. That allows local villages to secure some funding to plan their own projects, to plan their own future, to bring women into governing councils, to establish those projects which will secure those villages and promote long-term security and stability.

These are two programs, among many, which make this a product that both sides of the aisle can be very proud of. It is the best investment that we can make. And I again thank the chairwoman for her support.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to thank the gentleman because I have worked very closely with him to support I think one of the key combat-support elements of this bill, which is the National Solidarity Program of the Government of Afghanistan.

We won the war in El Salvador largely through the help of a program called Mayors in Action, in which we funded programs totaling between $5,000 and then $10,000, as long as the community could come together and decide on what project. Having government services and activities in support of the El Salvadoran Government quickly undercut the insurgency and helped win a counterinsurgency campaign there.

Based on the success of that program and others, the National Solidarity Program is now operating in Afghanistan. This bill provides $175 million, largely through the leadership of the gentleman from New York.

When I deployed to Afghanistan in December, I spent quite a lot of time working with Monty Greer and Minister Zia, who described how this program is now in hundreds of villages throughout Afghanistan, but they had a funding shortfall. And working with General Nicholson of ISAF Region South, we put together a plan so that this bill would fund community development programs right behind the advance of U.S. troops.

It has been little noticed so far in this body that 2 weeks ago the United States Marine Corps launched an offensive in the key poppy-growing region of Afghanistan called Helmand Province, and it was that funding shortfall which would have not enabled U.S. troops to have the money to do community development projects right in the wake of their advance, along with the Afghan troops. This legislation allows them to have those tools right away so that the Afghan people will see progress in community development right behind the battlefield. It makes our chances of success much greater. It makes the sustainment and expansion of the Afghan Government much more likely. And bottom line, I think it will save a number of lives, especially for those of our constituents right now working for what sometimes has been called ''Uncle Sam's misguided children,'' otherwise known as the United States Marine Corps.

I yield to the gentleman who has worked with me so much with Minister Zia on this.

Mr. ISRAEL. Well, I thank the gentleman for his personal commitment and participation in this project.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for a colloquy.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

As the co-Chair of the House Task Force on Terrorist Financing and Nonproliferation, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, Chairwoman LOWEY.

I would like to confirm that the $57 million requested by President Obama for nonproliferation, antiterrorism, demining, and related programs in Afghanistan, will be fully funded.

Is it the chairwoman's intent that those critical security and humanitarian-related activities will be funded at the President's requested level?

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, first, I thank my friend for raising this important issue.

Yes, it is the committee's intent to fully fund Afghanistan's nonproliferation, antiterrorism, demining, and related programs at the President's requested level. We agree these programs are vital to our success in Afghanistan. And as we developed the bill, our funding assumption was, unless otherwise noted, that the President's full request for Afghanistan was met.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you.

Is it also the chairwoman's view that the State Department should ensure that these funds are used to support the range of programs, such as export control and border security, antiterrorism assistance, terrorist interdiction activities, counterterrorism financing, humanitarian demining, and destruction of small arms and other weapons?

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, yes, it is the committee's intent to support these activities.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you. I want to thank the chairwoman for her courtesy, and to the gentleman from Illinois for his bipartisanship on this and all of our critical efforts in Afghanistan.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, an outstanding member of the committee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentlewoman.

I rise in strong support of the 2010 State-Foreign Ops Appropriations bill and congratulate my Chair and friend, NITA LOWEY, for her leadership in crafting a bill that not only addresses critical national security needs, but does so in a cost-effective manner.

After too many years in which diplomacy and smart power were shunted aside, this legislation is a reassertion of American leadership in helping to assure a brighter, more peaceful future for America's children and for children around the world.

I am particularly concerned about Somalia's renewed descent into chaos and the prospect that al Qaeda, which is under increasing pressure along the Afghan/Pakistan frontier, will take advantage of the power vacuum in that country as it did in Afghanistan during the 1990s.

This must not be allowed to happen. And the U.S. must be willing to work with the United Nations, the African Union, and nongovernmental organizations to help stabilize Somalia and create an atmosphere in which governance and security are again possible.

This will be a long and difficult process, and in the main it must be driven by the Somalis themselves. But I was gratified that the bill includes aid above the President's request to foster economic growth, encourages the State Department to continue its support of Somali refugees in neighboring countries and, most importantly, provides $102 million to support both the African Union mission in Somalia and security sector reform within Somalia itself.

In this bill, even as we have provided funding for important initiatives like that, and we provided robust funding to increase the size of our Foreign Service and USAID professionals to revamp our aid to Pakistan and to help it to better confront the threat from al Qaeda, to provide crucial aid to key Middle Eastern allies Israel, Jordan and Egypt, to ramp up our efforts to fight the scourges of malaria, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis, and fully meet our obligations to the United Nations, Ms. Lowey, Ranking Member GRANGER, and the staff of the subcommittee have also been mindful of the state of our economy here at home. In fact, this bill is $1.2 billion, or 2.4 percent, below the President's spending, and $3.2 billion, or 6 percent, below the administration's request.

Finally, I am very pleased the bill includes $48 million in economic assistance to Armenia, as well as an increase in humanitarian assistance to Karabakh to $10 million, and maintains military assistance parity to both countries at $3 million, and the IMET assistance at $450,000 each.

Importantly, the report accompanying the bill references the policy of parity in military assistance provided to Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Mr. KIRK. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's also important to note that this bill carries forward the Kirk amendment that now prohibits any U.S. assistance to a Palestinian Authority that includes Hamas—a terrorist organization, as designated by the United States, President Clinton, President Bush and I believe now President

Obama—unless every member of the new Palestinian Government has publicly, in writing, recognized Israel's right to exist and renounced terrorism. Over 20 United States citizens have been murdered directly by Hamas, and having this provision included in this legislation I think is very important.

Also, this legislation reverses the administration's proposed cut for U.S. assistance to Armenia. We provide $48 million in economic aid and $3 million in military aid for Armenia while maintaining military funding parity with Azerbaijan and providing $10 million in assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh. The bill also includes a new requirement for the administration to consult with Congress before exercising its waiver authority for assistance to Azerbaijan granted under section 907 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Now, according to the Congressional Research Service, between 100,000 and 500,000 Korean Americans still have family living in North Korea. Almost all of them have not seen their loved ones since the end of the Korean War, while many have not seen family members even since World War II. In the absence of diplomatic relations between the two countries, elderly Korean Americans are forced to contact their relatives without the protection of the U.S. Embassy or help from the State Department. Families are at the mercy of a black market group of smuggling rings that control access to North Korea.

This legislation urges the State Department Policy Coordinator for North Korea to make the issue of divided American citizen families who have their relatives in North Korea a priority and to establish a coordinator for this issue.

One last thing I want to highlight. As the United States draws down our troop commitment to Iraq, and we have tremendous concerns about safe and secure and sustainable homes and businesses for Iraq's embattled Christian minority, this bill provides a historic $20 million dedicated to religious minorities in Iraq, a big step forward for building an autonomous administrative region for Chaldo Assyrians in the Nineveh Plain. It's an important group that we should be concerned about, especially as the United States leaves Iraq.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for a colloquy with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

I am pleased to yield to Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the chairwoman and applaud her leadership on behalf of women's health. No one in Congress has done more to prioritize the needs of women and children in our foreign assistance spending.

As you well know, Madam Chairwoman, every minute somewhere in the world a woman dies during pregnancy or childbirth. In the poorest regions, one out of 22 women will die from these causes compared to one in 4,800 in the United States. In the developing world, mothers routinely face death or injury as a result of uncontrolled bleeding, infection, seizures, hypertensive disorders, birth obstruction, or other complications.

□ 1545

A pregnancy should be a joyful time in a woman's life, not a death threat.

The good news is that practical interventions exist. We just need to leverage the necessary resources and sufficiently focus our assistance on maternal health.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words and for her support for women's health at home and abroad. Healthier mothers will enjoy safer pregnancies and childbirths, enabling them to better care for their children. Bolstering maternal health initiatives can help reduce the 4 million newborn deaths each year in the developing world. The committee has directed USAID to undertake a detailed review of its maternal health portfolio, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the chairwoman. I look forward to working with her on this issue to ensure that not one more mother has to replace a birth announcement with a death notice.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We rarely do this under this legislation, but we also have an important tradition of highlighting human rights cases, especially if they set a particularly dangerous precedent. And one of the most concerning precedents is the one set by the Government of Egypt when they imprisoned Kareem Amer, who is the first blogger ever to be arrested for what he wrote on his Internet blog, calling for reconciliation between Muslims and Jews on his personal blog. He was convicted. He's currently serving in prison, and it is a particularly dangerous precedent to have set that merely what you may write in your Internet blog will land you in jail.

It's interesting to me, too, that of all the Muslim countries around the world, Egypt set the precedent, and of all the countries around the world that could have set this precedent against the freedom of speech on the Internet, it was one of the largest recipients of U.S. foreign assistance under this act. We have not gone to the step yet of dramatically affecting the U.S. assistance provided by this, but we do have to highlight Abdel Kareem Nabil Soliman, his full legal name, and his time in jail, a very dangerous precedent under Egyptian law and one that should be highlighted here.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the very distinguished chairwoman of the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, Mrs. LOWEY, who is a great friend, and I want to thank her staff for their diligence in working with us. They have been absolutely more than wonderful on an important issue.

My intention today is to confirm that the $20 million provided by the subcommittee for religious minorities in Iraq is intended to focus on the needs of the Nineveh Plains region.

Did the subcommittee intend that this funding for ethnoreligious minorities focus on the Assyrian/Chaldean/Syriac/Christians of the Nineveh Plains region since that is the primary location of these displaced persons?

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes. The committee is aware that this region is home to most of the displaced ethnoreligious minorities in Iraq.

Ms. ESHOO. Is the chairwoman's view that the State Department should ensure that these funds are used to support a range of programs such as security, small microenterprise development, agriculture capacity building, economic development, educational institution capacity building, health care enhancement, and democratization programs, including the dialogue on the Nineveh Plain Administrative Unit?

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes. It is the committee's intent to support these types of activities.

Ms. ESHOO. Would the chairwoman support the award of these funds to nongovernmental organizations that are already working tirelessly in the region such as the Dominican Sisters, the Assyrian Aid Society, the Nineveh Center for Research and Development, the Hammurabi Human Rights Organization, and other groups that provide services to all people on a nondiscriminatory basis?

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes. There are a number of organizations that have provided health, education, and other assistance in the region and should be considered as potential alternatives to governmental entities. I expect the State Department to continue to use a competitive bidding process to ensure that the most appropriate and effective organizations receive U.S. Government assistance.

Ms. ESHOO. I can't thank the chairwoman enough for her support of funding to alleviate the plight of these ancient people so critical to the future of Iraq. Her efforts are going to help hundreds of thousands of displaced ethnoreligious minorities. And I know that our colleagues Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY, Congressman GARY PETERS, and certainly Congressman FRANK WOLF thank you for your leadership and for your attention to this issue that matters to so many. God bless you.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us provides $2.22 billion worth of vital security assistance to the State of Israel, our most dependable and democratic ally in the Middle East. The funding in this bill will help ensure Israel maintains its qualitative military advantage in the region. That means Israel can defend itself against the existential threat posed by Iran and against Iranian terrorist proxies, Hamas and Hezbollah, both sworn to Israel's destruction.

A strong Israel means a more stable Middle East. A weakened Israel only gives momentum to the radicals in the region determined to sow discord and harm U.S. interests. Joint cooperation with Israel has also yielded tangible benefits to America since Israel is a leader in methods of fighting terrorism and preventing civilian casualties in terrorist attacks.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that Israel is a pillar in the national security interests of the United States, and it is, in my opinion, essential that we provide this assistance to Israel because it is in the best interests of the United States. That's why I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate the chairwoman. I served on this subcommittee for a few years, and this is an extraordinary bill. I think it's the best Foreign Operations bill in more than a couple of decades in this House on a range of issues, but I'm only here to speak about one.

I want to thank the chairwoman for her continued support, and notice in the bill and in the accompanying report the effort around safe blood in Africa, in sub-Saharan Africa. When we began talking about this issue a few years ago, there were no safe blood centers and there are now 35. It wouldn't have happened without the chairwoman's support and understanding the correlation and nexus between malaria and blood transfusions and, therefore, increases in AIDS when you have unsafe blood being used in those transfusions. So I want to thank her and congratulate her on a great bill.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to highlight a key provision of this bill, section 7006, which withholds 10 percent of the funding under this legislation for the Board of International Broadcasting, Radio Deewa. This is a service actually that the chairwoman and I helped sponsor and get rolling because of our perception that there was very little international broadcasting service and outside information in the main language of northwest Pakistan and Afghanistan of Pashtun. But we found that they were putting Batula Massoud on the U.S. taxpayer-funded radio, giving him a platform just 6 days after the Secretary of State put him on the Rewards for Justice terrorism list for his crimes against a number of terrorist targets, including the Prime Minister of Pakistan. So I really want to thank the chairwoman for including this because we sent a very clear signal that we want open and free communication with accurate news, but we do not give platforms to terrorists on the Rewards for Justice list of the State Department.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a leader in this Congress who understands the importance of water, in addition to bicycles, and has been a tireless advocate for a whole range of important causes, my good friend Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, as I appreciate her leadership in being able to advance a cause that's near and dear to both of our hearts.

Mr. Chairman, I will speak for 2 minutes. In the course of that time, about 10 children around the world will die needlessly from waterborne disease. We have been working, over the course of the last 5 years, for the United States to exercise its appropriate leadership to try to eliminate this tragedy.

I deeply appreciate the work that the subcommittee has done. Indeed, in the manager's amendment it takes an increase from last year and has a further increase of $25 million, meaning $335 million to help implement our Water for the Poor Act, dealing the world's number one public health problem.

Mr. Chairman, we have more than a billion people worldwide who lack access to both sanitation and clean drinking water, without which children cannot learn in school; the sick, including those with HIV/AIDS, cannot take their medication; stable societies cannot be built; and millions needlessly continue to die. Entirely preventable tragedies trap countries in poverty and diminish our own development and security efforts. It's no coincidence that the Middle East and North Africa, the most water-stressed region in the world has some of the most complex security issues. The State Department has said securing fresh drinking water is a significant part of the Middle East peace process and one that brings people together rather than dividing them.

I deeply appreciate the chairwoman and her staff for working with me and my colleague DON PAYNE, who has been tireless in advancing this issue. I hope that the administration, with the leadership of Secretary Clinton, will join in this effort so that we can make the progress that poor people around the world deserve and that we all need.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

□ 1600

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their work.

I rise today in support of a provision in the manager's amendment to increase the amount of funds available for human rights and democratic initiatives of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development. Specifically, the Democracy Fund in this appropriations bill will be, in large, helping countless people across the globe.

I'd like to thank my colleagues, the Honorable NITA LOWEY and the Honorable KAY GRANGER for accepting my amendment; and I commend them for their hard work on this bill. This really is an important bill. At this moment in history, I cannot help but be reminded of particular problems we are facing internationally. Although we have developed and maintained a high standard of living in our own country, we must remember that so many people across the globe cannot think about democracy because, frankly, they're so busy trying to survive, and they don't share the same luxuries and comforts that we take for granted in the United States. Basic human rights are a pillar of our democracy, and we seek to live in a stable and peaceful world. I work with women from around the world, trying to help build a culture of peace in this world. So this really is a very important part of it for me. The Democracy Fund does just this. It gives countless people a way to identify with a country of democracy.

I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in supporting the manager's amendment, which seeks to expand and encourage democratic and human rights initiatives globally.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman has no more speakers, I am prepared to close if he wishes to yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. KIRK. Let me just say this bill also contains one last program—and then I will close—and that is called the Near East Regional Democracy program. It used to be called the Iran democracy program, and I hope that's still exactly what it does. We're providing $40 million for this, and it's very important. Following the suppression of democracy in Iran, we're particularly concerned about key minority groups there. The Azeris, representing 40 percent of the country, including the leading candidate for president whose vote was suppressed; the Kurds that we worked with so well in northern Iraq; and the Baluch, in which a significant Iranian military presence is there. And I want to pay particular attention to the plight of the Baha'i. The National Assembly of the Baha'i Faith is located in my district; but this is the faith that

was founded in Persia, now Iran. There are 330,000 Baha'is in Iran right now. Under this regime, we have now seen that they have been told to register their businesses and place of address, that this is the bureaucratic machinery that we have seen in other countries in other uniforms before. It is the machinery of oppression and potentially worse. We have seen now that just following the time President Ahmadinejad claimed that he had won the election—remembering, of course, that in 150 Iranian cities, the votes totaled more than the number of people living in those cities—that just following their claim to have won the election after only 2 hours of counting the ballots, that he moved against the Baha'i leaders, putting them on trial for their lives in that country. The Near East Regional Democracy program can help us build alternative voices in that country, all the more important.

Let me close on this bill by saying that this bill has one key and major component, which is assistance to the State of Israel for us. In my view, land for peace generally means no land and even more war, as we saw with Israel's withdrawal from Gaza where an area that used to be used for agricultural produce is now used for mortars and rockets against southern Israel, especially Sderot and Ashkelon. My worry is that we might have more of that kind of adventurism by the other side further if we see instability in southern Lebanon and especially on the West Bank. This legislation helps us underscore our commitment to the Israeli Air Force, their missile defense system and, especially, to their army to at least encourage the states in that region to make sure that no adventurism like we saw, especially in 1973, can move forward against our best allies in the Middle East. My hope is that we have very strong commitment for this on the floor today and in the United States Senate because I think this bill, more than any other, makes any potential conflict in the Middle East less likely; and that is good for us all.

With that, I recommend passage of the bill. I want to commend our chairwoman and our greatly missed Ranking Minority Member KAY GRANGER, who's out today, for bringing us a bill that adheres to the key principle that I try to follow at every possible turn, and that is the aphorism that we say, that partisanship should end at the water's edge. In my service in the United States military, I generally found that when we were being shot at, they weren't shooting at Democrats or Republicans. They were shooting at American citizens. The United States has bipartisan interests overseas, and this bill fulfills this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. As we close this debate, I want to thank KAY GRANGER again, the ranking member of this committee, who has been an invaluable partner in creating what we think is a very, very good bill. I also want to thank Mr. KIRK for his leadership not only in the committee but certainly in his role in presenting this bill today. We really have an outstanding subcommittee. Again, it's because the subcommittee members and the staff on both sides, who I acknowledged in my opening statement, and the ranking member; as well as the Chair of the overall Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY. Everyone contributed to making this a really important bill.

I just must say in closing that, for me, it's a real privilege to be a Chair of this committee, to wake up every day and know that you can contribute to the great challenges we have internationally; and every day we are presented with an additional challenge that we have to face. As the leader of the free world, the United States of America has a key role to play, and I know that all the members of this committee understand our responsibility.

So this is a good bill. I appreciate your support. I hope we can get support from the majority of Members on your side of the aisle and our side of the aisle because this is an important bill; and as we move forward, it's extremely important that all of us support these efforts.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I rise to support H.R. 3081, the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2010.

This legislation addresses our most urgent national security needs, rebuilds our diplomatic infrastructure for the long term, and maintains our commitment to fiscally responsible government. The total for this bill comes in $3.2 billion below the President's budget request, meaning that we cut spending tremendously but still managed to fund the most vital programs around the globe. I'd like to touch on some of these programs.

This legislation requires that the Administration report to Congress on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I support the President's current efforts to stop Iran's dangerous nuclear weapons program; however, diplomacy should not be open-ended. This legislation makes it clear that Congress will exercise its oversight authority over these negotiations to ensure that there is a plan to stop Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

Furthermore, the legislation prevents the U.S. Export-Import Bank from providing or guaranteeing credit to companies that provide Iran with significant amounts of refined petroleum. Iran imports about 40 percent of its refined petroleum. Then-Presidential candidate Barack Obama stated that restricting these imports could be a valuable lever in persuading Iran to cease its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons capabilities. We start that process today, and I am proud to support legislation that takes the first step in instituting crippling sanctions against the Iranian government.

Iran represents a great threat to the United States and our allies throughout the world. This legislation helps mitigate that threat to our allies by ensuring that countries that Iran would seek to destroy or destabilize receive support from the United States. U.S. aid to Israel represents a cornerstone in the strong relationship that our two countries share. I visited Israel right after the signing of the 10–year Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Israel, and it was clear that this agreement would help cement our long-term friendship. This legislation fully funds our commitment under this accord and serves as an assurance to Israel that we will work together to ensure Israel's security during a time when Israel faces several powerful threats.

In addition, this legislation helps put us and our allies on a path to energy independence, funding clean energy initiatives that reduce our dependence on oil and make us more energy efficient. By partnering with other countries, we can share these important technologies and learn from others about new innovations.

Finally, I would like to briefly mention my support for the amendment by the gentleman from New York, Mr. WEINER. This amendment sends a strong statement to Saudi Arabia to cease its funding of terrorism and stop its incitement against Israel, Jews and America. While the bill prohibits aid to Saudi Arabia, it leaves the door open in case the President deems that aid is necessary. This amendment shuts that door. Common sense tells us that Saudi Arabia has enough American dollars from money that we waste on our dependence on oil.

In closing, this bill fulfills the American imperative to lead the world in commitment to democracy, human rights and security. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the 2010 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. This bill reflects the bipartisan priorities of Congress in the areas of national security and counterterrorism, diplomacy, development, global health and oversight.

This bill appropriates $48.8 billion for State Department operations, programs and foreign aid, including $13.4 billion for national security, counterterrorism and counternarcotics programs, $7.8 billion for global health programs, $5.8 billion to combat HIV/AIDS, $2.5 billion for general development aid, and $2.4 billion for the Child Survival and Disease Fund. And, to assist and enhance our diplomatic efforts around the world, the bill provides funding for over a thousand new Foreign Service officers and $746 million for international broadcasting activities such as the Voice of America.

To honor our strategic and diplomatic commitments to our partners around the world, the bill appropriates $2.2 billion in aid for Israel, $1.3 billion for Egypt, and $513 million in economic and security aid for Jordan. The bill also funds such commitments closer to home in Mexico where in 2008, more than 6,200 people died in drug-related violence, more than twice the number killed in 2007. More than 1,000 people have died so far in 2009.

This problem has grown so severe that the Department of Homeland Security is reviewing ways to assist Mexican law enforcement to stop the flow of guns, assault rifles, and cash from the U.S. into Mexico. This bill recognizes this challenge and provides $987 million to support counter narcotics and alternative development programs in Mexico, Central American, the Caribbean Basin, Colombia and Peru.

U.S. peacekeeping and humanitarian efforts are also served by this bill. The bill appropriates $2.4 billion for various peacekeeping operations, including missions in Darfur and

Somalia, where the United States continues to be the leading donor for emergency refugee and humanitarian assistance. For Sudan alone, this bill provides over $700 million in combined assistance for African Union and United Nations missions there.

I want to thank Chairman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER and all the members of the Appropriations Committee for crafting a bipartisan bill that responsibly satisfies our strategic, development and diplomatic commitments around the world. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3081—Department of State, Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 2010.

Providing funding to our friend and steadfast ally Israel is in our national interest, and this bill provides $2.2 Billion Dollars for Israel in the form of Military Assistance.

In a turbulent part of the world, we can count on the friendship of Israel because we share the important values of freedom of religion, speech and thought—values that aren't universally shared across the Middle East.

Israel is the only mature democracy in a region that hungers for freedom from dictators and tyrants and whose people are distracted by a steady stream of vitriol directed at the Jewish people.

We recently saw that hunger for freedom displayed on the streets of Iran in the wake of the disputed election and how it was brutally suppressed by the Iranian government, resulting in the death of several protesters.

Freedom and Democracy should be supported wherever we find it and this bill supports a vital ally, who shares our commitment to the rule of law, and freedom of assembly.

Israel has showed extraordinary restraint in response to terrorism and daily rocket attacks emanating from fanatical Hamas militants in the Gaza Strip. I can think of no country in the world that would have shown such restraint in the face of direct attacks on their civilians.

Every government of Israel has worked towards peace. Yet, except for Egypt and Jordan, no Arab government has even recognized the State of Israel. This bill calls for all Arab League States to normalize relations with Israel, which is an important step on the road to a durable peace in the region.

I was happy to see that no support will be provided to support a Palestinian state unless the Secretary of State determines that they have demonstrated a commitment to peaceful coexistence with Israel and is taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism and terrorist financing in the West Bank and Gaza.

This bill provides essential support to our friend and ally Israel, so I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3081. I would like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER for their hard work on this important legislation.

I am pleased that this bill provides $2.2 billion to one of our most important allies: the State of Israel. Israel is a strategic partner and this funding will help ensure Israel has the resources it needs to protect her borders and citizens. Ever since the United States became the first nation to recognize Israel's independence our two nations have shared a special friendship and I am pleased that this bill continues that close relationship.

I am also proud to support report language that will provide at least $20 million to provide relief to religious minorities in Iraq, including assistance for displaced and refugee populations. In the last year thousands of Iraqi Christians have sought refuge in Southeast Michigan and thousands more are expected in the years to come. This funding will aid refugee populations in Iraq that are most in need of our assistance I thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Representative ESHOO for their work on this issue.

This bill ensures that America will continue to be the leader in spreading security and opportunity throughout the world and I urge its passage.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise to support this bill, which protects our security and promotes our values by funding humanitarian assistance, health care, education, poverty reduction, and disaster relief throughout our world, and especially in countries like Haiti, a poverty-stricken but democratic nation close to our shores.

I oppose amendments to cut funding for these critical programs. I am especially concerned about the Lewis amendment, which cuts more than $500 million from multilateral development programs, including debt relief for the world's poorest countries. Debt relief has already helped more than 20 poor countries, freeing up billions of dollars for investments in health care, education, clean water, and poverty reduction. The United States played a critical role in negotiating poor country debt relief, and we did it with bipartisan support from this Congress.

In the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation, to expand poor country debt relief. The House passed this bill last year, although the Senate was not able to complete consideration of it. I will reintroduce the Jubilee Act later this year.

Both Bread for the World and Catholic Relief Services strongly supported debt relief, and now they are calling on Members of Congress to support this bill and oppose amendments like the Lewis amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendment shall be in order except the amendments printed in part A and B of House Report 111–193. Each amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. An amendment printed in part B of the report may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3081

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service not otherwise provided for, $8,229,000,000, of which $1,577,427,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection (to remain available until expended): *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may transfer up to $137,600,000 of the total funds made available under this heading to any other appropriation of any department or agency of the United States, upon the concurrence of the head of such department or agency, to support operations in and assistance for Afghanistan and to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That, consistent with existing law and regulation, the Secretary of State shall notify in writing the member of the House of Representatives representing the district of a left-behind parent when the parent reports an international child abduction to the Department of State and the Secretary shall maintain a computerized data tracking system to track and monitor such reported international child abduction cases: *Provided further*, That the requirements of the previous proviso shall not apply to cases where the left-behind parent does not consent to the Secretary taking such actions: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall be allocated as follows:

(1) HUMAN RESOURCES.—For necessary expenses for training, human resources management, and salaries, including employment without regard to civil service and classification laws of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $700,000), as authorized by section 801 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, $2,667,130,000 to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which not less than $138,075,000 shall be available only for public diplomacy American salaries, and, $220,840,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection and shall remain available until expended.

(2) OVERSEAS PROGRAMS.—For necessary expenses for the regional bureaus of the Department of State and overseas activities as authorized by law, $2,497,158,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which not less than $381,800,000 shall be available only for public diplomacy international information programs.

(3) DIPLOMATIC POLICY AND SUPPORT.—For necessary expenses for the functional bureaus of the Department of State including representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate or specific Acts of Congress, general administration, and arms control, nonproliferation and disarmament activities as authorized, $892,012,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

(4) SECURITY PROGRAMS.—For necessary expenses for security activities, $2,172,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which, $1,356,587,000 is for Worldwide Security Protection and shall remain available until expended.

(5) FEES AND PAYMENTS COLLECTED.—In addition to amounts otherwise made available under this heading—

(A) not to exceed $1,653,305 shall be derived from fees collected from other executive

agencies for lease or use of facilities located at the International Center in accordance with section 4 of the International Center Act, and, in addition, as authorized by section 5 of such Act, $490,000, to be derived from the reserve authorized by that section, to be used for the purposes set out in that section;

(B) as authorized by section 810 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, not to exceed $6,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from English teaching, library, motion pictures, and publication programs and from fees from educational advising and counseling and exchange visitor programs; and

(C) not to exceed $15,000, which shall be derived from reimbursements, surcharges and fees for use of Blair House facilities.

(6) TRANSFER AND REPROGRAMMING.—

(A) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, funds may be reprogrammed within and between subsections under this heading subject to section 7015 of this Act.

(B) Of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $10,000,000 may be transferred to, and merged with, funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service'', to be available only for emergency evacuations and rewards, as authorized.

(C) Funds appropriated under this heading are available for acquisition by exchange or purchase of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by law and, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1108(g), for the field examination of programs and activities in the United States funded from any account contained in this title.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. LOWEY:

Page 2, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $300,000)''.

Page 3, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $300,000)''.

Page 7, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $25,300,000)''.

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 24, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $28,000,000)''.

Page 25, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO SRI LANKA

SEC. 70XX. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' may be available for assistance for the Government of Sri Lanka.

PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN FIRST-CLASS TRAVEL

SEC. 70XX. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301-10.122 through 301-10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My amendment makes several modifications to the bill. Specifically, it would increase funding for safe water and sanitation programs by $25 million and democracy programs by $10 million. It would provide $300,000 for the implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Joint Action Plan to eliminate racial and ethnic discrimination and promote equality; increase funding for maternal health programs by $10 million; and ensure proper use of taxpayer dollars by increasing funding for oversight of Department of State and USAID programs by $8 million. These additions would be offset by reductions to the Department of State Capital Investment Fund and USAID's Capital Investment Fund. The amendment would also restrict foreign military financing to Sri Lanka, but I would note that the base bill includes up to $1 million for demining activities under the nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining, and related programs' account to continue the work with the Sri Lankan Government to help the displaced Tamil population return to their homes. Lastly, this amendment includes a restriction on first-class travel by employees of agencies funded by this act.

I am pleased to have worked with Representatives EARL BLUMENAUER, HENRY CUELLAR, ALCEE HASTINGS, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, JIM MARSHALL and GWEN MOORE to address these concerns. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chair, I seek time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. I yield myself 4 minutes. I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. There are many parts of the amendment that I support, like moving funds away from accounts that received a significant increase in the stimulus bill in order to increase funds for safe drinking water and sanitation programs.

Unfortunately, I oppose this amendment for what it represents. We are continuing the movement away from bipartisan consideration of amendments because it appears that the new practice under the Rules Committee is to take a number of Democratic amendments and put them in one group under the chairman's aegis so that it looks like we have a balanced list of amendments offered but really a much larger number of Democratic amendments are being considered. This is a very troubling practice that has now entered into the appropriations bills.

Once again, I would point out, under clause 2 of rule XXI, the only amendments that are allowed under our rules on the floor are money amendments that cut or rearrange funds, not policy amendments. That gives awesome power to the committee on both sides to limit debate on this bill. It's very odd that in all the consideration of appropriations bills before, we haven't really made this a standard practice like is happening now.

Mrs. LOWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. I just want to note that KAY GRANGER, the ranking member's amendment, is not a money amendment. It's a policy amendment as well.

Mr. KIRK. I stand corrected. Under the rule it's allowed, but we didn't need rules for appropriations bills. I would reiterate my admiration for Bill Natcher who insisted that his legislation always come to the floor without a rule because it was protected under clause 2 of rule XXI.

I'm also worried about this amendment because it cuts off FMF, Foreign Military Financing, for Sri Lanka. Now the Sri Lankan-elected democratic government was fighting the Tamil Tigers, registered as a terrorist organization by the State Department. Their victory over the Tamil Tigers will bring human rights and democracy to the whole country and remove the need for any kind of military operations which could tempt either side to hurt civilians.

The victory of the Sri Lankan military against the Tamil Tigers is exactly what will bring order, rule of law and democracy to that country. So we're now sending a signal that a democracy who is fighting a terrorist organization and wins will be cut off in its financing by the United States. I would put it to you that if we ever had a rebel terrorist organization operating in our country, maybe like the Confederate States after our victory, it would be odd, indeed, to see some country cutting off funding for us. Yet that's exactly what we did in our civil war. And I would say that a cutoff now is an odd signal when I would expect that the record of human rights, respect for the individual rule of law and especially in democracy will definitely go up now that the Sri Lankan Government controls all of their territory.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks but I just want to emphasize, again, that we are providing up to $1 million for demining activities under NADR for the Sri Lankan Government to help the displaced Tamil population return to their home. And in addition to the terrorism that occurred on the part of the Tamil Tigers,

we do have many civilians that have been displaced. And I think it is essential that the Government of Sri Lanka respond to that challenge and help those people return to their homes. So I know that we will continue to follow this issue to be sure that the policy that is in place adjusts to the actions that the government takes.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRK. I yield myself such time as I have remaining.

I would say that I think with this amendment it would have been better to have handled it under a different procedure. But the key point that I would make here is there are many good parts of this amendment. I particularly love the part about no first class travel and hope that that goes into the final bill.

I would urge us in conference to reconsider sending the signal that we are sending to Sri Lanka. The general signal should be that when a democratic government engages a terrorist organization, we support the democratic government. When that democratic government wins against that terrorist organization, we should support them. That means that we should support all the aspects of that government that can effect good order and a return to normalcy, which means helping refugees and which means helping the government, but it means helping also to maintain a good relationship with that democracy that just did a good thing in making sure that the world has one less terrorist organization.

So I would urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BUYER:

Page 2, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,200,000,000)''.

Page 21, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $330,000,000)''.

Page 25, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $670,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

It is very clear that Americans are feeling the burden of a shrinking economy, empty pocketbooks and also economic uncertainty. What is clear is that the American people are hurting and that we are continuing to lose jobs.

The Obama administration and congressional Democratic leadership promised that their trillion-dollar stimulus would create jobs immediately and gave the assurance to the American people that unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. In June alone, almost one-half million jobs were lost, driving unemployment now to 9.5 percent, the highest level in almost three decades.

I believe the American people know we cannot tax and spend nor bail our way out to a growing economy. So what are we doing here today? We are continuing this practice of reckless spending. Now what is clever is that there is a release that was sent out by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that said, well, it appears as though perhaps we are cutting, actually this bill is cutting, foreign spending. No, it is not.

What has to be clear here is that you have to be careful to this appropriations language called ''enacted'' level of spending. So when you look at 2008 and as we go into 2009, we had a continuing resolution, and then from the CR we go into an omnibus. On top of the omnibus, we go into supplemental spending. And now we go into the 2010 bill. So we have this 33 percent increase.

What I'm doing is I look at three specific accounts here in Foreign Operations. And I'm saying, okay, fine, keep your increases. But let's try to hold the line with regard to our Federal spending. I have great respect for the men and women that represent our country in Foreign Service abroad. They are serving on America's outposts, and I salute them. They deserve the best the Nation can provide to them. What I oppose is the continued habit of reckless and seemingly endless spending that this bill represents. So with the interests of our Nation's financial integrity at stake, I offer this amendment that cuts $2.2 billion from the bill to remedy this bloated increase.

The amendment reduces three accounts to match the fiscal year 2009 enacted funding levels: number one, the diplomatic and consular programs account reduced by $1.2 billion; secondly, the operating expense of USAID by $330 million; and the global health account reduced by $670 million. This represents a total savings of $2.2 billion left in the Treasury and not borrowed against our children's and grandchildren's future.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Ms. GRANGER and I have worked hard to craft a bill that strengthens the civilian diplomatic and development capacity of the U.S. Government.

President Obama, Secretary of State Clinton, former Secretary of State Rice, Secretary of Defense Gates and many of us in this Chamber have said time and time again that the State Department and USAID have to start leading U.S. Government efforts to address the global threats of the 21st century, including preventing and responding to conflict. As our new administration sets priorities, develops strategies and creates greater efficiencies and harmony in our foreign policy, this requires an expansion of people and resources.

The proposed cuts in this amendment, to USAID's operating expenses and the Department of State's operating account, strike at the very heart of the bill's efforts to strengthen our civilian capacity. This amendment would have a devastating impact on USAID and the Department of State's ability to carry out their diplomatic, development, and reconstruction mission.

For USAID operating expenses, the amendment would halt support for over 200 existing personnel, including in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Sudan, putting the U.S. Government missions in those countries in jeopardy.

The amendment would stop the construction of secure and safe facilities for USAID employees in nearly 30 countries overseas and halt the hiring of 350 new Foreign Service officers as planned in the development leadership initiative which is intended to rebuild the civilian development workforce.

Within the Department of State's operating account, the amendment would eliminate $328 million to add 1,000 foreign and civil service officers to fill the 12 percent vacancy rate at the 260 diplomatic posts worldwide and to fill urgently needed positions here in D.C., eliminate $213 million to add nearly 300 diplomatic security positions to better protect and secure diplomatic and development personnel, and reduce by nearly $700 million funding to regularize diplomatic operations in Iraq.

USAID is a global leader on health, and the proposed cuts would hamper their ability to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. The proposed cut in this amendment could result in 18.3 million women being without access to voluntary family planning services, which could lead to an estimated 5.5 million additional unintended pregnancies, 300,000 additional under-5 deaths per year and 15,000 additional maternal deaths per year, and approximately 800,000 people in four high-burden countries going without planned multidrug resistance tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment services.

Congress must strengthen civilian agencies to respond to foreign policy

crises and not cut core programs in our diplomacy and development initiatives, as this amendment seeks to do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUYER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say the gentlelady's comments still don't address the reason I brought this amendment. I will use two words that you just used to the gentlelady: ''jeopardy'' and ''devastate.'' That is exactly what Congress is doing to America's economy if we do not get our fiscal house in order.

This isn't my quote; this is OMB's. In May, OMB projected that if we continue this type of spending, the Federal debt will grow to $23.3 trillion in 2019. That is within 10 years, $23 trillion. I think the American people are getting numb to these numbers. Now to get $1 billion, to get $1 billion, if I take, excluding corporate income tax receipts, every individual working in my congressional district, if I take their Federal income tax revenue, I can get $1 billion. That is just $1 billion. So I think about all the hard work and labor of people in my congressional district in Indiana, that is $1 billion. So you throw numbers around here as though it is just nothing, it is just money. It is more than money. It represents the hard labor of people. They give it to us, and they make sure that we spend it in a fiscally responsible manner. At a time when America's economy is hurting, you plead to me in response, Mr. Chairman, the plea here is that all Members should weep and cry about the challenges that are all around the world. Well, what about the challenges in America? That is what I'm talking about. We are engaged here in a two-front war, actually, a multi-front war, but in two fronts right now in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I appreciate the leadership of our ranking member and what he is doing. But don't stand here on the floor and talk about we need more money for ''family planning,'' which is a code word for us to pay for abortions overseas. No, this is a moment in time. And I am going to ask for a recorded vote on something like this because I want a signal to be sent to the American people to take a look at this vote. That is what I will say to America, Mr. Chairman: watch this vote.

Do we have what it takes to cut $2.2 billion or not? I'm even saying, guess what? I will take your 33 percent increase that you had over the baseline. I will just take us back to the 33 percent increase. And, America, watch what this Congress will do. Will they be fiscally responsible with your dollar? Or will they continue the reckless policies that have been going on in this Congress?

I urge everyone to support this amendment, and I yield back.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to my friend, the gentleman, Mr. BUYER. I agree. And I think most of us in this Congress would agree that we have to get our fiscal house in order. However, we put this bill together in a bipartisan way. And I again regret that Ms. GRANGER who worked so hard on this bill couldn't be here with us today. And I want to make it very clear that cutting funding for our diplomats who are serving our great Nation in very difficult parts of the world, whether it is Pakistan, Afghanistan, whether it is in Iraq, and I could go on and on, is irresponsible.

So I think it is fine to say that we have to put our house in order. However, I would like to remind you that in the past administration, diplomacy, development and defense were considered the three pillars of our national security. So just to say we can cut $1 billion here and $1 billion there and not to have the consequences, have great impact on the security of our people who are fighting for our Nation, I think is irresponsible.

Again, I ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 46, line 4 be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

CIVILIAN STABILIZATION INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses to establish, support, maintain, mobilize, and deploy a civilian response corps in coordination with the United States Agency for International Development, and for related reconstruction and stabilization assistance to prevent or respond to conflict or civil strife in foreign countries or regions, or to enable transition from such strife, $125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading may be made available in fiscal year 2010 to provide administrative expenses for the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law and following consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, the President may exercise transfer authorities contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for reconstruction and stabilization assistance managed by the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, United States Department of State, only to support an actively deployed civilian response corps, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a coordinated joint spending plan for funds made available under this heading and under the heading ''Civilian Stabilization Initiative'' in title II of this Act.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Capital Investment Fund, $160,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized: *Provided*, That section 135(e) of Public Law 103-236 shall not apply to funds available under this heading.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $100,000,000, notwithstanding section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465), as it relates to post inspections, of which $23,000,000 shall be for the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight, and $23,000,000 shall be for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction for reconstruction oversight.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For expenses of educational and cultural exchange programs, as authorized, $600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from or in connection with English teaching, educational advising and counseling programs, and exchange visitor programs as authorized.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized, $8,175,000.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

For expenses, not otherwise provided, to enable the Secretary of State to provide for extraordinary protective services, as authorized, $28,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for carrying out the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292-303), preserving, maintaining, repairing, and planning for buildings that are owned or directly leased by the Department of State, renovating, in addition to funds otherwise available, the Harry S Truman Building, and carrying out the Diplomatic Security Construction Program as authorized, $876,850,000, to remain available until expended as authorized, of which not to exceed $25,000 may be used for domestic and overseas representation as authorized: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for acquisition of furniture, furnishings, or generators for other departments and agencies.

In addition, for the costs of worldwide security upgrades, acquisition, and construction as authorized, $847,300,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Repatriation Loans Program Account'', subject to the same terms and conditions.

BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT

To offset adverse fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates and/or overseas wage and price changes, as authorized by section 24(b) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2696(b)), $7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $739,000, as authorized: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $711,000, which may be transferred to, and merged with, funds made available under the heading ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs''.

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

For necessary expenses to carry out the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8), $21,174,000.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as authorized by law, $158,900,000.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, $1,697,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State shall, at the time of the submission of the President's budget to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, transmit to the Committees on Appropriations the most recent biennial budget prepared by the United Nations for the operations of the United Nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days in advance (or in an emergency, as far in advance as is practicable) of any United Nations action to increase funding for any United Nations program without identifying an offsetting decrease elsewhere in the United Nations budget: *Provided further*, That any payment of arrearages under this title shall be directed toward activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to pay assessed and other expenses of international peacekeeping activities directed to the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security, $2,125,000,000, of which 15 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be obligated or expended for any new or expanded United Nations peacekeeping mission unless, at least 15 days in advance of voting for the new or expanded mission in the United Nations Security Council (or in an emergency as far in advance as is practicable): (1) the Committees on Appropriations are notified of the estimated cost and length of the mission, the national interest that will be served, and the planned exit strategy; (2) the Committees on Appropriations are notified that the United Nations has taken appropriate measures to prevent United Nations employees, contractor personnel, and peacekeeping forces serving in any United Nations peacekeeping mission from trafficking in persons, exploiting victims of trafficking, or committing acts of illegal sexual exploitation, and to hold accountable individuals who engage in such acts while participating in the peacekeeping mission, including the prosecution in their home countries of such individuals in connection with such acts; and (3) notification pursuant to section 7015 of this Act is submitted, and the procedures therein followed, setting forth the source of funds that will be used to pay for the cost of the new or expanded mission: *Provided further*, That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the Committees on Appropriations that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services, and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to meet obligations of the United States arising under treaties, or specific Acts of Congress, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For necessary expenses for the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and to comply with laws applicable to the United States Section, including not to exceed $6,000 for representation; as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, not otherwise provided for, $33,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of authorized projects, $43,250,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for the International Joint Commission and the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, as authorized by treaties between the United States and Canada or Great Britain, and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission as authorized by Public Law 103-182, $12,608,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading for the International Joint Commission, $9,000 may be made available for representation expenses.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses for international fisheries commissions, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law, $48,576,000: *Provided*, That the United States share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3324, *Provided further*, That, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds available under this heading may be used to make payments necessary to fulfill the United States' obligations under the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

RELATED AGENCY

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to enable the Broadcasting Board of Governors, as authorized, to carry out international communication activities, including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception and purchase, lease, and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception to Cuba, and to make and supervise grants for radio and television broadcasting to the Middle East, $733,788,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount in this heading, not to exceed $16,000 may be used for official receptions within the United States as authorized, not to exceed $35,000 may be used for representation abroad as authorized, and not to exceed $39,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; and in addition, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $2,000,000 in receipts from advertising and revenue from business ventures, not to exceed $500,000 in receipts from cooperating international organizations, and not to exceed $1,000,000 in receipts from privatization efforts of the Voice of America and the International Broadcasting Bureau, to remain available until expended for carrying out authorized purposes.

BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

For the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception as authorized, $12,662,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

RELATED PROGRAMS

THE ASIA FOUNDATION

For a grant to the Asia Foundation, as authorized by the Asia Foundation Act (22 U.S.C. 4402), $19,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

For necessary expenses of the United States Institute of Peace as authorized in the United States Institute of Peace Act, $49,220,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

CENTER FOR MIDDLE EASTERN-WESTERN DIALOGUE TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses of the Center for Middle Eastern-Western Dialogue Trust Fund, the total amount of the interest and earnings accruing to such Fund on or before September 30, 2010, to remain available until expended.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated, as authorized by sections 4 and 5 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (20 U.S.C. 5204-5205), all interest and earnings accruing to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund on or before September 30, 2010, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary or other compensation, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376; or for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A-122 (Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations), including the restrictions on compensation for personal services.

ISRAELI ARAB SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Israeli Arab Scholarship Program as authorized by section 214 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2452), all interest and earnings accruing to the Israeli Arab Scholarship Fund on or before September 30, 2010, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

For grants made by the Department of State to the National Endowment for Democracy, as authorized by the National Endowment for Democracy Act, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than $250,000 shall be for human rights and democracy programs relating to Tibet: *Provided*, That the President of the National Endowment for Democracy shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report on the proposed uses of funds under this heading on a regional and country basis: *Provided further*, That funds made available by this Act for the promotion of democracy may be made available for the National Endowment for Democracy notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation.

OTHER COMMISSIONS

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, $635,000, as authorized by section 1303 of Public Law 99-83.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, as authorized by title II of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292), $4,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as authorized by Public Law 94-304, $2,610,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, as authorized, $2,000,000, including not more than $3,000 for the purpose of official representation, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, $3,500,000, including not more than $4,000 for the purpose of official representation, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That the Commission shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly accounting of the cumulative balances of any unobligated funds that were received by the Commission during any previous fiscal year: *Provided further*, That section 308(e) of the United States-China Relations Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 6918(e)) (relating to the treatment of employees as Congressional employees), and section 309 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6919) (relating to printing and binding costs), shall apply to the Commission in the same manner as such section applies to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall comply with chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code, regarding the establishment and regular review of employee performance appraisals: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall comply with section 4505a of title 5, United States Code, with respect to limitations on payment of performance-based cash awards: *Provided further*, That compensation for the executive director of the Commission may not exceed the rate payable for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That travel by members of the Commission and its staff shall be arranged and conducted under the rules and procedures applying to travel by members of the House of Representatives and its staff.

TITLE II

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $1,388,800,000, of which up to $105,000,000 may remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading and under the heading ''Capital Investment Fund'' in this title may be made available to finance the construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long-term lease of offices for use by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), unless the USAID Administrator has identified such proposed construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long-term lease of offices in a report submitted to the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to the obligation of funds for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply when the total cost of construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long-term lease of offices does not exceed $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for capital investments related to the Development Leadership Initiative, up to $245,000,000 may remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That contracts or agreements entered into with funds appropriated under this heading may entail commitments for the expenditure of such funds through the following fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any decision to open a new USAID overseas mission or office or, except where there is a substantial security risk to mission personnel, to close or significantly reduce the number of personnel of any such mission or office, shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the authority of sections 610 and 109 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be exercised by the Secretary of State to transfer funds appropriated to carry out chapter 1 of part I of such Act to ''Operating Expenses'' in accordance with the provisions of those sections: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated or made available under this heading, not to exceed $250,000 may be available for representation and entertainment allowances, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be available for entertainment allowances for USAID during the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no such entertainment funds may be used for the purposes listed in section 7020 of this Act: *Provided further*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars.

CIVILIAN STABILIZATION INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses to carry out section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to establish, support, maintain, mobilize, and deploy a civilian response corps in coordination with the Department of State, and for related reconstruction and stabilization assistance to prevent or respond to conflict or civil strife in foreign countries or regions, or to enable transition from such strife, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator shall submit a coordinated joint spending plan for funds made available under this heading and under the heading ''Civilian Stabilization Initiative'' in title I of this Act.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For necessary expenses for overseas construction and related costs, and for the procurement and enhancement of information technology and related capital investments, pursuant to section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $213,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount is in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation only pursuant to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $46,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development.

TITLE III

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For necessary expenses to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 2010, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

GLOBAL HEALTH AND CHILD SURVIVAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for global health activities, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, $2,375,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, and which shall be apportioned directly to the United States Agency for International Development: *Provided*, That this amount shall be made available for such activities as: (1) child survival and maternal health programs; (2) immunization and oral rehydration programs; (3) other health, nutrition, water and sanitation programs which directly address the needs of mothers and children, and related education programs; (4) assistance for children displaced or orphaned by causes other than AIDS; (5) programs for the prevention, treatment, control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, polio, malaria, and other infectious diseases, and for assistance to communities severely affected by HIV/AIDS, including children infected or affected by AIDS; and (6) family planning/reproductive health: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph may be made available for nonproject assistance, except that funds may be made available for such assistance for ongoing health activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph, not to exceed $400,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of child survival, maternal and family planning/reproductive health, and infectious disease programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated

under this paragraph, $77,000,000 should be made available for a United States contribution to The GAVI Fund: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization: *Provided further*, That any determination made under the previous proviso must be made no later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and must be accompanied by a comprehensive analysis as well as the complete evidence and criteria utilized to make the determination: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion: *Provided further*, That in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning project shall meet the following requirements: (1) service providers or referral agents in the project shall not implement or be subject to quotas, or other numerical targets, of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning (this provision shall not be construed to include the use of quantitative estimates or indicators for budgeting and planning purposes); (2) the project shall not include payment of incentives, bribes, gratuities, or financial reward to: (A) an individual in exchange for becoming a family planning acceptor; or (B) program personnel for achieving a numerical target or quota of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning; (3) the project shall not deny any right or benefit, including the right of access to participate in any program of general welfare or the right of access to health care, as a consequence of any individual's decision not to accept family planning services; (4) the project shall provide family planning acceptors comprehensible information on the health benefits and risks of the method chosen, including those conditions that might render the use of the method inadvisable and those adverse side effects known to be consequent to the use of the method; and (5) the project shall ensure that experimental contraceptive drugs and devices and medical procedures are provided only in the context of a scientific study in which participants are advised of potential risks and benefits; and, not less than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that there has been a violation of the requirements contained in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (5) of this proviso, or a pattern or practice of violations of the requirements contained in paragraph (4) of this proviso, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report containing a description of such violation and the corrective action taken by the Agency: *Provided further*, That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, the term ''motivate'', as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: *Provided further*, That to the maximum extent feasible, taking into consideration cost, timely availability, and best health practices, funds appropriated in this Act or prior appropriations Acts that are made available for condom procurement shall be made available only for the procurement of condoms manufactured in the United States: *Provided further*, That information provided about the use of condoms as part of projects or activities that are funded from amounts appropriated by this Act shall be medically accurate and shall include the public health benefits and failure rates of such use.

In addition, for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, HIV/AIDS, $5,409,000,000, to remain available until expended, and which shall be apportioned directly to the Department of State: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph, not less than $750,000,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–25), as amended, for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds made available to the Global Fund in fiscal year 2010 may be made available to the United States Agency for International Development for technical assistance related to the activities of the Global Fund: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this paragraph, up to $14,000,000 may be made available, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for administrative expenses of the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103, 105, 106, and sections 251 through 255, and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $2,465,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for assistance programs for displaced and orphaned children and victims of war, not to exceed $44,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of such programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this Act, not less than $265,000,000 shall be made available for microenterprise and microfinance development programs for the poor, especially women: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $24,000,000 shall be made available for the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad program: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this Act, not less than $310,000,000 shall be made available for water and sanitation supply projects pursuant to the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121): *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than $1,000,000,000 shall be made available for food security and agricultural development programs, of which $32,000,000 shall be made available for Collaborative Research Support Programs: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds pursuant to the previous proviso and after consultation with other relevant Federal departments and agencies, the Committees on Appropriations, and relevant nongovernmental organizations, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a strategy for achieving the food security and agricultural development program goals: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for food security and agricultural development programs, $10,000,000 shall be made available for a United States contribution to the endowment of the Global Crop Diversity Trust pursuant to section 3202 of Public Law 110–246: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $20,000,000 shall be made available for programs to improve women's leadership capacity in recipient countries.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, $830,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TRANSITION INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for international disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, to support transition to democracy and to long-term development of countries in crisis: *Provided*, That such support may include assistance to develop, strengthen, or preserve democratic institutions and processes, revitalize basic infrastructure, and foster the peaceful resolution of conflict: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, up to $50,000,000 may be made available for a Rapid Response Fund: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Rapid Response Fund may be obligated until the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development consults with the Committees on Appropriations on the country that will receive assistance, the level of assistance proposed for such country, a description of the proposed programs, projects and activities, and the implementing agencies or departments of the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations at least 5 days prior to beginning a new program of assistance.

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AUTHORITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees provided by the United States Agency for International Development, as authorized by sections 256 and 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, up to $25,000,000 may be derived by transfer from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I of such Act and under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'': *Provided*, That funds provided under this paragraph and funds provided as a gift pursuant to section 635(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available only for micro and small enterprise programs, urban programs, and other programs which further the purposes of part I of such Act: *Provided further*,

That such costs, including the cost of modifying such direct and guaranteed loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds made available by this paragraph may be used for the cost of modifying any such guaranteed loans under this Act or prior Acts, and funds used for such costs shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 107A(d) (relating to general provisions applicable to the Development Credit Authority) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in section 306 of H.R. 1486 as reported by the House Committee on International Relations on May 9, 1997, shall be applicable to direct loans and loan guarantees provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any portion of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $700,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out credit programs administered by the United States Agency for International Development, $8,600,000, which may be transferred to, and merged with, funds made available under the heading ''Operating Expenses'' in title II of this Act: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2012.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $6,370,096,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $250,000,000 shall be available only for Egypt, which sum shall be provided on a grant basis, and of which sum cash transfer assistance shall be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic and democratic reforms which are additional to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Egypt, not less than $25,000,000 shall be made available for democracy, human rights and governance programs, and not less than $25,000,000 shall be made available for education programs: *Provided further*, That $11,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for Cyprus to be used only for scholarships, administrative support of the scholarship program, bicommunal projects, and measures aimed at reunification of the island and designed to reduce tensions and promote peace and cooperation between the two communities on Cyprus: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $363,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for Jordan: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not more than $400,400,000 may be made available for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, of which not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, to carry out programs in the West Bank and Gaza: *Provided further*, That not more than $150,000,000 of the funds provided for the West Bank and Gaza shall be for cash transfer assistance: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Afghanistan and Pakistan, assistance may be provided notwithstanding any provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries for cross border stabilization and development programs between Afghanistan and Pakistan or between either country and the Central Asian republics: *Provided further*, That $300,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance for Afghanistan under this heading may be obligated for such assistance only after the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Afghanistan at both the national and provincial level is cooperating fully with United States-funded poppy eradication and interdiction efforts in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That the President may waive the previous proviso if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so is vital to the national security interests of the United States: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $200,660,000 shall be apportioned directly to USAID for alternative development/institution building programs in Colombia: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading that are available for Colombia, not less than $4,500,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated under the heading ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'' and shall be made available only for assistance to nongovernmental organizations that provide emergency relief aid to Colombian refugees in neighboring countries.

DEMOCRACY FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the promotion of democracy globally, $120,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, of which $70,000,000 shall be made available for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State, and $50,000,000 shall be made available for the Office of Democracy and Governance of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development: *Provided*, That funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for the promotion of democracy may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law, and with regard to the National Endowment for Democracy, any regulation: *Provided further*, That with respect to the provision of assistance for democracy, human rights and governance activities in this Act, the organizations implementing such assistance and the specific nature of that assistance shall not be subject to the prior approval by the government of any foreign country.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $18,000,000, which shall be available for the United States contribution to the International Fund for Ireland and shall be made available in accordance with the provisions of the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–415): *Provided*, That such amount shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2011.

ASSISTANCE FOR EUROPE, EURASIA AND CENTRAL ASIA

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the FREEDOM Support Act, and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, $722,253,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for assistance and for related programs for countries identified in section 3 of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 3(c) of the SEED Act: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act for the use of economic assistance: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, funds appropriated in prior years under the headings ''Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' and similar headings and ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'' and similar headings, and currencies generated by or converted from such funds, shall be available for use in any country for which funds are made available under this heading without regard to the geographic limitations of the heading under which such funds were originally appropriated: *Provided further*, That funds made available for the Southern Caucasus region may be used for confidence-building measures and other activities in furtherance of the peaceful resolution of conflicts, including in Nagorno-Karabagh.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $1,630,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2010, the Department of State may also use the authority of section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, without regard to its restrictions, to receive excess property from an agency of the United States Government for the purpose of providing it to a foreign country or international organization under chapter 8 of part I of that Act subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and prior to the initial obligation of funds appropriated under this heading, a report on the proposed uses of all funds under this heading on a country-by-country basis for each proposed program, project, or activity: *Provided further*, That section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That assistance provided with funds appropriated under this heading that is made available notwithstanding section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Afghanistan may be made available for eradication programs through the aerial spraying of herbicides unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the President of Afghanistan has requested assistance for such aerial spraying programs for counternarcotics purposes: *Provided further*, That in the event the Secretary of State makes a determination pursuant to the previous proviso, the Secretary shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of funds for such eradication programs: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Colombia shall be made available for budget support or as cash payments: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for assistance for the Bolivian military and police may be made available for such purposes only if the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Bolivian military and police are respecting internationally recognized human rights and cooperating fully with investigations and

prosecutions by civilian judicial authorities of military and police personnel who have been credibly alleged to have violated such rights: *Provided further*, That in order to enhance border security and cooperation in law enforcement efforts between the United States and Mexico, funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Mexico may be made available for the procurement of law enforcement communications equipment only if such equipment utilizes open standards and is compatible with, and capable of operating with, radio communications systems and related equipment utilized by Federal law enforcement agencies in the United States to enhance border security and cooperation in law enforcement efforts between Mexico and the United States.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs and activities, $717,430,000, to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for anti-terrorism assistance, chapter 9 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for demining activities, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, the destruction of small arms, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations, and section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for a voluntary contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and for a United States contribution to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Preparatory Commission: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $75,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities relating to nonproliferation, disarmament and weapons destruction: *Provided further*, That such funds may also be used for such countries other than the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and international organizations when it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so: *Provided further*, That funds made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for IAEA only if the Secretary of State determines (and so reports to the Congress) that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of that Agency: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $500,000 may be made available for public-private partnerships for conventional weapons and mine action by grant, cooperative agreement or contract: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for demining and related activities, not to exceed $700,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used for administrative expenses related to the operation and management of the demining program: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading that are available for ''Anti-terrorism Assistance'' and ''Export Control and Border Security'' shall remain available until September 30, 2011.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to enable the Secretary of State to provide, as authorized by law, a contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross, assistance to refugees, including contributions to the International Organization for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other activities to meet refugee and migration needs; salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980; allowances as authorized by sections 5921 through 5925 of title 5, United States Code; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $1,480,444,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than $25,000,000 shall be made available for refugees resettling in Israel.

□ 1630

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2601(c)), $75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

PEACE CORPS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2501-2523), including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States, $450,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Peace Corps may transfer to the Foreign Currency Fluctuations Account, as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2515, an amount not to exceed $5,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds transferred pursuant to the previous proviso may not be derived from amounts made available for Peace Corps overseas operations: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $4,000 may be made available for entertainment expenses: *Provided further*, That any decision to open a new domestic office or to close, or significantly reduce the number of personnel of, any office, shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

□ 1630

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 46, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $76,560,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady from New York talked about bipartisanship. This is a bipartisan amendment.

The President has requested $373 million be allocated to the Peace Corps under the State-Foreign Operations bill and related appropriations. The gentlelady should realize, all my amendment does is ensure that we fund the Peace Corps at simply the level the President requested.

So when you look at this amendment, it's really an President Obama-Stearns amendment in which he is saying, I think we can get it done, the Peace Corps allocation under the Foreign Operations bill, for $373 million. And when you look at the facts, I think you will probably agree with me. In fact, I think, obviously, the President must agree because that's what he has allocated.

In 2009, the Peace Corps was funded at $340 million. President Obama has requested $373.4 million, so this is an increase of $33 million. So there is an increase, 10 percent, it's right there, I agree with him. Let's go ahead and approve it this afternoon at what the President requested.

Now, I support the Peace Corps, but I think what you have done is allocated $450 million, which is almost $77 million increase from what President Obama has requested. That's $110 million above the FY 2009 level.

So what you are trying to do is increase the Peace Corps by 33 percent over last year's level and, frankly, to the gentlelady from New York, with the economy the way it is we should keep the money in America and not in 76 other countries. Certainly the money that we are spending overseas could be used in this country. So I think President Obama tried to be conservative in saying let's allocate $373 million rather than your number of $450 million.

So I think again, with the severe economic crises, and all of us agree, we must consider carefully how we use taxpayers dollars. We certainly don't want to send them overseas when we can use them here in the United States. As Mr. Buyer mentioned we are spending Federal tax dollars at a rate we can't sustain, and we are putting ourselves into deeper debt.

Today our national debt stands at almost $12 trillion. You know, adoption of my amendment, my simple amendment, will demonstrate a positive step towards restoring fiscal balance and responsibility but also staying in line with what President Obama has requested.

So with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. I would like to remind my good friend, Mr. STEARNS, that the Peace Corps is also a job-creating program. These are our young people here who are going abroad to serve our country. So it is also a job-creation program for our young people. The Peace Corps, which is funded at $450 million in this bill, has long been one

of America's most effective tools in directly reaching citizens of other countries, demonstrating firsthand the best of American values and generating goodwill for our Nation around the world.

Just last year, Peace Corps volunteers helped train 148,000 teachers, health care workers and other professionals overseas. Their efforts improved the lives of over 2 million people in developing countries, including countries that are vital to our national security interests.

In recent years, the Peace Corps has been chronically underfunded. Last year the agency was forced to cut 500 new positions. Funding the Peace Corps at the authorized $450 million level lays the groundwork to fulfill the President's pledge to increase the number of Peace Corps volunteers at a responsible pace. In addition, the bill calls for the GAO to conduct a management review to ensure that every dollar is well spent and every volunteer's effort is well placed.

In recent weeks I and other Members have heard from thousands of Peace Corps' 200,000 alumni. I am sure there are some in Florida, Mr. STEARNS, and other constituents calling for this increase. In fact, the gentleman from Florida may have heard from some of the nearly 7,000 Peace Corps current and former volunteers from the State of Florida.

I hope my colleagues will support me in opposing this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that the gentlelady from New York does not agree with her President. Her President has offered a funding level. He said he thinks this will do the job, and you obviously don't agree with him.

So I am a little surprised if the President of the United States, your President, indicates he thinks the job can be done with those dollars, them why don't you agree with him? Using your argument, you want to increase spending so that we can send jobs for people in America to go overseas.

And the question is, a simple question for you is, why not let these people have jobs here in the United States? Why not take the money, give the jobs to the people in the United States so they don't have to go overseas?

It is cheaper. It is cheaper to give a job to a student, a college graduate, here in the United States than to send them oversees into all these 76—100 countries that we have allocated it for. It's also cheaper logistically. So I think if the Democrats will look at this, why aren't you agreeing with your President on the allocation for the Peace Corps, and why do you want to spend more money overseas when we can put the jobs here in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to Sam Farr, a former Peace Corps worker, from California.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I rise in strong support of this. And the answer to your question is the President has not endorsed your position. He has not asked us to cut this amount. The reason is that there are 12,000 Americans that applied for Peace Corps jobs that can't be filled because there isn't enough money to fill them.

There are 20 other countries that want Peace Corps in them. We can't expand the program because there isn't enough money for it. That's why the committee put more money in it. This is the most effective foreign aid program, the most effective domestic program. If we are going to curtail violence in the world, we have got to do it through initiating what is best in America by sending more and more Peace Corps volunteers to countries who want them.

To the people who apply for the jobs, there is only room for one out of every four applicants because of the money. So this $450 million is exactly what President Obama has said in his campaign speeches—that he wanted to double the Peace Corps. You can't double it without putting more money in it.

So I object to your opinion that Mr. Obama, President Obama, supports your amendment. He does not, and neither do the people in this House or the other House.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD Senator CHRISTOPHER BOND's letter asking for $450 million from the Senate for an Appropriations Committee.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
Senate Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations,
Senate Dirksen Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GREGG:

President Obama pledged to double the number of Peace Corps volunteers by 2011—a goal I strongly support—but unfortunately failed to provide the necessary funding to do so in his budget request. The House of Representatives has already acted to correct this oversight by increasing funds for the Peace Corps to $450 million for fiscal year 2010. I hope that in the House-Senate Conference Committee the Senate's conferees will support providing additional resources the Peace Corps needs to accomplish their critical mission.

The need for the Peace Corps has never been more important. There is no doubt that anti-Americanism is growing throughout the world. One of the most effective tools to combat, this anti-Americanism and other extremist ideologies is the Peace Corps, which remains one of the United States' most effective grassroots diplomacy and development programs.

In addition to the growing need for the Peace Corps, the demand is up as well. The Peace Corps reports that as many as twenty nations are interested in starting Peace Corps programs where none currently exist, and there are real opportunities to expand and improve upon existing programs.

An increased investment in Peace Corps will support an expansion of Americans serving our country as volunteers, enable new country programs to be established in strategic—and too long ignored—countries like Indonesia, and continue the collaboration and integration of volunteers into our foreign assistance priority program areas, like basis education, agriculture and nutrition, global health, and HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment. Expanding and strengthening our Peace Corps would provide an immediate opportunity to realize America's commitment to global leadership and citizen service.

Smart Power initiatives like the Peace Corps should be a cornerstone in our foreign policy and in our efforts to combat extremism and terrorism around the world. Your recognition and support of these critical efforts is invaluable. Chairmen Leahy and Ranking Member Gregg, I appreciate your difficult task of balancing the many competing Smart Power priorities with limited resources and I appreciate the subcommittee's support for my additional Smart Power requests like international exchanges, biotechnology research and public diplomacy to name a few. However, I also believe it is critical that we work together to support an increased investment in the Peace Corps above the President's request. Our nation must reinvigorate the Peace Corps as part of its overall effort to strengthen our Smart Power efforts.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, President Obama certainly doesn't endorse your plan because he did not propose $450 million. He proposed a lot less. He proposed a 10 percent increase; you proposed a 33 percent increase.

Really, although the President hasn't called me up to say he endorses my amendment, frankly, I have endorsed his. I have endorsed his legislative initiative. What he has proposed, is a 10 percent increase, I think this is fair. I am just asking you folks to recognize what he has proposed is fair.

Why not adopt my amendment and let it go at that. Why do you want to increase the Peace Corp 33 percent and send these jobs overseas when, frankly, we can keep them here cheaper, and logistically it's easier. So again I ask you to explain to me why you don't want to agree with the President's request.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a great advocate of the Peace Corps and a distinguished member of the committee, BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am very proud of my staff and the other staff and Members who have served in the Peace Corps who are in this House.

Mr. Chairman, today the Peace Corps, one of the most successful foreign policy initiatives, is at a crossroads. Since 1961, over 200,000 Americans have served our country by helping others around the world. Today's Peace Corps needs to be reenergized. Peace Corps is not capable of meeting the demand of Americans of all ages who want to serve. As I said, Peace Corps is at a crossroads.

We have an opportunity here today in this moment to reinvigorate Peace Corps for the next new century, but it's

going to take leadership from Congress. The President's request simply was not enough, even though the President does propose to double, increase and fully fund Peace Corps out into the years.

We have an opportunity to do it today. Chairwoman LOWEY is leading with $450 million, a commitment to Peace Corps to put the agency back on track to double those numbers.

President Bush spoke up from this Chamber and President Obama spoke too in his inaugural address.

We have an opportunity to make history today. Support the Peace Corps.

Mr. STEARNS. The gentlelady says the Peace Corps is not meeting the demands around the world. I think the American taxpayers want the people to meet the demands of the American people here at home.

I yield back.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DRIEHAUS), who is a former Peace Corps volunteer.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Chairman, I am a former Peace Corps volunteer, and I am an American, and the money was spent wisely. As a matter of fact, I don't know if the sponsor is familiar at all with the Peace Corps, but we spend $225 a month on a Peace Corps volunteer. That's what the salary is for a Peace Corps volunteer.

Now, find me a job anywhere else where America's dollars are better spent on foreign policy than for $225 a month. The total cost of the Peace Corps is less than two F–22 fighters, almost 1½ planes. That's what we spend to send hundreds of thousands of Americans across the globe to help people better understand this United States. That's what we spend, less than two F–22 fighters.

The Peace Corps is critical to the foreign policy of this United States. That is why the Obama administration did not, did not object to this funding increase, because they know it is the right thing to do. It is the most cost-effective foreign policy program we have.

I would urge my colleagues to support the Peace Corps and reject this amendment.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Stearns amendment, which would reduce the amount appropriated to the Peace Corps from a much needed $450 million to a little more that $373 million. As a former Peace Corps Volunteer and a member of the House Appropriations committee, I was pleased to see Chairwoman LOWEY answer President Obama's call to double the size of the Peace Corps, beginning with increased funding.

Since President John F. Kennedy's call to serve in 1960, over 195,000 people have served as Peace Corps Volunteers spanning 139 countries. The Peace Corp gives Volunteers the chance to travel the world and help some of the most impoverished people in the world develop better lives for themselves and their communities. Beyond that, my experience as a Peace Corps volunteer in El Salvador was a defining moment in my life—I developed both personally and professionally, and tested my physical, emotional, and spiritual limits. I returned with a passion for teaching, and quickly put my skills, including fluency in Spanish, to use in Santa Clara county schools and started a lifelong commitment to public service.

There are currently just under 8,000 Peace Corps volunteers serving around the world, with thousands more ready, willing, and eager to join, but held back by the lack of funding and opportunity. A $450 million dollar funding level is necessary to help the Peace Corps modernize its systems, optimize the number of Volunteers and staff in existing countries, strengthen and expand recruiting and diversity efforts, expand to new nations, and maximize safety and security training and compliance efforts. I hope that with increased funding, a commitment to double the size of the Peace Corps, and a renewed call to service by President Barack Obama, people from all walks of life will bear the torch of peace and goodwill that many Americans in the past have carried proudly to other countries.

The Peace Corp's budget is 1% of the foreign policy budget of the United States, which, in itself, is only 1% of the entire federal budget. For the good this does around the world, it is a critical investment. With a bleak economic outlook and an international community under pressure, the Peace Corps mission is more vital than ever, and so I urge mu colleagues to oppose the Stearns Amendment and urge full funding of the Peace Corps at the $450 million level agreed upon by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, $1,400,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to $95,000,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (the Corporation): *Provided further*, That up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to carry out the purposes of section 616 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 for fiscal year 2010: *Provided further*, That section 605(e)(4) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 shall apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for a Millennium Challenge Compact entered into pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 only if such Compact obligates, or contains a commitment to obligate subject to the availability of funds and the mutual agreement of the parties to the Compact to proceed, the entire amount of the United States Government funding anticipated for the duration of the Compact: *Provided further*, That the Corporation should reimburse the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for all expenses incurred by USAID with funds appropriated under this heading in assisting the Corporation in carrying out the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), including administrative costs for compact development, negotiation, and implementation: *Provided further*, That the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation shall notify the Committees on Appropriations not later than 15 days prior to signing any new country compact or new threshold country program; terminating or suspending any country compact or threshold country program; or commencing negotiations for any new compact or threshold country program: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $100,000 may be available for representation and entertainment allowances, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be available for entertainment allowances.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the functions of the Inter-American Foundation in accordance with the provisions of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, $22,760,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $2,000 may be available for entertainment and representation allowances.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

For necessary expenses to carry out title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–533), $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That funds made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the Board of Directors of the Foundation: *Provided further*, That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the Board of Directors of the Foundation may waive the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project and a project may exceed the limitation by up to $10,000 if the increase is due solely to foreign currency fluctuation: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations after each time such waiver authority is exercised.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 129 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012, which shall be available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, of concessional loans, guarantees and credit agreements, as authorized under section 572

of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100–461), and of canceling amounts owed, as a result of loans or guarantees made pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, by countries that are eligible for debt reduction pursuant to title V of H.R. 3425 as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106–113, $60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2012: *Provided*, That not less than $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to carry out the provisions of part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That amounts paid to the HIPC Trust Fund may be used only to fund debt reduction under the enhanced HIPC initiative by—

(1) the Inter-American Development Bank;

(2) the African Development Fund;

(3) the African Development Bank; and

(4) the Central American Bank for Economic Integration:

Provided further, That funds may not be paid to the HIPC Trust Fund for the benefit of any country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that the government of such country is engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights or in military or civil conflict that undermines its ability to develop and implement measures to alleviate poverty and to devote adequate human and financial resources to that end: *Provided further*, That on the basis of final appropriations, the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations concerning which countries and international financial institutions are expected to benefit from a United States contribution to the HIPC Trust Fund during the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall notify the Committees on Appropriations not less than 15 days in advance of the signature of an agreement by the United States to make payments to the HIPC Trust Fund of amounts for such countries and institutions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may disburse funds designated for debt reduction through the HIPC Trust Fund only for the benefit of countries that—

(1) have committed, for a period of 24 months, not to accept new market-rate loans from the international financial institution receiving debt repayment as a result of such disbursement, other than loans made by such institutions to export-oriented commercial projects that generate foreign exchange which are generally referred to as ''enclave'' loans; and

(2) have documented and demonstrated their commitment to redirect their budgetary resources from international debt repayments to programs to alleviate poverty and promote economic growth that are additional to or expand upon those previously available for such purposes:

Provided further, That any limitation of subsection (e) of section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading in this or any other appropriations Act shall be made available for Sudan or Burma unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines and notifies the Committees on Appropriations that a democratically elected government has taken office.

TITLE IV

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $331,500,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act, to provide assistance to enhance the capacity of foreign security forces, including gendarmes, to participate in peacekeeping operations: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than $26,000,000 shall be made available for a United States contribution to the Multinational Force and Observers mission in the Sinai: *Provided further*, That up to $102,000,000 may be made available for assistance for Somalia, of which up to $55,000,000 may be used to pay assessed expenses of international peacekeeping activities in Somalia: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $110,283,000, of which up to $4,000,000 may remain available until expended and may only be provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That the civilian personnel for whom military education and training may be provided under this heading may include civilians who are not members of a government whose participation would contribute to improved civil-military relations, civilian control of the military, or respect for human rights: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for assistance for Haiti, Guatemala, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Libya, and Angola may only be provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and any such notification shall include a detailed description of proposed activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $55,000 may be available for entertainment allowances.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for grants to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, $4,260,000,000: *Provided*, That to expedite the provision of assistance to foreign countries and international organizations, the Secretary of State may use the funds appropriated under this heading to procure defense articles and services to enhance the capacity of foreign security forces: *Provided further*, That the Department of State shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations prior to exercising the authority contained in the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $2,220,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Israel, and not less than $1,040,000,000 shall be made available for grants only for Egypt, including for border security programs and activities in the Sinai: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph for Israel shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed by the United States and Israel, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which not less than $583,860,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading estimated to be outlayed for Egypt during fiscal year 2010 shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York within 30 days of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, $150,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Jordan: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $60,000,000 shall be available for Colombia, of which $12,500,000 is available to support maritime interdiction and riverine operations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading for assistance for Pakistan may be made available only for border security, counter-terrorism and law enforcement activities directed against Al Qaeda, the Taliban and associated terrorist groups: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to support or continue any program initially funded under the authority of section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456) unless the Department of State, in coordination with the Department of Defense, has justified such program to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be obligated upon apportionment in accordance with paragraph (5)(C) of title 31, United States Code, section 1501(a).

None of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to finance the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act unless the foreign country proposing to make such procurements has first signed an agreement with the United States Government specifying the conditions under which such procurements may be financed with such funds: *Provided*, That all country and funding level increases in allocations shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures of section 7015 of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for assistance for Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Philippines, Indonesia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Haiti, Guatemala, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo except pursuant to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for demining, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, and related activities, and may include activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations: *Provided further*, That only those countries for which assistance was justified for the ''Foreign Military Sales Financing Program'' in the fiscal year 1989 congressional presentation for security assistance programs may utilize funds made available under this heading for procurement of defense articles, defense services or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for defense articles and services: *Provided further*, That not more than $54,464,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for necessary expenses, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, for the general costs of administering

military assistance and sales, except that this limitation may be exceeded only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for general costs of administering military assistance and sales, not to exceed $4,000 may be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed $130,000 may be available for representation allowances: *Provided further*, That not more than $550,000,000 of funds realized pursuant to section 21(e)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act may be obligated for expenses incurred by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2010 pursuant to section 43(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, except that this limitation may be exceeded only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE V

MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973, $395,091,000: *Provided*, That section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to contributions to the United Nations Democracy Fund.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

For the United States contribution for the Global Environment Facility, $86,500,000, to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as trustee for the Global Environment Facility, by the Secretary of the Treasury, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,235,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE CLEAN TECHNOLOGY FUND

For contributions to the multilateral Clean Technology Fund, $225,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated without specific authorization in a subsequent Act of Congress.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE STRATEGIC CLIMATE FUND

For contributions to the multilateral Strategic Climate Fund, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated without specific authorization in a subsequent Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations on the proposed uses of these funds prior to making a contribution to the Strategic Climate Fund.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Inter-American Investment Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, $4,670,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND

For payment to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States contribution to the fund, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the Asian Development Fund, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, as amended, $115,250,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the African Development Fund, $159,885,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the resources of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE VI

EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $2,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year for such corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country, other than a nuclear-weapon state as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act, that has detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428, as amended, sections 1(a) and (b) of Public Law 103–428 shall remain in effect through October 1, 2010: *Provided further*, That not less than 10 percent of the aggregate loan, guarantee, and insurance authority available to the Export-Import Bank under this Act should be used for renewable energy technologies or energy efficient end-use technologies.

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, not to exceed $58,000,000: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2025, for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Acts appropriating funds for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for tied-aid credits or grants may be used for any other purpose except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any Eastern European country, any Baltic State or any agency or national thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $30,000 for official reception and representation expenses for members of the Board of Directors, not to exceed $83,880,000: *Provided*, That the Export-Import Bank may accept, and use, payment or services provided by transaction participants for legal, financial, or technical services in connection with any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insurance commitment has been made: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 117 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1992, subsection (a) thereof shall remain in effect until October 1, 2010.

RECEIPTS COLLECTED

Receipts collected pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, and the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, as amended, in an amount not to exceed the amount appropriated herein, shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account: *Provided*, That the sums herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis by such offsetting collections so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the General Fund estimated at $0: *Provided further*, That of amounts collected in fiscal year 2010 in excess of obligations, up to $50,000,000, shall become available on September 1, 2010 and shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

NONCREDIT ACCOUNT

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the amount available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed $35,000) shall not exceed $52,310,000: *Provided further*, That project-specific transaction costs, including direct and indirect costs incurred in claims settlements, and other direct costs associated with services provided to specific investors or potential investors pursuant to section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall not be considered administrative expenses for the purposes of this heading.

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, $29,000,000, as authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such sums shall be available for direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012: *Provided further*, That funds so obligated in fiscal year 2010 remain available for disbursement through 2018; funds obligated in fiscal year 2011 remain available for disbursement through 2019; and funds obligated in fiscal year 2012 remain available for

disbursement through 2020: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to undertake any program authorized by title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in Iraq: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of the previous proviso shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

In addition, such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses to carry out the credit program may be derived from amounts available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account and merged with said account.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $55,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $4,000 may be made available for representation and entertainment allowances.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

ALLOWANCES AND DIFFERENTIALS

SEC. 7001. Funds appropriated under title I of this Act shall be available, except as otherwise provided, for allowances and differentials as authorized by subchapter 59 of title 5, United States Code; for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and for hire of passenger transportation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1343(b).

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES REPORT

SEC. 7002. Any Department or Agency to which funds are appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly accounting of cumulative balances by program, project, and activity of the funds received by such Department or Agency in this fiscal year or any previous fiscal year that remain unobligated and unexpended.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 7003. The expenditure of any appropriation under title I of this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

EMBASSY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 7004. (a) Of funds provided under title I of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), a project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may not include office space or other accommodations for an employee of a Federal agency or department if the Secretary of State determines that such department or agency has not provided to the Department of State the full amount of funding required by subsection (e) of section 604 of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106–113 and contained in appendix G of that Act; 113 Stat. 1501A–453), as amended by section 629 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005.

(b) Notwithstanding the prohibition in subsection (a), a project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may include office space or other accommodations for members of the United States Marine Corps.

PERSONNEL ACTIONS

SEC. 7005. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under title I of this Act resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available under title I to such department or agency: *Provided*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 7015 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

SEC. 7006. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''International Broadcasting Operations'' for programming to the Middle East, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, 10 percent of the funds shall not be available for obligation until the Broadcasting Board of Governors reports to the Committees on Appropriations that each relevant language service or grantee is abiding by the standards and principles set forth in the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6202(a) and (b)), is in compliance with the relevant Journalistic Code of Ethics, and have a policy, including appropriate management controls, of not providing an open platform for terrorists or those who support terrorists.

(b) The Broadcasting Board of Governors shall notify the Committees on Appropriations within 15 days of any determination by the Board that any of its broadcast entities, including its grantee organizations, was found to be in violation of the principles, standards, or journalistic code of ethics referenced in subsection (a).

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 7007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations for the governments of Cuba, North Korea, Iran, or Syria: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

MILITARY COUPS

SEC. 7008. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to the government of any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by military coup or decree: *Provided*, That assistance may be resumed to such government if the President determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that subsequent to the termination of assistance a democratically elected government has taken office: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to assistance to promote democratic elections or public participation in democratic processes: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous provisos shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 7009. (a) DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.—Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of State under title I of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Broadcasting Board of Governors under title I of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 7015(a) and (b) of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

(b) EXPORT FINANCING TRANSFER AUTHORITIES.—Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation other than for administrative expenses made available for fiscal year 2010, for programs under title VI of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations for use for any of the purposes, programs, and activities for which the funds in such receiving account may be used, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 25 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS BETWEEN AGENCIES.—

(1) None of the funds made available under titles II through V of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in addition to transfers made by, or authorized elsewhere in, this Act, funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be allocated or transferred to agencies of the United States Government pursuant to the provisions of sections 109, 610, and 632 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(d) TRANSFERS BETWEEN ACCOUNTS.—None of the funds made available under titles II through V of this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, except for transfers specifically provided for in this Act, unless the President, not less than 5 days prior to the exercise of any authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to transfer funds, consults with and provides a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations.

(e) AUDIT OF INTER-AGENCY TRANSFERS.—Any agreement for the transfer or allocation of funds appropriated by this Act, or prior Acts, entered into between the United States Agency for International Development and another agency of the United States Government under the authority of section 632(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law, shall expressly provide that the Office of the Inspector General for the agency receiving the transfer or allocation of such funds shall perform periodic program and financial audits of the use of such funds: *Provided*, That funds transferred under such authority may be made available for the cost of such audits.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 7010. The Secretary of State shall provide the Committees on Appropriations, not later than April 1, 2010, and for each fiscal quarter, a report in writing on the uses of

funds made available under the headings ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', ''International Military Education and Training'', and ''Peacekeeping Operations'': *Provided*, That such report shall include a description of the obligation and expenditure of funds, and the specific country in receipt of, and the use or purpose of the assistance provided by such funds.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 7011. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation after the expiration of the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided in this Act: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of chapters 1, 8, 11, and 12 of part I, section 661, section 667, chapters 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and funds provided under the headings ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' and ''Development Credit Authority'', shall remain available for an additional 4 years from the date on which the availability of such funds would otherwise have expired, if such funds are initially obligated before the expiration of their respective periods of availability contained in this Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are allocated or obligated for cash disbursements in order to address balance of payments or economic policy reform objectives, shall remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN DEFAULT

SEC. 7012. No part of any appropriation provided under titles III through VI in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to the government of any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to the government of such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act unless the President determines, following consultations with the Committees on Appropriations, that assistance to such country is in the national interest of the United States.

PROHIBITION ON TAXATION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7013. (a) PROHIBITION ON TAXATION.—None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act may be made available to provide assistance for a foreign country under a new bilateral agreement governing the terms and conditions under which such assistance is to be provided unless such agreement includes a provision stating that assistance provided by the United States shall be exempt from taxation, or reimbursed, by the foreign government, and the Secretary of State shall expeditiously seek to negotiate amendments to existing bilateral agreements, as necessary, to conform with this requirement.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT OF FOREIGN TAXES.—An amount equivalent to 200 percent of the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2010 on funds appropriated by this Act by a foreign government or entity against commodities financed under United States assistance programs for which funds are appropriated by this Act, either directly or through grantees, contractors and subcontractors shall be withheld from obligation from funds appropriated for assistance for fiscal year 2011 and allocated for the central government of such country and for the West Bank and Gaza program to the extent that the Secretary of State certifies and reports in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such taxes have not been reimbursed to the Government of the United States.

(c) DE MINIMIS EXCEPTION.—Foreign taxes of a de minimis nature shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (b).

(d) REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS.—Funds withheld from obligation for each country or entity pursuant to subsection (b) shall be reprogrammed for assistance to countries which do not assess taxes on United States assistance or which have an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes.

(e) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any country or entity the Secretary of State determines—

(A) does not assess taxes on United States assistance or which has an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes; or

(B) the foreign policy interests of the United States outweigh the purpose of this section to ensure that United States assistance is not subject to taxation.

(2) The Secretary of State shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to exercising the authority of this subsection with regard to any country or entity.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall issue rules, regulations, or policy guidance, as appropriate, to implement the prohibition against the taxation of assistance contained in this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the terms ''taxes'' and ''taxation'' refer to value added taxes and customs duties imposed on commodities financed with United States assistance for programs for which funds are appropriated by this Act; and

(2) the term ''bilateral agreement'' refers to a framework bilateral agreement between the Government of the United States and the government of the country receiving assistance that describes the privileges and immunities applicable to United States foreign assistance for such country generally, or an individual agreement between the Government of the United States and such government that describes, among other things, the treatment for tax purposes that will be accorded the United States assistance provided under that agreement.

RESERVATIONS OF FUNDS

SEC. 7014. (a) Funds appropriated under titles II through VI of this Act which are specifically designated may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the designation if compliance with the designation is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That assistance that is reprogrammed pursuant to this subsection shall be made available under the same terms and conditions as originally provided.

(b) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a), the original period of availability of funds appropriated by this Act and administered by the United States Agency for International Development that are specifically designated for particular programs or activities by this or any other Act shall be extended for an additional fiscal year if the Administrator of such agency determines and reports promptly to the Committees on Appropriations that the termination of assistance to a country or a significant change in circumstances makes it unlikely that such designated funds can be obligated during the original period of availability: *Provided*, That such designated funds that continue to be available for an additional fiscal year shall be obligated only for the purpose of such designation.

(c) Ceilings and specifically designated funding levels contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs: *Provided*, That specifically designated funding levels or minimum funding requirements contained in any other Act shall not be applicable to funds appropriated by this Act.

REPROGRAMMING NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 7015. (a) None of the funds made available in title I of this Act, or in prior appropriations Acts to the agencies and departments funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2010, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or of currency reflows or other offsetting collections, or made available by transfer, to the agencies and departments funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) closes or opens a mission or post; (6) reorganizes or renames offices; (7) reorganizes programs or activities; or (8) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) For the purposes of providing the executive branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds provided under title I of this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agency or department funded under title I of this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2010, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agency or department funded by title I of this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel, which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) For the purposes of providing the executive branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds made available under titles II through V in this Act under the headings ''Global Health and Child Survival'', ''Development Assistance'', ''International Organizations and Programs'', ''Trade and Development Agency'', ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', ''Economic Support Fund'', ''Democracy Fund'', ''Peacekeeping Operations'', ''Capital Investment Fund'', ''Operating Expenses'', ''Civilian Stabilization Initiative'', ''Office of Inspector General'', ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'', ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', ''International Military Education and Training'',

''Peace Corps'', and ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operations not justified or in excess of the amount justified to the Committees on Appropriations for obligation under any of these specific headings unless the Committees on Appropriations are previously notified 15 days in advance: *Provided*, That the President shall not enter into any commitment of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for the provision of major defense equipment, other than conventional ammunition, or other major defense items defined to be aircraft, ships, missiles, or combat vehicles, not previously justified to Congress or 20 percent in excess of the quantities justified to Congress unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such commitment: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to any reprogramming for an activity, program, or project for which funds are appropriated under titles II through IV of this Act of less than 10 percent of the amount previously justified to the Congress for obligation for such activity, program, or project for the current fiscal year.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds transferred by the Department of Defense to the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, and funds made available for programs authorized by section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(e) The requirements of this section or any similar provision of this Act or any other Act, including any prior Act requiring notification in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare: *Provided*, That in case of any such waiver, notification to the Congress, or the appropriate congressional committees, shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: *Provided further*, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

(f) None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act shall be obligated or expended for assistance for Serbia, Sudan, Zimbabwe, Pakistan, Dominican Republic, Cuba, Iran, Haiti, Libya, Ethiopia, Nepal, Colombia, Mexico, Kazakhstan, or Cambodia and countries listed in section 7045(c)(2) and (f)(2) of this Act except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 7016. Prior to providing excess Department of Defense articles in accordance with section 516(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations to the same extent and under the same conditions as other committees pursuant to subsection (f) of that section: *Provided*, That before issuing a letter of offer to sell excess defense articles under the Arms Export Control Act, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the regular notification procedures of such Committees if such defense articles are significant military equipment (as defined in section 47(9) of the Arms Export Control Act) or are valued (in terms of original acquisition cost) at $7,000,000 or more, or if notification is required elsewhere in this Act for the use of appropriated funds for specific countries that would receive such excess defense articles: *Provided further*, That such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 7017. Subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act or any previously enacted Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, which are returned or not made available for organizations and programs because of the implementation of section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

SEC. 7018. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated or expended for any country or organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by any such country or organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilizations.

ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 7019. (a) Funds provided in this Act for the following accounts shall be made available for programs and countries in the amounts contained in the respective tables included in the report accompanying this Act:

''Civilian Stabilization Initiative''.

''Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs''.

''International Fisheries Commissions''.

''International Broadcasting Operations''.

''Global Health and Child Survival''.

''Economic Support Fund''.

''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia''.

''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement''.

''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs''.

''Foreign Military Financing Program''.

''Peacekeeping Operations''.

''International Organizations and Programs''.

(b) For the purposes of implementing this section and only with respect to the tables included in the report accompanying this Act, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, as appropriate, may propose deviations to the amounts referenced in subsection (a), subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) The requirements contained in subsection (a) shall apply to the table under the heading ''Bilateral Economic Assistance'' in such report.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES

SEC. 7020. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the headings ''International Military Education and Training'' or ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' for Informational Program activities or under the headings ''Global Health and Child Survival'', ''Development Assistance'', and ''Economic Support Fund'' may be obligated or expended to pay for—

(1) alcoholic beverages; or

(2) entertainment expenses for activities that are substantially of a recreational character, including but not limited to entrance fees at sporting events, theatrical and musical productions, and amusement parks.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT EXPORT LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 7021. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by titles III through VI of this Act may be available to any foreign government which provides lethal military equipment to a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that supports international terrorism for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979. The prohibition under this section with respect to a foreign government shall terminate 12 months after that government ceases to provide such military equipment. This section applies with respect to lethal military equipment provided under a contract entered into after October 1, 1997.

(b) Assistance restricted by subsection (a) or any other similar provision of law, may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) Whenever the President makes a determination pursuant to subsection (b), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of such assistance. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided, including the estimated dollar amount of such assistance, and an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national interests.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 7022. (a) Funds appropriated for bilateral assistance under any heading in titles III through VI of this Act and funds appropriated under any such heading in a provision of law enacted prior to the enactment of this Act, shall not be made available to any country which the President determines—

(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism; or

(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

(b) The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 7023. Funds appropriated by this Act, except funds appropriated under the heading ''Trade and Development Agency'', may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

SEC. 7024. For the purpose of titles II through VI of this Act ''program, project, and activity'' shall be defined at the appropriations Act account level and shall include all appropriations and authorizations Acts funding directives, ceilings, and limitations with the exception that for the following accounts: ''Economic Support Fund'' and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the development assistance accounts of the United States Agency for International Development ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include central, country, regional, and program level funding, either as: (1) justified to the Congress; or (2) allocated by the executive branch in accordance with a report, to be provided to the Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, as required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 7025. Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this or any other Act, including provisions contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, shall not be construed to prohibit activities authorized by or conducted under the Peace Corps Act, the Inter-American Foundation Act or the African Development Foundation Act. The agency shall promptly report to the Committees on Appropriations whenever it is conducting activities or is proposing to conduct activities in a country for which assistance is prohibited.

COMMERCE, TRADE AND SURPLUS COMMODITIES

SEC. 7026. (a) None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act for direct assistance and none of the funds otherwise made available to the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall be obligated or expended to finance any loan, any assistance or any other financial commitments for establishing or expanding production of any commodity for export by any country other than the United States, if the commodity is likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity is expected to become operative and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity: *Provided*, That such prohibition shall not apply to the Export-Import Bank if in the judgment of its Board of Directors the benefits to industry and employment in the United States are likely to outweigh the injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity, and the Chairman of the Board so notifies the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available for any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training in connection with the growth or production in a foreign country of an agricultural commodity for export which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not prohibit—

(1) activities designed to increase food security in developing countries where such activities will not have a significant impact on the export of agricultural commodities of the United States; or

(2) research activities intended primarily to benefit American producers.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the North American Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the African Development Bank, and the African Development Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any assistance by these institutions, using funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act, for the production or extraction of any commodity or mineral for export, if it is in surplus on world markets and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 7027. (a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES.—

(1) If assistance is furnished to the government of a foreign country under chapters 1 and 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under agreements which result in the generation of local currencies of that country, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

(A) require that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by that government;

(B) enter into an agreement with that government which sets forth—

(i) the amount of the local currencies to be generated; and

(ii) the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, consistent with this section; and

(C) establish by agreement with that government the responsibilities of the United States Agency for International Development and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account.

(2) USES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES.—As may be agreed upon with the foreign government, local currencies deposited in a separate account pursuant to subsection (a), or an equivalent amount of local currencies, shall be used only—

(A) to carry out chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), for such purposes as—

(i) project and sector assistance activities; or

(ii) debt and deficit financing; or

(B) for the administrative requirements of the United States Government.

(3) PROGRAMMING ACCOUNTABILITY.—The United States Agency for International Development shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the equivalent of the local currencies disbursed pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A) from the separate account established pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are used for the purposes agreed upon pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

(4) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Upon termination of assistance to a country under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), any unencumbered balances of funds which remain in a separate account established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disposed of for such purposes as may be agreed to by the government of that country and the United States Government.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall report on an annual basis as part of the justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of local currencies for the administrative requirements of the United States Government as authorized in subsection (a)(2)(B), and such report shall include the amount of local currency (and United States dollar equivalent) used and/or to be used for such purpose in each applicable country.

(b) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.—

(1) If assistance is made available to the government of a foreign country, under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as cash transfer assistance or as nonproject sector assistance, that country shall be required to maintain such funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law which are inconsistent with the nature of this assistance including provisions which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (House Report No. 98–1159).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—At least 15 days prior to obligating any such cash transfer or nonproject sector assistance, the President shall submit a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, which shall include a detailed description of how the funds proposed to be made available will be used, with a discussion of the United States interests that will be served by the assistance (including, as appropriate, a description of the economic policy reforms that will be promoted by such assistance).

(4) EXEMPTION.—Nonproject sector assistance funds may be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b)(1) only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7028. (a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1, 10, 11, and 12 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and from funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'': *Provided*, That before using the authority of this subsection to furnish assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations, the President shall notify the Committees on Appropriations under the regular notification procedures of those committees, including a description of the program to be assisted, the assistance to be provided, and the reasons for furnishing such assistance: *Provided further*, That nothing in

this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or involuntary sterilizations contained in this or any other Act.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 480.—During fiscal year 2010, restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to carry out title I of such Act and made available pursuant to this subsection may be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply—

(1) with respect to section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that support international terrorism; or

(2) with respect to section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to the government of a country that violates internationally recognized human rights.

IMPACT ON JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 7029. None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act may be obligated or expended to provide—

(1) any financial incentive to a business enterprise currently located in the United States for the purpose of inducing such an enterprise to relocate outside the United States if such incentive or inducement is likely to reduce the number of employees of such business enterprise in the United States because United States production is being replaced by such enterprise outside the United States; or

(2) assistance for any program, project, or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 507(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, of workers in the recipient country, including any designated zone or area in that country: *Provided*, That the application of section 507(4)(D) and (E) of such Act should be commensurate with the level of development of the recipient country and sector, and shall not preclude assistance for the informal sector in such country, micro and small-scale enterprise, and smallholder agriculture.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 7030. (a) None of the funds appropriated in title V of this Act may be made as payment to any international financial institution while the United States Executive Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate which, together with whatever compensation such Director receives from the United States, is in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, or while any alternate United States Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to oppose any loan, grant, strategy or policy of these institutions that would require user fees or service charges on poor people for primary education or primary healthcare, including prevention, care and treatment for HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and infant, child, and maternal well-being, in connection with the institutions' financing programs.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any loan, project, agreement, memorandum, instrument, plan, or other program of the Fund to a Heavily Indebted Poor Country that imposes budget caps or restraints that do not allow the maintenance of or an increase in governmental spending on health care or education; and to promote government spending on health care, education, food aid, or other critical safety net programs in all of the Fund's activities with respect to Heavily Indebted Poor Countries.

(d) For purposes of this section ''international financial institutions'' are the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the International Monetary Fund, the North American Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 7031. In order to enhance the continued participation of nongovernmental organizations in debt-for-development and debt-for-nature exchanges, a nongovernmental organization which is a grantee or contractor of the United States Agency for International Development may place in interest bearing accounts local currencies which accrue to that organization as a result of economic assistance provided under title III of this Act and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, any interest earned on such investment shall be used for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN DEBT BUYBACKS OR SALES

SEC. 7032. (a) LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR SALE, REDUCTION, OR CANCELLATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO SELL, REDUCE, OR CANCEL CERTAIN LOANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, in accordance with this section, sell to any eligible purchaser any concessional loan or portion thereof made before January 1, 1995, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to the government of any eligible country as defined in section 702(6) of that Act or on receipt of payment from an eligible purchaser, reduce or cancel such loan or portion thereof, only for the purpose of facilitating—

(A) debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps; or

(B) a debt buyback by an eligible country of its own qualified debt, only if the eligible country uses an additional amount of the local currency of the eligible country, equal to not less than 40 percent of the price paid for such debt by such eligible country, or the difference between the price paid for such debt and the face value of such debt, to support activities that link conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with local community development, and child survival and other child development, in a manner consistent with sections 707 through 710 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, if the sale, reduction, or cancellation would not contravene any term or condition of any prior agreement relating to such loan.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall, in accordance with this section, establish the terms and conditions under which loans may be sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Facility, as defined in section 702(8) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall notify the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of purchasers that the President has determined to be eligible, and shall direct such agency to carry out the sale, reduction, or cancellation of a loan pursuant to this section. Such agency shall make adjustment in its accounts to reflect the sale, reduction, or cancellation.

(4) LIMITATION.—The authorities of this subsection shall be available only to the extent that appropriations for the cost of the modification, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, are made in advance.

(b) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the sale, reduction, or cancellation of any loan sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the United States Government account or accounts established for the repayment of such loan.

(c) ELIGIBLE PURCHASERS.—A loan may be sold pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) only to a purchaser who presents plans satisfactory to the President for using the loan for the purpose of engaging in debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(d) DEBTOR CONSULTATIONS.—Before the sale to any eligible purchaser, or any reduction or cancellation pursuant to this section, of any loan made to an eligible country, the President should consult with the country concerning the amount of loans to be sold, reduced, or canceled and their uses for debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt Restructuring''.

SPECIAL DEBT RELIEF FOR THE POOREST

SEC. 7033. (a) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE DEBT.—The President may reduce amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by an eligible country as a result of—

(1) guarantees issued under sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(2) credits extended or guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act; or

(3) any obligation or portion of such obligation, to pay for purchases of United States agricultural commodities guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under export credit guarantee programs authorized pursuant to section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of June 29, 1948, as amended, section 4(b) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89–808), or section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended (Public Law 95–501).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only to implement multilateral official debt relief and referendum agreements, commonly referred to as ''Paris Club Agreed Minutes''.

(2) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only in such amounts or to such extent as is provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

(3) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to countries with heavy debt burdens that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as ''IDA-only'' countries.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to a country whose government—

(1) does not have an excessive level of military expenditures;

(2) has not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;

(3) is not failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters;

(4) (including its military or other security forces) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and

(5) is not ineligible for assistance because of the application of section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt Restructuring''.

(e) CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS INAPPLICABLE.—A reduction of debt pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered assistance for the purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country. The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or section 321 of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 7034. (a) AFGHANISTAN, IRAQ, PAKISTAN, LEBANON, MONTENEGRO, VICTIMS OF WAR, DISPLACED CHILDREN, AND DISPLACED BURMESE.—Funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act that are made available for assistance for Afghanistan may be made available notwithstanding section 7012 of this Act or any similar provision of law and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and funds appropriated in titles III and VI of this Act that are made available for Iraq, Lebanon, Montenegro, Pakistan, and for victims of war, displaced children, and displaced Burmese, and to assist victims of trafficking in persons and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, to combat such trafficking, may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b)(1) WAIVER.—The President may waive the provisions of section 1003 of Public Law 100–204 if the President determines and certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that it is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(c) SMALL BUSINESS.—In entering into multiple award indefinite-quantity contracts with funds appropriated by this Act, the United States Agency for International Development may provide an exception to the fair opportunity process for placing task orders under such contracts when the order is placed with any category of small or small disadvantaged business.

(d) VIETNAMESE REFUGEES.—Section 594(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2005 (enacted as division D of Public Law 108–447; 118 Stat. 3038) is amended by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2011''.

(e) RECONSTITUTING CIVILIAN POLICE AUTHORITY.—In providing assistance with funds appropriated by this Act under section 660(b)(6) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, support for a nation emerging from instability may be deemed to mean support for regional, district, municipal, or other subnational entity emerging from instability, as well as a nation emerging from instability.

(f) INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONDITIONS.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 11 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, shall be made available notwithstanding section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for assistance to address inhumane conditions in prisons and other detention facilities administered by foreign governments that the Secretary of State determines are making efforts to address, among other things, prisoners' health, sanitation, nutrition and other basic needs.

(g) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101–167) is amended—

(1) in section 599D (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''and 2009'' and inserting ''2009, and 2010''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''2009'' each place it appears and inserting ''2010''; and

(2) in section 599E (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2010''.

(h) WORLD FOOD PROGRAM.—Of the funds managed by the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development, from this or any other Act, not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available as a general contribution to the World Food Program, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(i) DISARMAMENT, DEMOBILIZATION AND REINTEGRATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, regulation or Executive order, funds appropriated by this Act and prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'', ''Peacekeeping Operations'', ''International Disaster Assistance'', and ''Transition Initiatives'' should be made available to support programs to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate into civilian society former members of foreign terrorist organizations: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of funds pursuant to this subsection: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this subsection the term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means an organization designated as a terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(j) PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH AND TRAINING ON EASTERN EUROPE AND THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.—Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading, ''Economic Support Fund'', not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available to carry out the Program for Research and Training on Eastern Europe and the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (title VIII) as authorized by the Soviet-Eastern European Research and Training Act of 1983 (22 U.S.C. 4501–4508, as amended).

(k) MIDDLE EAST FOUNDATION.—Funds appropriated by this Act and prior Acts for a Middle East Foundation shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(l) INTERPARLIAMENTARY EXCHANGES.—Of the unobligated funds in the ''Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs'' appropriation account, $411,687 shall be transferred to the permanent appropriation for delegation expenses provided under Section 303 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1988, as enacted into law by section 101(a) of Public Law 100-202 (22 USC 276e Note), for the purpose of conducting Interparliamentary Exchanges and shall remain available until expended.

ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

SEC. 7035. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Arab League boycott of Israel, and the secondary boycott of American firms that have commercial ties with Israel, is an impediment to peace in the region and to United States investment and trade in the Middle East and North Africa;

(2) the Arab League boycott, which was regrettably reinstated in 1997, should be immediately and publicly terminated, and the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel immediately disbanded;

(3) all Arab League states should normalize relations with their neighbor Israel;

(4) the President and the Secretary of State should continue to vigorously oppose the Arab League boycott of Israel and find concrete steps to demonstrate that opposition by, for example, taking into consideration the participation of any recipient country in the boycott when determining to sell weapons to said country; and

(5) the President should report to Congress annually on specific steps being taken by the United States to encourage Arab League states to normalize their relations with Israel to bring about the termination of the Arab League boycott of Israel, including those to encourage allies and trading partners of the United States to enact laws prohibiting businesses from complying with the boycott and penalizing businesses that do comply.

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD

SEC. 7036. (a) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act may be provided to support a Palestinian state unless the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the governing entity of a new Palestinian state—

(A) has demonstrated a firm commitment to peaceful co-existence with the State of Israel;

(B) is taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism and terrorist financing in the West Bank and Gaza, including the dismantling of terrorist infrastructures, and is cooperating with appropriate Israeli and other appropriate security organizations; and

(2) the Palestinian Authority (or the governing entity of a new Palestinian state) is working with other countries in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East that will enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relationships, which should include—

(A) termination of all claims or states of belligerency;

(B) respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

(C) their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

(D) freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; and

(E) a framework for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the governing entity should enact a constitution assuring the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and respect for human rights for its citizens, and should enact other laws and regulations assuring transparent and accountable governance.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) if he determines that it is important to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(d) EXEMPTION.—The restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply to assistance intended to help reform the Palestinian Authority and affiliated institutions, or the governing entity, in order to help meet the requirements of subsection (a), consistent with the provisions of section 7040 of this Act (''Limitation on Assistance to the Palestinian Authority'').

RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 7037. None of the funds appropriated under titles II through VI of this Act may be obligated or expended to create in any part of Jerusalem a new office of any department or agency of the United States Government for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with the Palestinian Authority over Gaza and Jericho or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the acquisition of additional space for the existing Consulate General in Jerusalem: *Provided further*, That meetings between officers and employees of the United States and officials of the Palestinian Authority, or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with such authority should continue to take place in locations other than Jerusalem. As has been true in the past, officers and employees of the United States Government may continue to meet in Jerusalem on other subjects with Palestinians (including those who now occupy positions in the Palestinian Authority), have social contacts, and have incidental discussions.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 7038. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

SEC. 7039. (a) OVERSIGHT.—For fiscal year 2010, 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program, the Secretary of State shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations that procedures have been established to assure the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to appropriate United States financial information in order to review the uses of United States assistance for the Program funded under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for the West Bank and Gaza.

(b) VETTING.—Prior to the obligation of funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, the Secretary of State shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that such assistance is not provided to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that the Secretary knows or has reason to believe advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity nor, with respect to private entities or educational institutions, those that have as a principal officer of the entity's governing board or governing board of trustees any individual that has been determined to be involved in, or advocating terrorist activity or determined to be a member of a designated foreign terrorist organization. The Secretary of State shall, as appropriate, establish procedures specifying the steps to be taken in carrying out this subsection and shall terminate assistance to any individual, entity, or educational institution which the Secretary has determined to be involved in or advocating terrorist activity.

(c) PROHIBITION.—

(1) None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act for assistance under the West Bank and Gaza Program may be made available for the purpose of recognizing or otherwise honoring individuals who commit, or have committed acts of terrorism.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this or prior appropriations act, including funds made available by transfer, may be made available for obligation for security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza until the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations on the benchmarks that have been established for security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza and reports on the extent of Palestinian compliance with such benchmarks.

(d) AUDITS.—

(1) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that Federal or non-Federal audits of all contractors and grantees, and significant subcontractors and sub-grantees, under the West Bank and Gaza Program, are conducted at least on an annual basis to ensure, among other things, compliance with this section.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act up to $500,000 may be used by the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development for audits, inspections, and other activities in furtherance of the requirements of this subsection. Such funds are in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes.

(e) Subsequent to the certification specified in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit and an investigation of the treatment, handling, and uses of all funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program, including all funds provided as cash transfer assistance, in fiscal year 2010 under the heading ''Economic Support Fund''. The audit shall address—

(1) the extent to which such Program complies with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), and

(2) an examination of all programs, projects, and activities carried out under such Program, including both obligations and expenditures.

(f) Funds made available in this Act for West Bank and Gaza shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(g) Not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations updating the report contained in section 2106 of chapter 2 of title II of Public Law 109–13.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 7040. (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended with respect to providing funds to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition included in subsection (a) shall not apply if the President certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations that waiving such prohibition is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(c) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to subsection (b) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT.—Whenever the waiver authority pursuant to subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the justification for the waiver, the purposes for which the funds will be spent, and the accounting procedures in place to ensure that the funds are properly disbursed. The report shall also detail the steps the Palestinian Authority has taken to arrest terrorists, confiscate weapons and dismantle the terrorist infrastructure.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—If the President exercises the waiver authority under subsection (b), the Secretary of State must certify and report to the Committees on Appropriations prior to the obligation of funds that the Palestinian Authority has established a single treasury account for all Palestinian Authority financing and all financing mechanisms flow through this account, no parallel financing mechanisms exist outside of the Palestinian Authority treasury account, and there is a single comprehensive civil service roster and payroll.

(f) PROHIBITION TO HAMAS AND THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION.—

(1) None of the funds appropriated in titles III through VI of this Act may be obligated for salaries of personnel of the Palestinian Authority located in Gaza or may be obligated or expended for assistance to Hamas or any entity effectively controlled by Hamas or any power-sharing government of which Hamas is a member.

(2) Notwithstanding the limitation of subsection (1), assistance may be provided to a power-sharing government only if the President certifies and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that such government, including all of its ministers or such equivalent, has publicly accepted and is complying with the principles contained in section 620K(b)(1)(A) and (B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

(3) The President may exercise the authority in section 620K(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act as added by the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-446) with respect to this subsection.

(4) Whenever the certification pursuant to paragraph (2) is exercised, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations within 120 days of the certification and every quarter thereafter on whether such government, including all of its ministers or such equivalent are continuing to comply with the principles contained in section 620K(b)(1) (A) and (B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The report shall also detail the amount, purposes and delivery mechanisms for any assistance provided pursuant to the abovementioned certification and a full accounting of any direct support of such government.

(5) None of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI of this Act may be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization.

□ 1645

Mrs. LOWEY (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 126, line 19, be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. 7041. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to finance any assistance to Saudi Arabia unless the President certifies that Saudi Arabia

is fully cooperating with efforts to combat international terrorism and such assistance will facilitate these efforts.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. I have an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. WEINER:

Page 126, beginning on line 23, strike ''unless the President certifies that Saudi Arabia is fully cooperating with efforts to combat international terrorism and such assistance will facilitate these efforts''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I thank the Chair and I thank the body for its patience, allowing me to breathlessly run over and offer my amendment.

Let me begin with a noncontroversial statement. The American people and this body of their representatives believes that there should be no money, no taxpayer dollars, going from the people of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

I can say that with some confidence because in fiscal year 2007, 312 Members said so. In fiscal year 2006, 293 Members said so. I can say that with some certitude because the bill we have before us says that no money in this bill will go to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Yet, despite the fact that we in this House keep expressing that sentiment loudly and clearly, for reasons that would be mysterious anyplace else but Washington, money continues to flow. That has to stop.

The reason it happens, by the way, is because we always feel this sense that we have to include language in the bill offering an exemption, a loophole you can drive a truck through, that says: Unless the President says so.

Well, I have news for you, my colleagues. Democrat and Republican alike, Presidents seem to develop a love affair with the notion of Saudi Arabia based on what they say. They say they want to be friends to the United States. They say they want to be a fulcrum against terrorism. They say they want to be a moderate force in the Middle East. And yet, year after year, we see evidence that they do the opposite.

We know this, for example, by reading the human rights reports over the last several years that see more and more stories like the one of a 75-year-old woman being sentenced to be lashed nearly to death for having the audacity of being in a home of two unrelated men.

We know, based on research that was done this year by my office, that they continue to teach hate in their textbooks now; things that teach ninth-graders, for example, to say things like, The hour of judgment will not come until the Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. If there is a Jew behind me, come kill him. This is what ninth-graders are being taught.

We know, for example, that 15 of the 19 homicide bombers that attacked my city on September 11th were Saudis, and we also know, based on evidence that came out in the lawsuit against the Saudi Government, that these were agents that were not acting apart from the Saudi Government but, in many cases, were intertwined.

So my amendment does something simple. It takes the very good work of the Chair of the subcommittee that says, No money, and takes out the loophole. Because, to be honest with you, even if the administration certifies something, I can tell you already that the United States Department of International Narcotics Control Strategy said in February of this year that the Saudis were responsible for laundering money that ''continues,'' in their words, ''to be a significant jurisdictional source for terrorism financing worldwide.''

If you believe that there should not be money going to the Saudis, like I guarantee your constituents do, you have to vote ''yes'' on the Weiner amendment. If you want to kind of have it both ways, that you get to vote and then but you really want the money to go, then vote ''no.'' But I believe overwhelmingly in a bipartisan way in this House we have made it clear.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. It's important to get the facts out as to what this foreign assistance is. This is simply American-to-Saudi joint military training. This is an opportunity for Americans and Saudis to work in concert so that we can continue to build a bridge with our historic ally so that we can be in a better position to influence Saudi society and we can learn from them what they have to offer.

The fact is that this particular amendment does not bring America safety, doesn't bring it security. It brings it the opposite.

This new administration, this new Congress is about opening a new era of foreign policy, a new page in diplomacy that is smarter, more respectful of other countries, more appreciative of our allies. Saudi Arabia is one of the most important allies in the Middle East.

King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia is one who proposed the Arab Peace Initiative, which has recently been endorsed by the Arab League. President Obama himself expressed support for this initiative in the early days of his Presidency.

I would go on, but I do want to yield time to a distinguished Member from Florida, Congressman CRENSHAW, who is here today to offer his views on why this amendment is not good.

Before I yield to the gentleman, let me say that the 2008 U.S. State Department Country Report on Terrorism praised Saudi Arabia in Saudi counterterrorism practices, credited Saudi cooperation with U.S. counterterrorism efforts as significant, and characterized Saudi anti-extremism initiatives as aggressive, directly contrary to the gentleman from New York's representation of what Saudi Arabia is doing.

I urge Members not to perpetuate prejudice, but to try to build a bridge of understanding with the rest of the world.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just give you a little perspective on this. I think we ought to reject this amendment because I think it's the wrong policy.

Every year, the State Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations includes a little bit of foreign assistance for Saudi Arabia. It's usually less than half a million dollars. Some of it's for military training, sometimes it's for counterterrorism. The last couple of years Mr. WEINER has offered an amendment to say we want to restrict that flow of foreign assistance unless the President waives that.

He offered that amendment in 2007 and it passed. Again, it had the language saying unless the President deems in his wisdom that we need to waive that. It passed again in 2008.

So this year, in the bill that we have before us is that language, the language that Mr. WEINER always wanted to put, and we put it in there. It wasn't unanimous, but it's in the bill today. It says that no foreign assistance will be paid to Saudi Arabia unless the President waives that provision.

Now he wants to go a step further and take out that provision that he's always had before and say, Under no circumstances, no circumstances can the President find that there might be a need for foreign assistance to Saudi Arabia.

I don't think he really wants to do that to this new President, who we all hope somehow, some way can negotiate around the world, do a great job of foreign affairs, national security. Give him that option. Why would you want to tie his hands in his first year?

No matter what he thinks, no matter what he thinks is important to the national security of America, he's not going to have the opportunity to exercise his Presidential authority. I think that's a step too far. I think it's wrong. I think we should reject the amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CRENSHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WEINER. I guess the question is what are we doing here. I think what we're doing here with this entire bill is saying what we, the Representatives of

this country, who have the power of the purse, think should and should not be in the bill.

What's the purpose of doing that, I ask the gentleman, if year after year after year, despite the preferences of this Congress, Presidents, Democrat and Republican alike, say, We don't really care what Members of Congress say.

What is this exercise for? Why not have one giant waiver authority on everything and say we don't want to tie his hands. We do want to tie his hands; 319 of us say we do want to tie his hands. And if it wasn't abused year after year, I wouldn't be standing here.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Why did you put, every time the amendment that you always offer to say no foreign assistance unless—unless—the President has a waiver? That's what you've always said.

Mr. WEINER. Actually, that's not true.

Mr. CRENSHAW. And now you want to go one step further. All I'm saying is you got what you wanted.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman would yield, first of all, the last time when it passed the House and died in the Senate, I had the waiver struck in that amendment as well, in fairness.

Mr. ELLISON. I'd like to reclaim the time, Mr. Chair, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida. I actually just want to submit that I see the gentleman has a poster board up there, and it's extremely unfortunate that that poster board, I would submit to the American people, is extremely upsetting to me because, first of all, it has to do with something called Hadith, and that is disputed. It's not necessarily even authentic.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. No, no. I will not yield. I didn't yield, Mr. Chairman. I will not yield.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. So that is the kind of thing that will promote prejudice and religious bigotry. And I'm very ashamed for this body that he would do what he's doing right now.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WEINER. First of all, I would ask the gentleman to observe decorum on the floor, referring to the gentleman in the first person, but I will respond.

Do you know whose words these are? This is the Saudi Arabian Department of Education teaching to its ninth-graders. I did not write this. Now, I did translate it, but I did not write it. If the translation is incorrect, the gentleman will be the first to ever point that out.

But I will say this. The simple question is this for my colleagues: If you want aid to go to Saudi Arabia, if, as the gentleman says, you somehow believe they need our foreign assistance, one of the richest kingdoms, on our blood money, that there is on Earth—

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I would ask the gentlemen to let me continue my point, because it's a good one.

If he believes that our paying $80 a barrel for oil when the Saudis would do nothing to help us with it is a good idea, vote ''no'' on this, but don't say it's because you don't want to tie hands.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. What we want to do here is tie the President's hands to finally live up to what this Congress has said, which is not a dollar, not a shekel, not a pound, not a dime going to the Saudi Arabians of our tax dollars.

Enough is enough. And I think that the gentlelady has it exactly right. No money. And you can't have it both ways. You can't say, Yes, I want no money, but I want there to be some wiggle room.

We want no wiggle room in this case, I say to my colleagues. We want there to be no money going to this nation. They have blood on their hands. They say one thing and do something else. We all know it. 319 of us—and maybe with some help around here we'll get closer to 419 of us—have said, Enough is enough.

Year in and year out. 2004, 217 said no more money; $960,000 went. In 2005, 293; $1.5 million went. 2006, 312 Members said no money, and $319,000.

Have you no sense of dignity around here?

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. Let me just finish. I'm reaching a crescendo.

□ 1700

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IRAQ

SEC. 7042. (a) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—Funds appropriated in this Act for assistance for Iraq shall be made available in accordance with the Department of State's April 9, 2009, ''Guidelines for Government of Iraq Financial Participation in United States Government-Funded Civilian Foreign Assistance Programs and Projects''.

(b) BASE RIGHTS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Government of the United States to enter into a permanent basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

IRAN

SEC. 7043. (a) DIPLOMACY WITH IRAN.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations, in classified form if necessary, on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts aimed at curtailing the pursuit by Iran of nuclear weapons technology.

(b) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK RELATED TO IRAN.—None of the funds made available in Title VI under the headings ''Program Account'' and ''Subsidy Appropriation'' may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to guarantee, insure, or extend credit for any project controlled by an energy producer or refiner that provides the Islamic Republic of Iran with significant refined petroleum resources, that materially contributes to Iran's capability to import refined petroleum resources, or that allows Iran to maintain or expand, in any material respect, its domestic production of refined petroleum resources, including any assistance in refinery construction, modernization, or repair.

(c) SANCTIONS REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations on the status of multilateral and bilateral United States sanctions against Iran and actions taken by the United States and the international community to enforce sanctions against Iran. The report, which may be submitted in classified form if necessary, shall include the following:

(1) A list of all current United States bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran;

(2) A list of all United States and foreign registered entities which the Secretary of State has reason to believe may be in violation of existing United States bilateral and multilateral sanctions;

(3) A detailed description of United States efforts to enforce sanctions, including a list of all investigations initiated in the 12 months preceding the enactment of this Act that have resulted in a determination that a sanctions violation has occurred and United States government actions taken pursuant to the determination;

(4) In the instances when sanctions were waived or otherwise not imposed against entities that were determined to have violated United States bilateral or multilateral sanctions, the reason in each instance of why action was not taken to sanction the entity; and

(5) A description of United States diplomatic efforts to expand bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran and strengthen international efforts to enforce existing sanctions.

LEBANON

SEC. 7044. (a) Funds appropriated under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' in this Act for assistance for Lebanon shall be made available only to professionalize the Lebanese Armed Forces and to strengthen border security and combat terrorism, including training and equipping the Lebanese Armed Forces to secure Lebanon's borders, interdicting arms shipments, preventing the use of Lebanon as a safe haven for terrorist groups and implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701.

(b) None of the funds in subsection (a) may be made available for obligation until after the Secretary of State provides the Committees on Appropriations a detailed spending plan, which shall include a strategy for professionalizing the Lebanese Armed Forces, strengthening border security and combating terrorism in Lebanon.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

SEC. 7045. (a) FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Of the funds appropriated by this Act not less than $10,000,000 from ''Development Assistance'' and not less than $10,000,000 from

''Economic Support Fund'' shall be made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities relating to the free trade agreements with countries of Central America, Peru and the Dominican Republic.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI.—

(1) The Government of Haiti shall be eligible to purchase defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), for the Coast Guard.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under titles III and IV, not less than $300,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Haiti.

(3) None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' may be used to transfer excess weapons, ammunition or other lethal property of an agency of the United States Government to the Government of Haiti for use by the Haitian National Police until the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations that any members of the Haitian National Police who have been credibly alleged to have committed serious crimes, including drug trafficking and violations of internationally recognized human rights, have been suspended.

(c) CARIBBEAN BASIN SECURITY INITIATIVE.—Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Development Assistance'', ''Economic Support Fund'', ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' in this Act, up to $37,000,000 may be made available to provide equipment and training for counter-narcotics forces to combat drug trafficking and related violence and organized crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, education, anti-corruption, rule of law activities, and maritime security, of which not less than $21,100,000 shall be made available for social justice and education programs to include vocational training, workforce development and juvenile justice activities: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this subsection shall be made available for budget support or as cash payments.—

(1) SPENDING PLAN.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a detailed spending plan for funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the countries of the Caribbean Basin by this Act, with concrete goals, actions to be taken, budget proposals, and anticipated results.

(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ''countries of the Caribbean Basin'' means Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago.

(d) ASSISTANCE FOR GUATEMALA.—

(1) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' not less than $3,000,000 shall be made available for a United States contribution to the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG).

(2) Funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'' (IMET) that are available for assistance for Guatemala, other than for expanded IMET, may be made available only for the Guatemalan Air Force, Navy and Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided*, That assistance for the Army Corps of Engineers shall only be available for training to improve disaster response capabilities and to participate in international peacekeeping operations: *Provided further*, That such funds may be made available only if the Secretary of State certifies that the Air Force, Navy and Army Corps of Engineers are respecting internationally recognized human rights and cooperating with civilian judicial investigations and prosecutions of current and retired military personnel who have been credibly alleged to have committed violations of such rights, and with the CICIG by granting access to CICIG personnel, providing evidence to CICIG, and allowing witness testimony.

(3) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', not more than $1,000,000 may be made available for the Guatemalan Air Force, Navy and Army Corps of Engineers: *Provided*, That assistance for the Army Corps of Engineers shall only be available for training to improve disaster response capabilities and to participate in international peacekeeping operations: *Provided further*, That such funds may be made available only if the Secretary of State certifies that the Air Force, Navy and Army Corps of Engineers are respecting internationally recognized human rights and cooperating with civilian judicial investigations and prosecutions of current and retired military personnel who have been credibly alleged to have committed violations of such rights, including protecting and providing to the Attorney General's office all military archives pertaining to the internal armed conflict, and cooperating with the CICIG by granting access to CICIG personnel, providing evidence to CICIG, and allowing witness testimony.

(e) ASSISTANCE FOR MEXICO.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', and ''Economic Support Fund'' in this Act, not more than $235,825,000 may be made available for assistance for Mexico, only to combat drug trafficking and related violence and organized crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, anti-corruption, and rule of law activities: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this subsection shall be made available for budget support or as cash payments.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF FISCAL YEAR 2009 PROVISIONS.—The provisions of paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 7045(e) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111-8) shall apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for assistance for Mexico to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions of law applied to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by such other Act for assistance for Mexico.

(f) ASSISTANCE FOR THE COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.—Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', $83,000,000 may be made available for assistance for the countries of Central America only to combat drug trafficking and related violence and organized crime, and for judicial reform, institution building, anti-corruption, rule of law activities, and maritime security: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this subsection shall be made available for budget support or as cash payments.

(1) APPLICABILITY OF FISCAL YEAR 2009 PROVISIONS.—The provisions of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 7045(f) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111-8) shall apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for assistance for countries of Central America to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions of law applied to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by such other Act for assistance for the countries of Central America.

(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ''countries of Central America'' means Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama.

(g) AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the costs of operations and maintenance, including fuel, of aircraft funded by this Act should be borne by the recipient country.

COLOMBIA

SEC. 7046. (a) ASSISTANCE FOR COLOMBIA.—Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'', ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', ''International Military Education and Training'', and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' in this Act, not more than $520,000,000 shall be available for assistance for Colombia.

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) Funds appropriated by this Act and made available to the Department of State for assistance to the Government of Colombia may be used to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking and organizations designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations and successor organizations, and to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations: *Provided*, That assistance made available in prior Acts for the Government of Colombia to protect the Cano-Limon pipeline may also be used for purposes for which funds are made available under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'': *Provided further*, That no United States Armed Forces personnel or United States civilian contractor employed by the United States will participate in any combat operation in connection with assistance made available by this Act for Colombia: *Provided further*, That rotary and fixed wing aircraft supported with funds appropriated under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' for assistance for Colombia may be used for aerial or manual drug eradication and interdiction including to transport personnel and supplies and to provide security for such operations, and to provide transport in support of alternative development programs and investigations of cases under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, the Procuraduria General de la Nacion, and the Defensoria del Pueblo: *Provided further*, That the President shall ensure that if any helicopter procured with funds in this Act or prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, is used to aid or abet the operations of any illegal self-defense group, paramilitary organization, illegal security cooperative or successor organizations in Colombia, such helicopter shall be immediately returned to the United States.

(2) Of the funds available under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' in this Act for the Colombian national police for the procurement of chemicals for aerial coca and poppy eradication programs, not more than 20 percent of such funds may be made available for such eradication programs unless the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that: (1) the herbicide is being used in accordance with EPA label requirements for comparable use in the United States and with Colombian laws; and (2) the herbicide, in the manner it is being used, does not pose unreasonable risks or adverse effects to humans or the environment, including endemic species: *Provided*, That such funds may not

be made available unless the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that complaints of harm to health or licit crops caused by such aerial eradication are thoroughly evaluated and fair compensation is being paid in a timely manner for meritorious claims: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be made available for such purposes unless programs are being implemented by the United States Agency for International Development, the Government of Colombia, or other organizations, in consultation and coordination with local communities, to provide alternative sources of income in areas where security permits for small-acreage growers and communities whose illicit crops are targeted for aerial eradication: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for assistance for Colombia shall be made available for the cultivation or processing of African oil palm, if doing so would contribute to significant loss of native species, disrupt or contaminate natural water sources, reduce local food security, or cause the forced displacement of local people: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this Act may be used for aerial eradication in Colombia's national parks or reserves only if the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations on a case-by-case basis that there are no effective alternatives and the eradication is conducted in accordance with Colombian laws.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF FISCAL YEAR 2009 PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of subsections (b) through (f) of section 7046 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2009 (division H of Public Law 111-8) shall apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for assistance for Colombia to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions of law applied to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by such other Act for assistance for Colombia.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The following provisions of section 7046 of division H of Public Law 111-8 shall apply to funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for assistance for Colombia as follows:

(A) Subsection (b)(1)(B) is amended by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iv) That the Government of Colombia is respecting the rights of human rights defenders, journalists, trade unionists, political opposition and religious leaders, and indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities, and the Colombian Armed Forces are implementing procedures to distinguish between civilians, including displaced persons, and combatants in their operations.''.

(B) Subsection (b)(2) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2009'' and inserting ''July 31, 2010''.

(C) Subsection (b)(3) is amended by striking ''Andean Counterdrug Programs'' and inserting ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement''.

(D) Subsection (c) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2009'' and inserting ''September 30, 2010''.

(E) Subsection (d)(1) is amended—

(i) by striking ''$16,769,000'' and inserting ''$18,606,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''fiscal year 2009'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2010''.

COMMUNITY-BASED POLICE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7047. (a) AUTHORITY.—Funds made available by titles III and IV of this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapters 4 and 6 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of that Act, to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of civilian police authority through training and technical assistance in human rights, the rule of law, anti-corruption, strategic planning, and through assistance to foster civilian police roles that support democratic governance including assistance for programs to prevent conflict, respond to disasters, address gender-based violence, and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

SEC. 7048. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations or, from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the costs for participation of another country's delegation at international conferences held under the auspices of multilateral or international organizations.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS DRAWDOWN

SEC. 7049. If the President determines that doing so will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international humanitarian law, the President may direct a drawdown pursuant to section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of up to $30,000,000 of commodities and services for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal established with regard to the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations Security Council or such other tribunals or commissions as the Council may establish or authorize to deal with such violations, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof: *Provided*, That the determination required under this section shall be in lieu of any determinations otherwise required under section 552(c): *Provided further*, That funds shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS

SEC. 7050. None of the funds made available under title I of this Act may be used for any United Nations undertaking when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that: (1) the United Nations undertaking is a peacekeeping mission; (2) such undertaking will involve United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national; and (3) the President's military advisors have not submitted to the President a recommendation that such involvement is in the national interests of the United States and the President has not submitted to the Congress such a recommendation.

PEACEKEEPING ASSESSMENT

SEC. 7051. Section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, (22 U.S.C. 287e note) is amended by striking clause (v) and inserting in lieu thereof:

''(v) For assessments made during each of the calendar years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, 27.1 percent.''.

UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

SEC. 7052. The Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2010, on the resolutions proposed and adopted in the United Nations Human Rights Council: *Provided*, That the report shall include a summary of each proposed and adopted resolution; the sponsor and a record of how member nations voted.

ATTENDANCE AT INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

SEC. 7053. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees of agencies or departments of the United States Government who are stationed in the United States, at any single international conference occurring outside the United States, unless the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations that such attendance is in the national interest: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section the term ''international conference'' shall mean a conference attended by representatives of the United States Government and of foreign governments, international organizations, or nongovernmental organizations.

RESTRICTIONS ON UNITED NATIONS DELEGATIONS

SEC. 7054. None of the funds made available under title I of this Act may be used to pay expenses for any United States delegation to any specialized agency, body, or commission of the United Nations if such commission is chaired or presided over by a country, the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)), supports international terrorism.

PARKING FINES AND REAL PROPERTY TAXES OWED BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 7055. (a) Subject to subsection (c), of the funds appropriated under titles III through VI by this Act that are made available for assistance for a foreign country, an amount equal to 110 percent of the total amount of the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by the central government of such country shall be withheld from obligation for assistance for the central government of such country until the Secretary of State submits a certification to the Committees on Appropriations stating that such parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes are fully paid.

(b) Funds withheld from obligation pursuant to subsection (a) may be made available for other programs or activities funded by this Act, after consultation with and subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, provided that no such funds shall be made available for assistance for the central government of a foreign country that has not paid the total amount of the fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by such country.

(c) Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d)(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to parking fines and penalties no sooner than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, or at any time with respect to a particular country, if the Secretary determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to the unpaid property taxes if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(e) Not later than 6 months after the initial exercise of the waiver authority in subsection (d), the Secretary of State, after consultations with the City of New York, shall

submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing a strategy, including a timetable and steps currently being taken, to collect the parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes and interest owed by nations receiving foreign assistance under this Act.

(f) In this section:

(1) The term ''fully adjudicated'' includes circumstances in which the person to whom the vehicle is registered—

(A)(i) has not responded to the parking violation summons; or

(ii) has not followed the appropriate adjudication procedure to challenge the summons; and

(B) the period of time for payment of or challenge to the summons has lapsed.

(2) The term ''parking fines and penalties'' means parking fines and penalties—

(A) owed to—

(i) the District of Columbia; or

(ii) New York, New York; and

(B) incurred during the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 2009.

(3) The term ''unpaid property taxes'' means the amount of unpaid taxes and interest determined to be owed by a foreign country on real property in the District of Columbia or New York, New York in a court order or judgment entered against such country by a court of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof.

LANDMINES AND CLUSTER MUNITIONS

SEC. 7056. (a) LANDMINES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, demining equipment available to the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State and used in support of the clearance of landmines and unexploded ordnance for humanitarian purposes may be disposed of on a grant basis in foreign countries, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

(b) CLUSTER MUNITIONS.—No military assistance shall be furnished for cluster munitions, no defense export license for cluster munitions may be issued, and no cluster munitions or cluster munitions technology shall be sold or transferred, unless—

(1) the submunitions of the cluster munitions have a 99 percent or higher functioning rate; and

(2) the agreement applicable to the assistance, transfer, or sale of the cluster munitions or cluster munitions technology specifies that the cluster munitions will only be used against clearly defined military targets and will not be used where civilians are known to be present.

LIMITATION ON RESIDENCE EXPENSES

SEC. 7057. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to title II of this Act, not to exceed $100,500 shall be for official residence expenses of the United States Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 7058. (a) AUTHORITY.—Up to $93,000,000 of the funds made available in title III of this Act to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', may be used by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to hire and employ individuals in the United States and overseas on a limited appointment basis pursuant to the authority of sections 308 and 309 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) The number of individuals hired in any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) may not exceed 175.

(2) The authority to hire individuals contained in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2011.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority of subsection (a) may only be used to the extent that an equivalent number of positions that are filled by personal services contractors or other non-direct hire employees of USAID, who are compensated with funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', are eliminated.

(d) PRIORITY SECTORS.—In exercising the authority of this section, primary emphasis shall be placed on enabling USAID to meet personnel positions in technical skill areas currently encumbered by contractor or other non-direct hire personnel.

(e) CONSULTATIONS.—The USAID Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations at least on a quarterly basis concerning the implementation of this section.

(f) PROGRAM ACCOUNT CHARGED.—The account charged for the cost of an individual hired and employed under the authority of this section shall be the account to which such individual's responsibilities primarily relate. Funds made available to carry out this section may be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated by this Act in title II under the heading ''Operating Expenses''.

(g) FOREIGN SERVICE LIMITED EXTENSIONS.—Individuals hired and employed by USAID, with funds made available in this Act or prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, pursuant to the authority of section 309 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, may be extended for a period of up to 4 years notwithstanding the limitation set forth in such section.

(h) JUNIOR OFFICER PLACEMENT AUTHORITY.—Of the funds made available in subsection (a), USAID may use, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, up to $15,000,000 to fund overseas support costs of members of the Foreign Service with a Foreign Service rank of four or below: *Provided*, That such authority is only used to reduce USAID's reliance on overseas personal services contractors or other non-direct hire employees compensated with funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia''.

(i) DISASTER SURGE CAPACITY.—Funds appropriated under title III of this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'', may be used, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the cost (including the support costs) of individuals detailed to or employed by USAID whose primary responsibility is to carry out programs in response to natural disasters.

(j) TECHNICAL ADVISORS.—Up to $13,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act in title III for assistance under the heading ''Global Health and Child Survival'', may be used to reimburse United States Government agencies, agencies of State governments, institutions of higher learning, and private and voluntary organizations for the full cost of individuals (including for the personal services of such individuals) detailed or assigned to, or contracted by, as the case may be, USAID for the purpose of carrying out activities under that heading: *Provided*, That up to $3,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be used to reimburse such agencies, institutions, and organizations for such costs of such individuals carrying out other development assistance activities.

(k) PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTORS.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I, chapter 4 of part II, and section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be used by USAID to employ up to 40 personal services contractors in the United States, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing direct, interim support for new or expanded overseas programs and activities managed by the agency until permanent direct hire personnel are hired and trained: *Provided*, That not more than 10 of such contractors shall be assigned to any bureau or office: *Provided further*, That not more than 15 of such contractors shall be for activities related to USAID's Afghanistan program: *Provided further*, That such funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be made available only for personal services contractors assigned to the Office of Food for Peace.

(l) HIRING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 307 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, the USAID Administrator may hire up to 30 individuals under the Development Leadership Initiative: *Provided*, That the authority contained in this subsection shall expire on September 30, 2011.

GLOBAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

SEC. 7059. Funds appropriated by titles III and IV of this Act that are made available for bilateral assistance for child survival activities or disease programs including activities relating to research on, and the prevention, treatment and control of, HIV/AIDS may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law except for the provisions under the heading ''Global Health and Child Survival'' and the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (117 Stat. 711; 22 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.), as amended: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under title III of this Act, not less than $648,457,000 should be made available for family planning/reproductive health, including in areas where population growth threatens biodiversity or endangered species.

DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROGRAM

SEC. 7060. Of the funds appropriated in title III of this Act, not less than $40,000,000 shall be made available for the Development Grants Program established pursuant to section 674 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008 (division J of Public Law 110-161) and of which, $15,000,000 shall be for grants for organizations focused on building women's leadership capacity, addressing women's unique development needs, or directly benefitting women and girls: *Provided*, That funds made available under this section are in addition to other funds available for such purposes including funds designated by this Act by section 7064.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 7061. (a) Programs funded under title III of this Act shall include, where appropriate, gender considerations in the planning, assessment, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of such programs.

(b) Funds made available under title III of this Act shall be made available to support programs to enhance economic opportunities

for poor women in developing countries, including increasing the number and capacity of women-owned enterprises, improving property rights for women, increasing access to financial services, and improving women's ability to participate in the global economy, including expanding their access to markets.

(c) Funds made available under title III of this Act for food security and agricultural development shall take into consideration the unique needs of women in agriculture development and technical assistance for women farmers should be a priority.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

SEC. 7062. (a) Funds appropriated under the headings ''Development Assistance'' and ''Economic Support Fund'' in this Act shall be made available for programs to address sexual and gender-based violence.

(b) Programs and activities funded under titles III and IV of this Act that provide training for foreign police, judicial, and military officials shall address, where appropriate, gender-based violence.

EDUCATION

SEC. 7063. (a) BASIC EDUCATION.—

(1) Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than $1,000,000,000 should be made available for assistance for basic education, of which not less than $365,000,000 shall be made available under the heading ''Development Assistance''.

(2) There shall continue to be a Coordinator of United States government basic education assistance in developing countries as established in section 664 of division J of Public Law 110-161.

(3) The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) shall ensure that programs supported by funding appropriated for basic education in this Act, and prior Acts, are fully integrated with other health, agriculture and economic development funding. Programs should provide access to a quality education and funding from other accounts should be integrated into the economic and social needs of the broader community. Schools supported by funding in this Act and in prior Acts should serve as ''Communities of Learning'' and should be the focal point for health, education and development activities.

(4) USAID shall ensure that pilot programs implemented pursuant to section 664 of division J of Public Law 110-161 include ''Communities of Learning'' in the five-year strategic plans.

(b) HIGHER EDUCATION.—Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than $200,000,000 should be made available for assistance for higher education, of which not less than $20,000,000 shall be made available to expand higher education activities in Africa.

RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 7064. Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'' and ''Development Assistance'', $27,000,000 shall be made available to support people to people reconciliation programs which bring together individuals of different ethnic, religious and political backgrounds from areas of civil conflict and war, of which $11,000,000 shall be made available to support programs in the Middle East: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations, prior to the initial obligation of funds, on the most effective uses of such funds.

COMPREHENSIVE EXPENDITURES REPORT

SEC. 7065. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the total amount of United States Government expenditures in fiscal years 2008 and 2009, by Federal agency, for assistance programs and activities in each foreign country, identifying the line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix and the purpose for which the funds were provided: *Provided*, That if required, information may be submitted in classified form.

REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENTS

SEC. 7066. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles III through VI of this Act shall be available to a nongovernmental organization, including any contractor, which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the United States Agency for International Development.

SENIOR POLICY OPERATING GROUP

SEC. 7067. (a) The Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons, established under section 105(f) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(f)) to coordinate agency activities regarding policies (including grants and grant policies) involving the international trafficking in persons, shall coordinate all such policies related to the activities of traffickers and victims of severe forms of trafficking.

(b) None of the funds provided under title I of this or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs shall be expended to perform functions that duplicate coordinating responsibilities of the Operating Group.

(c) The Operating Group shall continue to report only to the authorities that appointed them pursuant to section 105(f).

PROHIBITION ON USE OF TORTURE

SEC. 7068. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture, cruel or inhumane treatment by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

AFRICA

SEC. 7069. (a) EXPANDED INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—

(1) Funds appropriated under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'' in this Act that are made available for assistance for Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Cote D'Ivoire, Guinea and Zimbabwe may be made available only for expanded international military education and training.

(2) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'' in this Act may be made available for assistance for Equatorial Guinea or Somalia.

(b) SUDAN LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—

(1) Subject to subsection (2):

(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Sudan.

(B) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the cost, as defined in section 502, of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees held by the Government of Sudan, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States, and modifying concessional loans, guarantees, and credit agreements.

(2) Subsection (b)(1) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that:

(A) The Government of Sudan honors its pledges to cease attacks upon civilians and disarms and demobilizes the Janjaweed and other government-supported militias.

(B) The Government of Sudan and all government-supported militia groups are honoring their commitments made in all previous cease-fire agreements.

(C) The Government of Sudan is allowing unimpeded access to Darfur to humanitarian aid organizations, the human rights investigation and humanitarian teams of the United Nations, including protection officers, and an international monitoring team that is based in Darfur and has the support of the United States.

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to—

(A) humanitarian assistance;

(B) assistance for the Darfur region, Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, and Abyei; and

(C) assistance to support implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the Darfur Peace Agreement or any other internationally-recognized viable peace agreement in Sudan.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this Act, the term ''Government of Sudan'' shall not include the Government of Southern Sudan.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, assistance in this Act may be made available to the Government of Southern Sudan to provide non-lethal military assistance, military education and training, and defense services controlled under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 CRF 120.1 et seq.) if the Secretary of State—

(A) determines that the provision of such items is in the national interest of the United States; and

(B) not later than 15 days before the provision of any such assistance, notifies the Committees on Appropriations of such determination.

(c) WAR CRIMES IN AFRICA.—

(1) The Congress reaffirms its support for the efforts of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) to bring to justice individuals responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity in a timely manner.

(2) Funds appropriated by this Act, including funds for debt restructuring, may be made available for assistance for the central government of a country in which individuals indicted by ICTR and SCSL are credibly alleged to be living, if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that such government is cooperating with ICTR and SCSL, including the surrender and transfer of indictees in a timely manner: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to assistance provided under section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or to project assistance under title VI of this Act: *Provided further*, That the United States shall use its voice and vote in the United Nations Security Council to fully support efforts by ICTR and SCSL to bring to justice individuals indicted by such tribunals in a timely manner.

(3) The prohibition in subsection (2) may be waived on a country-by-country basis if the President determines that doing so is in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided*, That prior to exercising such waiver authority, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations, in classified form if necessary, on—

(A) the steps being taken to obtain the cooperation of the government in surrendering the indictee in question to the court of jurisdiction;

(B) a strategy, including a timeline, for bringing the indictee before such court; and

(C) the justification for exercising the waiver authority.

(d) ZIMBABWE.—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to vote against any extension by the respective institution of any loans to the Government of Zimbabwe, except to meet basic human needs or to promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State determines and reports in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the rule of law has been restored in Zimbabwe, including respect for ownership and title to property, freedom of speech and association, and a transition government has been established that reflects the will of the people as they voted in the March 2008 elections.

(2) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be made available for assistance for the central government of Zimbabwe, except with respect to funds made available for macroeconomic growth assistance, unless the Secretary of State makes the determination pursuant to subsection (d)(1).

ASIA

SEC. 7070. (a) TIBET.—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to support projects in Tibet if such projects do not provide incentives for the migration and settlement of non-Tibetans into Tibet or facilitate the transfer of ownership of Tibetan land and natural resources to non-Tibetans; are based on a thorough needs-assessment; foster self-sufficiency of the Tibetan people and respect Tibetan culture and traditions; and are subject to effective monitoring.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than $7,300,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' should be made available to nongovernmental organizations to support activities which preserve cultural traditions and promote sustainable development and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibetan Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China.

(b) BURMA.—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive director to each appropriate international financial institution in which the United States participates, to oppose and vote against the extension by such institution any loan or financial or technical assistance or any other utilization of funds of the respective bank to and for Burma.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'', up to $12,000,000 may be made available for humanitarian assistance for individuals and communities impacted by Cyclone Nargis and to support democracy activities in Burma, and not less than $20,000,000 shall be made available for assistance along the Burma-Thailand border, for activities of Burmese student groups and other organizations located outside Burma, and for the purpose of supporting the provision of humanitarian assistance to displaced Burmese along Burma's borders: *Provided*, That such funds may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That in addition to assistance for Burmese refugees provided under the heading ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'' in this Act, not less than $4,000,000 shall be made available for community-based organizations operating in Thailand to provide food, medical and other humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons in eastern Burma: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) INDONESIA.—

(1) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for Indonesia, of which $2,000,000 shall be made available only after the Secretary of State submits to the Committees on Appropriations the report on Indonesia detailed under such heading in the report accompanying this Act.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' that are available for assistance for Indonesia, not less than $300,000 should be made available for grants for capacity building of Indonesian human rights organizations, including in Papua.

(d) NORTH KOREA.—

(1) Funds made available under the heading ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'' in this Act should be made available for assistance for refugees from North Korea.

(2) Of the funds made available under the heading ''International Broadcasting Operations'' in title I of this Act, not less than $7,800,000 shall be made available for broadcasts into North Korea.

(3) None of the funds made available under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be made available for assistance for the Government of North Korea unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations in writing that North Korea is fulfilling its commitments under the Six Party Talks agreements.

(e) PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—

(1) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' in this Act may be obligated or expended for processing licenses for the export of satellites of United States origin (including commercial satellites and satellite components) to the People's Republic of China unless, at least 15 days in advance, the Committees on Appropriations are notified of such proposed action.

(2) The terms and requirements of section 620(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall apply to foreign assistance projects or activities of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) of the People's Republic of China, to include such projects or activities by any entity that is owned or controlled by, or an affiliate of, the PLA: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act may be used to finance any grant, contract, or cooperative agreement with the PLA, or any entity that the Secretary of State has reason to believe is owned or controlled by, or an affiliate of, the PLA.

(f) PHILIPPINES.—Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', not to exceed $30,000,000 may be made available for assistance for the Philippines, of which $2,000,000 may not be obligated until the Secretary of State reports in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that—

(1) the Government of the Philippines is taking effective steps to implement the recommendations of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, to include prosecutions and convictions for extrajudicial executions; sustaining the decline in the number of extrajudicial executions; addressing allegations of a death squad in Davao City; and strengthening government institutions working to eliminate extrajudicial executions;

(2) the Government of the Philippines is implementing a policy of promoting military personnel who demonstrate professionalism and respect for internationally recognized human rights, and is investigating and prosecuting military personnel and others who have been credibly alleged to have violated such rights; and

(3) the Philippine Armed Forces do not have a policy of, and are not engaging in, acts of intimidation or violence against members of legal organizations who advocate for human rights.

(g) VIETNAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under the heading ''Development Assistance'' in this Act may be made available for programs and activities in the central highlands of Vietnam, and shall be made available for environmental remediation and related health activities in Vietnam.

SERBIA

SEC. 7071. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the central Government of Serbia after May 31, 2010, if the President has made the determination and certification contained in subsection (c).

(b) After May 31, 2010, the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive directors to the international financial institutions to support loans and assistance to the Government of Serbia subject to the conditions in subsection (c).

(c) The determination and certification referred to in subsection (a) is a determination and a certification by the President to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Serbia is—

(1) cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia including access for investigators, the provision of documents, timely information on the location, movement, and sources of financial support of indictees, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension, including Ratko Mladic;

(2) taking steps that are consistent with the Dayton Accords to end Serbian financial, political, security and other support which has served to maintain separate Republika Srpska institutions; and

(3) taking steps to implement policies which reflect a respect for minority rights and the rule of law.

(d) This section shall not apply to humanitarian assistance or assistance to promote democracy.

INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

SEC. 7072. (a) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' shall be made available for assistance for a government of an Independent State of the former Soviet Union if that government directs any action in violation of the territorial integrity or national sovereignty of any other Independent State of the former Soviet Union, such as those violations included in the Helsinki Final Act: *Provided*, That such funds may be made available without regard to the restriction in this subsection if the President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.

(b) Funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' for the Russian Federation, Armenia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c)(1) Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' that are allocated for assistance for the Government of the Russian Federation, 60 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical

expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability; and

(B) is providing full access to international nongovernmental organizations providing humanitarian relief to refugees and internally displaced persons in Chechnya.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) assistance to combat infectious diseases, child survival activities, or assistance for victims of trafficking in persons; and

(B) activities authorized under title V (Nonproliferation and Disarmament Programs and Activities) of the FREEDOM Support Act.

(d) Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not apply to—

(1) activities to support democracy or assistance under title V of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 1424 of Public Law 104–201 or non-proliferation assistance;

(2) any assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421);

(3) any activity carried out by a member of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service while acting within his or her official capacity;

(4) any insurance, reinsurance, guarantee or other assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.);

(5) any financing provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; or

(6) humanitarian assistance.

REPRESSION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 7073. (a) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia'' in this Act may be made available for the Government of the Russian Federation, after 180 days from the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Russian Federation:

(1) has implemented no statute, Executive order, regulation or similar government action that would discriminate, or which has as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party; and

(2) is—

(A) honoring its international obligations regarding freedom of expression, assembly, and press, as well as due process;

(B) is investigating and prosecuting law enforcement personnel credibly alleged to have committed human rights abuses against political leaders, activists and journalists; and

(C) is immediately releasing political leaders, activists and journalists who remain in detention.

UZBEKISTAN

SEC. 7074. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the central Government of Uzbekistan only if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Uzbekistan is making substantial and continuing progress—

(1) in meeting its commitments under the ''Declaration on the Strategic Partnership and Cooperation Framework Between the Republic of Uzbekistan and the United States of America'', including respect for internationally recognized human rights, establishing a genuine multi-party system, and ensuring free and fair elections, freedom of expression, and the independence of the media; and

(2) in investigating and prosecuting the individuals responsible for the deliberate killings of civilians in Andijan in May 2005.

(b) If the Secretary of State has credible evidence that any current or former official of the Government of Uzbekistan was responsible for the deliberate killings of civilians in Andijan in May 2005, or for other violations of internationally recognized human rights in Uzbekistan, not later than 6 months after enactment of this Act any person identified by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection shall be ineligible for admission to the United States.

(c) The restriction in subsection (b) shall cease to apply if the Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Uzbekistan has taken concrete and measurable steps to improve respect for internationally recognized human rights, including allowing peaceful political and religious expression, releasing imprisoned human rights defenders, and implementing recommendations made by the United Nations on torture.

(d) The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (b) if the Secretary determines that admission to the United States is necessary to attend the United Nations or to further United States law enforcement objectives.

(e) For the purpose of this section ''assistance'' shall include excess defense articles.

AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 7075. (a) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' that are available for assistance for Afghanistan shall be made available, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that utilizes Afghan entities and emphasizes the participation of Afghan women and directly improves the security, economic and social well-being, and political status, of Afghan women and girls.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS.—

(1) Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for assistance for Afghanistan shall comply with sections 7061 and 7062 of this Act and shall be made available to support programs that increase participation by women in the political process, including at the national, provincial, and sub-provincial levels, and in efforts to improve security in Afghanistan.

(2) Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'' and ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', not less than $175,000,000 shall be made available to support programs that directly address the needs of Afghan women and girls, including for the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs, and for women-led nongovernmental organizations.

(c) NATIONAL SOLIDARITY PROGRAM.—Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' that are available for assistance for Afghanistan, not less than $175,000,000 shall be made available for the National Solidarity Program.

(d) ANTICORRUPTION.—Ten percent of the funds appropriated under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' that are available for assistance for the Government of Afghanistan shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Afghanistan is implementing a policy to promptly remove from office any government official who is credibly alleged to have engaged in narcotics trafficking, gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, or other major crimes.

(e) BASE RIGHTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Government to enter into a permanent basing rights agreement between the United States and Afghanistan.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

SEC. 7076. (a) Prior to the distribution of any assets resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, the President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, a plan for the distribution of the assets of the Enterprise Fund.

(b) Funds made available under titles III through VI of this Act for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities and shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND

SEC. 7077. (a) CONTRIBUTION.—Of the funds made available under the heading ''International Organizations and Programs'' in this Act for fiscal year 2010, $60,000,000 shall be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated by this Act for UNFPA, that are not made available for UNFPA because of the operation of any provision of law, shall be transferred to the ''Global Health and Child Survival'' account and shall be made available for family planning, maternal, and reproductive health activities, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by UNFPA for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(d) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds made available by this Act for UNFPA may not be made available to UNFPA unless—

(1) UNFPA maintains funds made available to UNFPA under this section in an account separate from other accounts of UNFPA;

(2) UNFPA does not commingle amounts made available to UNFPA under this section with other sums; and

(3) UNFPA does not fund abortions.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS AND DOLLAR-FOR-DOLLAR WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—

(1) Not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations indicating the amount of funds that the UNFPA is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(2) If a report under paragraph (1) indicates that the UNFPA plans to spend funds for a country program in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds the UNFPA plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the UNFPA after March 1 for obligation for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

SEC. 7078. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act by the Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 may be made available to carry out the provisions of section 316 of Public Law 96–533.

OPIC

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 7079. Whenever the President determines that it is in furtherance of the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,

up to a total of $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title III of this Act may be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated by this Act for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Program Account, to be subject to the terms and conditions of that account: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available for administrative expenses of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation: *Provided further*, That designated funding levels in this Act shall not be transferred pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

EXTRADITION

SEC. 7080. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to provide assistance (other than funds provided under the headings ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Migration and Refugee Assistance,'' ''Emergency Migration and Refugee Assistance'', and ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Assistance'') for the central government of a country which has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual indicted for a criminal offense for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole or for killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

(b) Subsection (a) shall only apply to the central government of a country with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations and with which the United States has an extradition treaty and the government of that country is in violation of the terms and conditions of the treaty.

(c) The Secretary of State may waive the restriction in subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis if the Secretary certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that such waiver is important to the national interests of the United States.

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

SEC. 7081. (a) CLEAN ENERGY.—Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than $180,000,000 shall be made available to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes, for programs and activities that reduce global warming by promoting the sustainable use of renewable energy technologies and energy efficient end-use technologies, carbon sequestration, and carbon accounting: *Provided*, That of the amount made available to USAID for clean energy programs, $10,000,000 shall be made available for the ''Solar Energy Microfinance Initiative''.

(b) CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION.—Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for a United States contribution to the Least Developed Countries Fund and to the Special Climate Change Fund to support grants for climate change adaptation programs and activities, if the Global Environment Facility makes publicly available on its website an annual report detailing the criteria used to determine which programs and activities receive funds, the manner in which such programs and activities meet such criteria, the extent of local involvement in such programs and activities, the amount of funds provided, and the results achieved.

(c) BIODIVERSITY.—Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for programs and activities which directly protect biodiversity, including tropical forests and wildlife, in developing countries, of which not less than $25,000,000 shall be made available for USAID's conservation programs in the Amazon Basin: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this paragraph, not less than $17,500,000 shall be made available for the Congo Basin Forest Partnership: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106, and chapter 4 of part II, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of supporting tropical forestry and biodiversity conservation activities and energy programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be made available as a contribution to the Galapagos Invasive Species Fund.

(d) EXTRACTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.—

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall inform the managements of the international financial institutions and the public that it is the policy of the United States to oppose any assistance by such institutions (including but not limited to any loan, credit, grant, or guarantee) for the extraction and export of oil, gas, coal, timber, or other natural resource unless the government of the country has in place functioning systems for:

(A) accurately accounting for payments for companies involved in the extraction and export of natural resources;

(B) the independent auditing of accounts receiving such payments and the widespread public dissemination of the findings of such audits; and

(C) verifying government receipts against company payments including widespread dissemination of such payment information, and disclosing such documents as Host Government Agreements, Concession Agreements, and bidding documents, allowing in any such dissemination or disclosure for the redaction of, or exceptions for, information that is commercially proprietary or that would create competitive disadvantage.

(2) Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing, for each international financial institution, the amount and type of assistance provided, by country, for the extraction and export of oil, gas, coal, timber, or other natural resources in the preceding 12 months, and whether each institution considered, in its proposal for such assistance, the extent to which the country has functioning systems described in paragraph (1).

PROHIBITION ON PROMOTION OF TOBACCO

SEC. 7082. None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of tobacco or tobacco products, except for restrictions which are not applied equally to all tobacco or tobacco products of the same type.

COMMERCIAL LEASING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 7083. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, the authority of section 23(a) of the Arms Export Control Act may be used to provide financing to Israel, Egypt and NATO and major non-NATO allies for the procurement by leasing (including leasing with an option to purchase) of defense articles from United States commercial suppliers, not including Major Defense Equipment (other than helicopters and other types of aircraft having possible civilian application), if the President determines that there are compelling foreign policy or national security reasons for those defense articles being provided by commercial lease rather than by government-to-government sale under such Act.

TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 7084. (a) UNITED NATIONS.—Funds made available by this Act shall be made available to continue reform efforts at the United Nations: Provided, That not later than September 30, 2010, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing actions taken by United Nations organizations under the headings ''Contributions to International Organizations'' and ''International Organizations and Programs'' to continue reform of United Nations financial management systems and program oversight.

(b) NATIONAL BUDGET TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the central government of any country that fails to make publicly available on an annual basis its national budget, to include income and expenditures.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of paragraph (1) on a country-by-country basis if the Secretary reports to the Committees on Appropriations that to do so is important to the national interest of the United States.

SRI LANKA

SEC. 7085. (a) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated in title III of this Act that are available for assistance for Sri Lanka shall be made available to fund programs that promote reconciliation between the ethnic Sinhalese and Tamil communities, support post-conflict reconstruction, and establish a meaningful and inclusive role for Tamil and other minorities in national, political, and economic life.

(b) SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available in title IV of this Act that are available for assistance for Sri Lanka should encourage programs that include the recruitment and training of Tamils into the Sri Lankan Security Forces, Tamil language training for Sinhalese forces, and human rights training for all security forces.

(c) DEMINING.—In addition to subsection (a), up to $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'' shall be provided for demining of conflict affected areas.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committee on Appropriations on the extent to which the Government of Sri Lanka's is:

(1) providing unrestricted humanitarian access to the displaced within camps;

(2) providing protection for internally displaced persons (IDPs) and humanitarian workers, including the International Committee of the Red Cross at all sites where the military and police conduct security screening;

(3) permitting freedom of movement for IDPs once they have completed security screening, including allowing the displaced to return home or move to other safe locations;

(4) allowing civilian authorities to run without interference camps and hospitals that house the displaced; and

(5) allowing for the safe and timely return of IDPs to their homes.

UNRWA ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 7086. The Secretary of State shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report on whether UNRWA is:

(1) continuing to utilize Operations Support Officers in the West Bank and Gaza to inspect UNRWA installations and report any inappropriate use;

(2) dealing promptly with any staff or beneficiary violations of its own policies (including the policies on neutrality and impartiality of employees) and the legal requirements under section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(3) taking necessary and appropriate measures to ensure it is operating in compliance with the conditions of section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(4) continuing regular reporting to the Department of State on actions it has taken to ensure conformance with the conditions of section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(5) taking steps to improve the transparency of all educational materials currently in use in UNRWA-administered schools;

(6) continuing to use curriculum materials in UNRWA-supported schools and summer camps designed to promote tolerance, nonviolent conflict resolution and human rights;

(7) not engaging in operations with financial institutions or related entities in violation of relevant United States law and is enhancing its transparency and financial due diligence and working to diversify its banking operations in the region; and

(8) in compliance with the United Nations Board of Auditors' biennial audit requirements and is implementing in a timely fashion the Board's recommendations.

LIMITATION ON FUNDS RELATING TO TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

SEC. 7087. None of the funds made available in this Act, or any other Act, may be obligated for any country, including a state with a compact of free association with the United States, that concludes an agreement with the United States to receive by transfer or release individuals detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, unless, not later than 5 days after the conclusion of the agreement but prior to implementation of the agreement, the Secretary of State notifies the Committees on Appropriations in writing of the terms of the agreement.

IMF PROVISIONS

SEC. 7088. (a) OPPOSITION TO IMF PROVIDING HARD CURRENCY FOR SDRS RECEIVED BY TERRORIST COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose the provision by the Fund of United States dollars, euros, or Japanese yen to any country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, in exchange for any Special Drawing Rights received by the country pursuant to the amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the Fund as described in section 64 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

(b) SUNSET ON AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS TO FUND THE NEW ARRANGEMENTS TO BORROW.—Section 17(a)(2) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286e-2(a)(2)) is amended by inserting ": *Provided further*, That the authority to make loans under this section shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this proviso" before the period.

(c) LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE OF NEW ARRANGEMENTS TO BORROW TO BE FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES.—At any time during fiscal years 2009 through 2014, no United States contribution to the New Arrangements to Borrow may cause the total amount of United States Government contributions to the New Arrangements to Borrow to exceed 20 percent of the total amount of funds contributed to the New Arrangements to Borrow from all sources.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 15, 2009, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report on the loans made and programs carried out using financing provided by or through the New Arrangements to Borrow. Each such report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the economies of countries requiring the assistance from the New Arrangements to Borrow, including the monetary, fiscal, and exchange rate policies of the countries.

(2) A description of the degree to which the countries requiring the assistance have fully implemented domestic reforms including—

(A) the enactment and implementation of appropriate financial reform legislation;

(B) strengthening the domestic financial system and improving transparency and supervision;

(C) opening domestic capital markets; and

(D) making nontransparent conglomerate practices more transparent through the application of internationally accepted accounting practices, independent external audits, full disclosure, and provision of consolidated statements.

(3) A detailed description of the trade policies of the countries, including any unfair trade practices or adverse effects of the trade policies on the United States.

(4) The amount, rate of interest, and disbursement and repayment schedules of any funds disbursed by the International Monetary Fund pursuant to the New Arrangements to Borrow.

Mrs. LOWEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 197, line 10, be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

SEC. 7089. Prior to the obligation of the funds made available in this Act for "Contribution to the Clean Technology Fund" or "Strategic Climate Fund" of the World Bank, the Secretary of State shall certify in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that all actions taken during the negotiations of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change ensure robust compliance with and enforcement of existing international legal requirements as of the date of the enactment of this Act that respect intellectual property rights and effective intellectual property rights protection and enforcement for energy and environment technology, including wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, hydro, landfill gas, natural gas, marine, trash combustion, fuel cell, hydrogen, microturbine, nuclear, clean coal, electric battery, alternative fuel, alternative refueling infrastructure, advanced vehicle, electric grid, or energy efficiency-related technologies.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. CULBERSON:

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

SEC. 70XX. Appropriations made in title V of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $505,896,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. LEWIS, I am pleased to offer this amendment today to give the House an opportunity to keep funding for multilateral assistance at last year's level. In fact, this is actually a 1 percent increase, trying to keep it as close to inflation as we can. I would prefer, as a fiscal conservative, to cut far more at this time of record debt, record deficit, of increasing unemployment; but we want to give the liberal majority some opportunity to cut somewhere. And if we will not cut foreign multilateral assistance simply by keeping the level of funding at last year's level, plus a little 1 percent bump, where will we cut?

In our personal lives, if we have a financial downturn, someone in the family loses a job, if there has been a financial hardship of some type in your personal life, if as a business you have suffered a dramatic downturn in sales, if you lose money or your income is reduced, then all of us in our private lives in the private sector understand that you start to cut expenses. The first thing to go, for example, in the private sector certainly is discretionary dollars in advertising. Or in a personal life, as much as I might like to have a swimming pool or expand the house, you just don't do it when your income is reduced; and the United States of America is in a similar situation.

The Nation is hurting. Unemployment is climbing. We have lost a record number of jobs. Under the new liberal leadership of this Congress, our new liberal administration in the White House, this Congress, this President has spent more money in less time than any Congress in the history of the United States.

In the first 6 months of this year under the budget adopted by this new liberal majority, the amount of debt created in the first 6 months of this year exceeds the amount of debt created from the time of George Washington to President George W. Bush. The national debt now exceeds $11 trillion. The deficit exceeds a trillion dollars. We as a Nation are on a path to become Argentina if we don't stop spending money.

So those of us in the fiscally conservative minority have offered in the Appropriations Committee multiple amendments. We have offered amendments on the floor to the limited extent we can under these very restrictive guidelines. We, in the conservative

minority, have offered amendments to cut 5 percent; 1 percent; 10 percent. On every bill on every occasion, we have searched for some way, somehow that the liberal majority might try to save some of our kids' money.

It hasn't happened yet. I haven't seen a cut yet that the liberal majority will agree to. This amendment today is simply to title V, multilateral assistance, asking that we keep funding at 2009 levels. In fact, the 2009 spending level is a 16 percent increase over 2008. And the programs, the international organizations that are included under title V, include Global Environmental Facility, a clean technology fund. There is even a new and completely unauthorized climate technology fund and strategic climate fund that costs a total of $300 million. These have not been approved by Congress, and they are just stuck into this bill. I know there are a lot of noble, good things accomplished by our foreign aid bill.

One that is near and dear to my heart is my support for the State of Israel. I personally support Mr. WEINER's amendment. I think Saudi Arabia can certainly afford to pull their own weight. But our good friends in Israel, I think one of the reasons God blesses the United States of America is America is the sword and shield of Israel. We have an obligation as a Nation to stand behind our friends around the world and help them. But at a time of economic downturn, at a time when so many Americans are losing their jobs, and at a time as we as guardians of the U.S. Treasury have an obligation to try to save money everywhere we can and follow Dave Ramsey's advice, don't spend money you don't have; don't borrow money to pay off borrowed money, the amendment is offered today in all sincerity to try to hold the line.

And if we won't cut here, Mr. Chairman, where will we cut? If we won't cut spending for multilateral assistance to foreign aid, which all of our constituents get, if we won't cut at the edges in money that we don't need to spend at this level for foreign assistance, where will we cut?

Are we not going to save any money anywhere, folks? This is a $500 million savings to keep us at 2009 levels.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. I understand that it is quite easy in a time of fiscal belt tightening to offer an amendment to reduce funding for the international financial institutions, but I would encourage my colleagues to recognize that voting in favor of this amendment has serious consequences to U.S. interests.

It would cut funding for the Asian Development Fund which provides basic loans and grants to support health care, education, infrastructure and economic development resources for Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The World Bank, which provides debt relief to developing countries, is supporting an integrated agricultural initiative to address the global food crisis. The Global Environmental Facility and the International Fund for Agricultural Development provide loans and grants. This amendment would undermine the ability of the United States to meet its commitments to global debt relief efforts and to countries around the world that rely on our assistance.

Remember, this is in the interest of our national security. These institutions fund valuable initiatives that provide opportunities to millions of people.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the Chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman.

As I listened to the gentleman from Texas, I recall these ferocious debates we have had, led by a true fiscal conservative, the gentleman from Arizona, as he assailed earmarks. And I heard the gentleman from Texas's voice in the earmarks debate. But then I realized I was a little confused: he was defending his earmark.

So the gentleman's ferocity on behalf of fiscal conservatism does not extend, apparently, to every earmark, including his own. Now I understand that. But it did seem to me a little inconsistent with the uncompromising ferocity of his rhetoric. The gentleman does not come here with quite the credentials as, for instance, the gentleman from Arizona.

As to the money here being spent, I would say this: the gentleman said, Where will we cut? I would like to cut the F–22 spending which we no longer need. I supported the President's proposals for cuts in agriculture spending. This notion that it is always the liberals who want to spend and the conservatives who don't want to spend is fallacious. When it comes to unnecessary Cold War weapons and when it comes to American troops being stationed overseas in countries where they should be able to defend themselves, you know, we could save a lot more money overseas by telling our wealthy allies that it is time for them to defend themselves. That is a lot better, in my mind, than cutting a much smaller amount of money that goes to feed poor children and that goes to prevent preventable deaths in the health care areas. And it would also save us because there has been the correct perception by a whole range of people, including Secretary Gates, including Colin Powell, a number of distinguished Republicans who have served in national security positions, that it is far better to spend money sensibly to avoid the kind of social conditions that don't cause terrorism, the terrorists are sick people with no justification, but it makes support for them. It recruits for them, and we should be undercutting their recruiting by these kinds of things.

The gentleman almost sneeringly said, well, it is global environmental, let's be national. Well, it may pain the gentleman, but it is kind of hard to confine the environment to the borders of the United States. The environment does not respect borders. So if you want to deal with the environment, it has to be done globally. Many of us feel, in fact, that it would be a grave error for us to go ahead with tough climate issues here unless we also did them internationally.

I was very proud, along with SPENCER BACHUS and Jim Leach and MAXINE WATERS, at the urging of the late Pope John Paul the Second and others to do debt relief for the poorest countries in the world, to take money that would otherwise go to pay off debts and give it to the poor children and to health care, and this would threaten that kind of problem.

So the half a billion dollars here, it pales in comparison, not in general because it is a lot of money, but to money spent on unnecessary Cold War weapons, on money that goes for agricultural subsidies to farmers who do not need it, on sending human beings to Mars.

I don't know how the gentleman plans to vote on that. I plan to vote, if that comes up, against that.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would yield.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much for yielding. I did vote against $2.6 trillion of spending under President Bush, and I voted against the farm bills. And I voted against——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate that. I take back my time to explain to the gentleman, I wasn't questioning his credentials except on his earmark. Everybody is entitled to a little earmark.

I'm sorry, I did not yield again. I said the gentleman made cuts elsewhere. I wasn't saying that the gentleman didn't vote for cuts; I was refuting his notion that liberals don't vote for cuts.

I have voted for many cuts, including to bring down the overall budget.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman need an instruction on the rules of the House?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The point is that the gentleman used up his time unwisely. He should have reserved a little time; he didn't do it. That is the way it goes.

The fact is that alleviating poverty overseas, going to the aid of children who will die of measles, who will die of diarrhea and who will die of these other illnesses, it is a far better use of our money morally and also in terms of national security because I repeat again what Secretary Gates and what

Colin Powell have said, what sensible military leaders have said, a much smaller amount of money spent in these ways on sensible efforts to alleviate the miserable conditions that lead to support for terrorism, not the terrorists themselves, is a very good way to preserve the national security much more cheaply in terms of human lives and in terms of money than a purely military solution.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I commend Mr. LEWIS for his leadership and work to reduce spending increases in this bill and other appropriations bills this year.

But I do have concern about the consequence of limiting funding for the World Bank's International Development Association. Doing so I believe could harm American credibility and leadership abroad. The Bank is doing critical work to help the world's poorest nations weather the global economic crisis, limit hunger, and provide for greater security in volatile areas of the world.

In Afghanistan, the World Bank helped build and reform the nation's telecommunications sector. This helped to attract $500 million in private investment, accounting for 60% of all foreign direct investment in Afghanistan. The Bank also helped train health care workers in Afghanistan, to help increase access to health care there.

As we seek to cut the deficit and prioritize funding, we must also consider that we may ultimately lose leverage over the priorities and direction of the World Bank should the U.S. fail to live up to its commitments.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

Mr. KIRK. I have an amendment for Ms. GRANGER under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KIRK:

Page 198, after line 3, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO NEGOTIATE AGREEMENT IN CONTRAVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to negotiate an agreement in contravention of section 1626 or 1627 of the International Financial Institutions Act, section 1112 or 1403 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32), or the provision added to the end of title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act by section 1404 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment which refers to the following situation:

Last month through the 2009 supplemental bill, Congress provided an expansion of resources and powers to the International Monetary Fund as requested by President Obama. This included $108 billion in new funding and approval for the IMF to sell 13 million ounces of gold to fund their internal operating expenses. As part of that bill, and consistent with its oversight role, Congress gave the administration clear guidelines on how an expanded IMF should function.

On June 24, President Obama decided to disregard those congressionally mandated guidelines. Upon signing the 2009 supplemental into law, the President issued a signing statement that said he would ignore sections 1110, 1112, 1403 and 1404 of the supplemental.

These provisions provide some of the only oversight that the United States exercises over the IMF, an organization that will triple in size this year.

The Granger amendment, which I offer here, would prohibit funds in this bill from being used by the Secretary of Treasury to negotiate any agreement in contravention of these statutorily enacted provisions in the supplemental.

One provision requires the U.S. to oppose IMF loans to countries that are supporters of terrorism, countries like Iran. The Congress consulted the Department of Treasury while drafting this provision.

□ 1715

Additionally, the provisions give the administration guidance from the Congress as to how the United States should vote at the IMF on health care, education, labor rights, and transparency issues.

This Congress, Democrats and Republicans, should not allow any administration to disregard a statutory mandate, especially on issues of transparency and accountability. The Congress voted to provide oversight for the IMF, and we should stand by those provisions.

Giving $108 billion to the IMF without a clear path for the future is not a policy we would support. And so, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this Granger amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, though I plan to support the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to again thank the gentlewoman who couldn't be with us today for her work on oversight and our assistance to the International Monetary Fund.

I recognize her concerns about the use of the signing statement by the President to interpret congressionally imposed mandates that apply to the World Bank and IMF in the fiscal year 2009 Supplemental Appropriations bill. It is my understanding that this issue was included in the signing statement because of concerns regarding constitutional authority and not because of underlying policy differences with the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I welcome this amendment from the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Illinois.

The Chair of the subcommittee, who does a great job, said that the administration says this is constitutional and not substantive, and I've been told by Treasury they intend to abide by them. That's not good enough. Let me give my constitutional friends over there another constitutional lesson: They won't have anything to put a signing statement to if we don't pass it.

I was asked by the administration and worked hard to get that money for the IMF with some reasonable conditions. There are some things in there that make sure that it ends the previous IMF practice of being unfair to low-income people.

The notion that the administration can take the money and pick and choose what it wants to do with the conditions is unacceptable. So let me say, as chairman of the committee that authorizes these and as someone who works closely with the appropriators in doing it, if the administration does not withdraw this claim that they can ignore conditions we put on it, then they will have nothing to ignore because there won't be any conditions and there won't be any money. And that's right there in the Constitution.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my chairman, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say I agree with every word uttered by the gentleman and rise also in support of the amendment.

The way the system works is that the administration asks the Congress for money. Many times that is not a popular request. Sometimes the only way that the votes can be found to provide the money the administration wants is to provide certain limitations on the use of that money. For any administration to say, Well, we will accept the money, but ignore the limitations is to greatly increase the likelihood that they will not get the money. That is not in the interest of the administration, and it certainly does not respect the rightful traditions and prerogatives of the Congress. And so I very much am in agreement with the amendment and congratulate the gentlewoman from Texas for offering the amendment and the gentleman from Illinois for offering it in her stead.

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KIRK. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when we consider legislation in this body, we have several different ways to put forward an idea or policy of the Congress—a Dear Colleague letter, filing a bill or a resolution. When we speak with more authority, we use report language to accompany a bill, which says a general direction that can be ignored, but at the peril of the administration. But when it is in a statute, that is, under the law of the land, the supreme authority, absent being overridden by a provision of the Constitution.

I really want to thank the clear, bipartisan message that we are sending here by virtue of the chairwoman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, and the chairman of the authorizing committee here, because I think this is a rare example of showing bipartisan concern on behalf of this institution against the executive branch.

Now, I would shudder to think that if ever we concede somehow the abuse of signing statements—which I am not really that in favor of, and I don't think have received any long-term sanction by the Supreme Court to try to override a statute—basic law 101 would provide that.

I yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would only make one correction. We do this—I'm sure he agrees with me, it's a wording change—we do this not on behalf of this institution, but literally on behalf of democracy, on behalf of the process by which people get elected and deliberate and do this. And there is a kind of a unilateralism, in an undemocratic, unreachable way, to these signing statements that is the opposite of what we do here. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRK. And I thank the gentleman because he was critical of signing statements under the previous administration and is now being critical of signing statements under this administration.

But there is a much more important legal point here, which is that a signing statement which attempts to override a statute enacted by the Congress of the United States should not require litigation before the Supreme Court. And that's why the statement of the full committee chairman, Mr. OBEY, is so critical here. Because in the end, the way that we enforce this absent court litigation is simply to deny funding. I learned that under Chairman Whitten, when I think I remember he defunded the Office of Legislative Affairs at the Department of Agriculture when he had a problem.

So the signal that we've sent to the Treasury is very clear: Ignore statute at your extreme peril. And this is on behalf of a bipartisan, overwhelming majority. We will be asking for a recorded vote on this and send a very clear signal to the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 3 in part B.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TERMINATION OF ONE-TIME SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE GRANTS PROGRAM

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs—Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs'' shall be available for the one-time special educational, professional, and cultural exchange grants program, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $8,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, on page 128 of the report accompanying this legislation it states, Neither the bill nor this report contain any congressional earmarks. I would have to disagree. The legislation will provide $8 million for the ''one-time special educational, professional, and cultural exchange grant program'' begun in fiscal year 2008. These one-time grants can go for up to a half-million dollars, and the Department of State is to award these proposals on a competitive basis.

Now, I have been a long supporter of cultural exchange programs, both having Americans go overseas and foreigners to come here. I am also supportive of these grants being awarded on a competitive basis. The problem here is the fact that the report also says, The Secretary is encouraged to consider the following proposals for this competitive program, and then it lists several specific exchange programs.

The recommendations of funding for these 12 specific programs certainly look like earmarks to me and certainly look like earmarks to a handful of Members who requested them, so much so that they actually listed the earmark requests on their Web sites—a number of them did. So to them it looked like an earmark; they're putting it in the report.

This year, the Appropriations Committee is telling us that earmarks aren't really earmarks; they're just suggestions to the agencies who are under no obligation to fund them. So my question would be, what is the difference here? And why, if in other bills there are disclosure requirements—certification letters, put your name next to the earmark, other things that we have to do, if those are mere suggestions to the agencies—a ''look see'' we are told by the Appropriations Committee—what is the difference here where we list several programs that the Secretary should consider?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and hope to be illuminated on this question.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. The bill before the House contains an increase of 11 percent for education and cultural exchanges and is $33 million below the amount requested in the budget.

The gentleman's amendment would reduce by $8 million funding for international exchange programs, bringing the amount in the bill to over $40 million below the request. It also would prohibit funding for the one-time special grants program begun in fiscal year 2008.

Grants under this program are required to be competitively awarded and support exchanges for people who do not benefit through existing programs. None of the entities and organizations listed in the report are earmarks. All entities highlighted in the report under the Special Grants Program must compete with all other applicants, whether listed in the report or not. And for example, of the 39 entities listed in the explanatory statement accompanying the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008, only 12, or less than one-third, received funding.

So, I say to my friend, respectfully, these are not earmarks. This program fills a void in our international exchange portfolio. It is a targeted, one-time, competitive opportunity for an organization to address either a regional or population gap in international exchanges and should be continued.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

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

Mr. FLAKE. The gentlelady mentioned FY 2008, mentioned there were some 36 listed. Only 24 of those 36 were actually eligible for funding. Half of

those that were eligible for funding did receive the funding, which took over half of the funding that was eligible to be dispersed. And so there is quite an uncanny alignment between what is put out there and what is actually then awarded.

And my question is, with the rest of our appropriations this year, if, as we are told, simply giving the agencies a list of recommendations or a ''look see,'' why is it that the so-called ''hard earmarks'' in other bills require a certification letter, require transparency, and other things, and these soft earmarks here, which act pretty much the same way, require no such disclosure or no such transparency? That's my concern here. And it's long been the concern of many with these soft earmarks.

The agencies have told us that their hands are sometimes too much tied by the soft earmarks. They have programs, and then Members of Congress will say, Oh, yes, we're appropriating money, but it needs to be spent here, here and here. And we all know that the agency knows who butters their bread, who appropriates their money. And they're inclined, particularly when it's the case of a powerful Member, to go along with the recommendations made.

So that's the question I have. It is more of transparency here; why are these earmarks treated differently than earmarks in other legislation?

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I certainly understand the gentleman's concern, but I would like to reiterate again, there were 39 entities listed, 24 applied; and of that 24, only 12 received the grants. So I think it's very different from an earmark where, if you list an earmark on many of the subcommittees, it is expected that those items listed will get the grants. So, if there were 12 of the 24, it's clear to me that this is a competitive grant. And so I certainly rest my case that this is not an earmark.

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

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentlelady.

I have to say, when we debated the Homeland Security bill just a few days ago, I challenged an earmark for a for-profit company, Global Solar.

□ 1730

I was told, no. Even though in the report language it says that the money is to go to Global Solar and there was a certification letter filled out by the Member saying the money is to go to Global Solar at this address, we were told there, well, no, it's going to be competitively bid, so don't worry about that language. It really doesn't mean anything.

So I just don't know what to believe here, if we are told that, well, this isn't like a hard earmark in other bills, and that's what I am being told now, but then I was told on the other bills, well, this isn't really a hard earmark either, but we did have the disclosure requirements there and we don't have them here. So I think it behooves us, until we can figure that out, until we can figure out are these hard earmarks or are they soft earmarks? Are they to be treated differently? Certainly the Members who requested them who actually listed them on their Web site as appropriation requests, they see them as earmarks. So I would think that we need to be careful here.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I would like to just say to the gentleman that in the bill that you referenced, there were a hundred applications, and 51 received funding of the hundred. And of the 24 that applied that were listed in the bill, 12 received funding. So that sounds like a competitive grant to me. It looks like a competitive grant. In my judgment, it is a competitive grant.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I would ask the gentlewoman, if that's the case, why list them? If they have to compete competitively, why do we list them? Why do we say to the agencies, well, you have a competitive program but we want you to look at these programs, we want you to look at this exchange program, this sister city program, and we're going to list it here in the report? If it's not an earmark, then don't list it and simply have those organizations compete like everyone else does.

Mrs. LOWEY. I would like to say to the gentleman, Members understand their districts. They have respect for some organizations and not for others. They have a right, certainly, to recommend to include, to reference specific groups. That doesn't mean they are directing the agency to give them the earmarks. So, again, a hundred applied, 51 received them, and of the 24 that were referenced as suggested by Members, 12 of those received funding. So, again, they had to compete. But if the Members may believe that a particular group has done laudable work in their district, I think they have every right. As long as there is no guarantee, it is not an earmark.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111–193 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 printed in part A by Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

Amendment No. 2 printed in part B by Mr. BUYER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 6 printed in part B by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

Amendment No. 7 printed in part B by Mr. WEINER of New York.

Amendment No. 5 printed in part B by Mr. CULBERSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 printed in part B by Mr. KIRK of Illinois.

Amendment No. 3 printed in part B by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

PART A AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 168, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—261

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—168

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Hinojosa
Jordan (OH)
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Smith (NJ)

□ 1800

Messrs. CAMP and ROGERS of Michigan changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 516, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 516, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Ms. GIFFORDS was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE JAMES F. MCNULTY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in remembrance of James F. McNulty, an Arizonan, a patriot, a statesman and a former Member of this body. Mr. McNulty passed away in Tucson on the 30th of June.

During his long life of service of 83 years, Jim McNulty was many things. He was a World War II veteran, a proud University of Arizona alumnus, a father of three, a successful attorney, a member of the Catholic Church, a Peace Corps volunteer, and a legislator.

In 1982, Jim was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, the fifth seat in the district of Arizona, a newly created seat. Though he only served for one single term, he was widely praised for his passionate advocacy for his community and for his constituents.

On behalf of the entire Arizona delegation, I would like to request that all Members please stand and observe a moment of silence in memory of our dear friend and former colleague, Jim McNulty.

The CHAIR. Members will please rise and observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 271, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—156

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—271

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono

Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Cardoza
DeLauro
Fudge
Gohmert
Granger
Heller
Hill
Hinojosa
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER, Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 517, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 517, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 259, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—172

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—259

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Barrow
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1815

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 518, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, noes 135, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—297

Abercrombie
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (TX)
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schauer
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Space
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—135

Ackerman
Aderholt
Baird
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bordallo
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Honda
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Linder
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Marshall
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Napolitano
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reichert
Rogers (MI)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Skelton
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Watt
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—6

DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1824

Mr. INSLEE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Messrs. GINGREY of Georgia, BROUN of Georgia, AL GREEN of Texas and MEEK of Florida changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 519, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 256, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—174

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

DeLauro
Edwards (TX)
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Larson (CT)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 520, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 429, noes 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—429

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Kucinich
Stark

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1839

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 521, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on

which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 268, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—164

Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—268

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Heller
Larson (CT)
Murphy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain on the vote.

□ 1846

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 522, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2010".

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAPUANO, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3081) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 617, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the question on adoption of the amendments will be put en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KIRK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kirk moves to recommit the bill back to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC.__. REGULAR ORDER ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) On October 6, 2000, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, made the following statement regarding the appropriations process: "We have gotten so far from the regular order that I fear that if this continues, the House will not have the capacity to return to the precedents and procedures of the House that have given true meaning to the term 'representative democracy'. The reason that we have stuck to regular order as long as we have in this institution is to protect the rights of every Member to participate. And when we lose those rights, we lose the right to be called the greatest deliberative body left in the world."

(2) On that same day, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey went on to say, "I believe that this incredible centralization of decision-making in the hands of staff in the House leadership offices means that for most Members representing their districts in this body is diminishing every day in terms of their ability to have a say in what goes on around here."

(3) On July 9, 2009, the House adopted a rule governing consideration of this bill making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 that deviated from the regular order by making in order no more than eight amendments and by specifically preventing 39 Members from offering amendments that

they had publicly indicated a desire to have debated.

(4) The following Members were specifically denied the right to participate in the deliberations on this bill by having one or more of their amendments denied the right to be debated:

The gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. Bean;

The gentleman from California, Mr. Bilbray;

The gentlewoman from Tennessee, Ms. Blackburn;

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Blunt;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Broun;

The gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. Brown-Waite;

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Burton;

The gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Castle;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Conaway;

The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. DeFazio;

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Dent;

The gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Fortenberry;

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Garrett;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Gingrey;

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Goodlatte;

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Grijalva;

The gentleman from Nevada, Mr. Heller;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Hensarling;

The gentlewoman from South Dakota, Ms. Herseth Sandlin;

The gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Hodes;

The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Jordan;

The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. King;

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Luetkemeyer;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Mack;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Marshall;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. McCaul;

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Murphy;

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Neugebauer;

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Payne;

The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Price;

The gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen;

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Roskam;

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Sensenbrenner;

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Smith;

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Stearns;

The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Stupak;

The gentlewoman from California, Ms. Waters;

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Weiner; and

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wittman.

(5) As each of these Members represents approximately 650,000 Americans, approximately 25,350,000 Americans were denied their right to be represented because the restrictive rule supported by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, failed to follow the precedents and procedures of the House;

(6) The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, was correct that a true representative democracy is impossible when 25,350,000 Americans have their representative to Congress shut-out of the legislative process;

(7) As a result of the restrictive rule implemented by the Democratic majority, the House was not allowed to vote or even debate pertinent issues such as:

An amendment that would prohibit funding for the Palestinian Authority until the ruling Fatah Party abandons the clauses in its Party Constitution that call for the destruction of Israel;

An amendment that would reduce subsidies for the Export-Import Bank;

An amendment to prohibit funding for a new international organization that proposes to tax American energy companies;

An amendment that would increase aid to Israel;

An amendment that would reduce spending by 15 percent from the 2009 levels, reducing the deficit by $17,700,000,000;

An amendment to permit Federal agencies to purchase alternative fuels;

An amendment to prevent U.S. funds from being used to pay for the legal expenses of United Nations employees who have been charged with malfeasance;

An amendment to prohibit funds from being used to establish commercial ties with Iran;

An amendment to prohibit diplomatic relations with Cuba unless they agree to extradite to the United States convicted cop killers;

An amendment to prohibit assistance to members of foreign terrorist organizations;

An amendment to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to pay Federal employees to do union activities while on official time;

An amendment to rescind funding for the International Monetary Fund;

An amendment to prohibit funds from being used to promote abortions;

An amendment to terminate the visa lottery program;

An amendment to prohibit taxpayer funds from being used to employ illegal aliens;

An amendment to help eliminate waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer funds by providing additional resources to the Inspectors General;

An amendment to prohibit funds from being used to fund projects named after sitting Members of Congress;

An amendment to reallocate funds from the Organization for American States to the National Endowment for Democracy;

An amendment to provide support for those advocating democracy in Iran;

An amendment to prohibit funding for international organizations headed by Iran;

An amendment to prohibit funding for organizations that perform abortions, and

Several amendments to reform the International Monetary Fund.

(8) The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, was correct that the House loses the right to be called the ''greatest deliberative body left in the world'' if it refuses to even debate, let alone vote, on these issues.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the U.S. House of Representatives that this bill should be reopened for amendment under the regular order procedures advocated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Obey, on October 6, 2000.

Mrs. LOWEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

POINT OF ORDER

Mrs. LOWEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I wish to insist on a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI and believe that the Chair has heard enough of the reading to dispose of such a question.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment being offered and the reading having begun, a point of order may interrupt the reading and the Chair may rule the amendment out if enough has been read to show that it is out of order.

Mr. KIRK. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain argument over the point of order. Does the gentleman wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. KIRK. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, the question I would ask is: How would the Chair know that a point of order lies if we haven't even read the underlying motion to recommit?

I would worry that we would enter into a parliamentary procedure something like the election counting in Iran where we quickly find out a result before——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment being ordered and the reading having begun, a point of order may interrupt the reading and the Chair may rule the amendment out if enough has been read to show that it is out of order.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on that I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has yet to rule on a point of order.

Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the underlying point of order?

Mr. KIRK. I continue to wish to be heard.

On that I would think that due consideration would be to have the House hear the motion to recommit, and once you have understood its full import, we would then be able to hear from the Chair and have the body decide if it wanted to appeal the ruling or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mrs. LOWEY. I insist on my point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KIRK. Parliamentary Inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KIRK. What is the point of order against reading the actual resolution that we have before us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York stated clause 2 of rule XXI as the basis.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the logic of this point of order being in order now is that in the alternative, those Members who suffer from Senate envy could write a 700-page nongermane amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my remarks which are that we have a—Mr. Speaker, let me amend what I said.

Let me amend what I said and refer to those thin-skinned Members with Senate envy.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that the point of order is necessary to disallow filibuster by reading a nongermane amendment that could last for hours. That is why I speak in support of the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons stated by the gentlewoman from New York, and as held in similar circumstances earlier today, the proposed amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The motion is not in order.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 180, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—180

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews
Boehner
DeLauro
Fudge
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Heller
Hill
Larson (CT)
Miller, George
Rangel
Slaughter
Stark
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1913

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KIRK. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kirk moves to recommit the bill back to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 11, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

Mr. KIRK (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mrs. LOWEY. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, we should support organizations that advance democracy and reduce the increase in funding for organizations which are ambivalent.

Under this bill, the National Endowment for Democracy was cut $15 million. Conversely, the Organization of American States and other international institutions got a $92 million increase. Yet, the OAS invited Fidel Castro back into the organization—by the way, Fidel then said no—and the OAS also leads support for the Honduran leader even after his supreme

court ruled that he could not extend his term.

□ 1915

Now many countries are forced into a dilemma by a would-be dictator who calls a vote but then ends all votes. Cuba has no votes. Venezuela has few remaining. And now Honduras was saved by a Supreme Court. Therefore, in my judgment, we should reduce the increase for the OAS, which doesn't know if it supports democracy, and give that money to the National Endowment for Democracy, which does.

I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his time.

Mr. Speaker, as he explained, our motion to recommit would reduce the United States' contribution to the Organization of American States by $15 million and instead direct that funding to NED, the National Endowment for Democracy, for democracy promotion programs.

Recent events call into question the commitment of the OAS to its historic values of democracy and human rights.

The OAS on Cuba? In spite of hundreds of political prisoners languishing in jail, having committed no crime but speaking on behalf of freedom; in spite of there being no elections; in spite of there being only one political party allowed to operate in Cuba, the Communist Party; in spite of no labor unions allowed to operate; no human rights respected, what did the OAS do? It passed a resolution lifting the 1962 suspension of Cuba from the OAS.

Regarding the events in Honduras, the OAS ignored President Zelaya's ongoing constitutional violations and remained silent when the Honduran Supreme Court acted, when the Attorney General decided, when the Human Rights Ombudsman decided, when the National Congress voted, all declaring his referendum illegal.

The United States is footing 60 percent of the entire budget bill for the OAS while that organization pursues an agenda of appeasement toward repressive governments in the hemisphere. The hard-earned dollars of your constituents go to fund this sham.

There are clearly much better uses of U.S. taxpayer funds in order to advance an agenda of freedom and democracy. The National Endowment for Democracy has a long record of fighting for fundamental freedoms, for democracies around the world. The $15 million will be better spent by NED to support dissidents and those struggling to advance freedom in the countries of the Americas.

A few examples of the OAS actions, I wish I had more time, but in February, following the attack of a prominent synagogue in Venezuela which highlighted the growing anti-Semitic campaign facilitated and tolerated by the Chavez regime, the then U.S. Ambassador to the OAS called for a condemnation. What did the OAS do? Nada. They did nothing. And the Secretary General expressed confidence in the system of Chavez and their investigation of the incident.

What about Nicaragua? In November of 2008, during their municipal elections, the OAS again did nada, nothing about reports that thousands of Sandinista supporters wielding homemade rocket launchers continued to arrive in Managua from all over the country gathering outside the Supreme Electoral Council's building to demand a final verdict on the elections. The OAS also did nada, nothing about the destruction of three opposition radio stations in the city of Leon during these municipal elections.

U.S. taxpayer funds are better spent supporting the work of the bipartisan National Endowment for Democracy that helps strengthen democratic institutions around the world. Let's help NED do something. Let's stop the OAS from doing nada.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that this House adopt the motion to recommit so that we can say that we don't want to cut the National Endowment for Democracy and that we want to support that organization rather than the Organization of American States, which has done nada.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, OAS is the preeminent multilateral organization in our hemisphere. It helps resolve or minimize many threats, including terrorism, narcotics, and political conflicts. It also plays an important role in promoting sustainable development in Central America, supports the election process in places like Ecuador, Paraguay, Haiti, and El Salvador.

While we may not agree with every issue and every member in the OAS, it is the key conduit for discussions among all of our hemispheric partners. We have made an international commitment as a member of OAS to pay our dues. Cutting our assessment payment will create arrears and undermine the work of the Secretariat, located here in Washington. The OAS is an international organization, and the United States has a legal commitment to provide our assessed contribution.

The OAS is the only regional organization in the Western Hemisphere that has all of the democratically elected members of the region, and all of them strive to enhance and secure democratic principles and values as embodied in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was accepted by all of the members.

The OAS is the prime defender of human rights in the region. OAS plays a major role in helping the people of Haiti as they struggle to establish a sustainable democratic regime, with assistance elections and civil society programs and rule of law. The OAS is one of the world's most recognized election observation experts, sending missions all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

It would be a disastrous sign of our commitment as the main contributor to the OAS for us to unilaterally cut off funding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, the Chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want everybody to understand the party proposing this motion to recommit is the same party that held the White House for 8 years where our policies and relationships towards the entire Latin American region so degraded our reputation and our effectiveness that they should be embarrassed to make suggestions.

Secondly, I am a great fan of the National Endowment for Democracy. I tell you they don't want this amendment to pass.

Thirdly, the real agenda here, this is an organization that has refused to bring back a member that does not meet the democratic criteria of that organization in great part because of the excellent work of our administration here at the most recent OAS meeting.

And, fourthly, the real agenda here is because some people here don't care that people they like better in a country called Honduras—and I understand why they like them better and in some ways they may be better—are willing to resort to a military coup and a totally antidemocratic approach to changing leadership but don't want to bring that into the debate because they're embarrassed to be associated with a military coup in Honduras. That's the goal of these people.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding to me.

As the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for the past 2 years, I can tell you wherever I go in South America, Central America, the Caribbean, people say that the United States has been neglectful over the past 8 years, that we haven't looked towards our own brothers and sisters in the Western Hemisphere, and I think that what we ought to be doing now is supporting organizations like the OAS. Even if we don't agree with everything they do, now is not the time to turn away or to cut funding for the OAS.

We need to be engaged. We need to work with our brother and sister countries in the hemisphere so that we can show that we are with them. And all cutting aid does is make it more difficult for our country to carry out our own foreign policy objectives.

I think there should be more money for the National Endowment for Democracy. This is not the way to do it.

Cutting aid to the OAS would be a grave mistake, and I oppose the motion.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 233, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

AYES—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schauer
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Boehner
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Graves
Heller
Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1942

Mr. McMAHON changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 524, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 106, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—318

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—106

Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hoekstra
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kucinich
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Radanovich
Rehberg
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stupak
Taylor
Teague
Thornberry
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Akin
Boehner
DeLauro
Fudge
Granger
Graves
Heller
Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1949

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2009 I missed votes because I was attending a funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 513, 514, 515, 516, 519, 521, 523 and 525. I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 517, 518, 520, 522, 524.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3082, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–195) on the resolution (H. Res. 622) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING AUGUST PROVOST III

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn and to salute August Provost III, a seaman at Camp Pendleton in California and to recognize the tragic way in which he lost his life in the line of duty. August Provost III was a young man, a constituent of the 18th Congressional District and coming from the famous Acres Home community. It was only a few days ago that his mother received the terrible news that he was shot dead on the base of Camp Pendleton, shot in the chest, shot in the back of the head and his body burned.

We cannot seem to find any definite information, Mr. Speaker. The allegation is that this is a hate crime. The reason why I rise today is that he will be funeralized tomorrow as a hero. We, as an American people, must stand against hateful acts on the basis of someone's difference. And to the United States military, for which I hold in the greatest respect, there must be a thorough, in-depth, full and broad investigation, not a cover-up, to find out why this valiant, young African American died on this military base in his uniform by being shot by an alleged fellow sailor.

The uniform of the United States military must be what it is, upstanding and respectful. And we cannot tolerate violence against fellow military personnel because of difference and should not exist in the United States of America military.

I mourn with the family. I pay tribute to him as he is laid to rest as an American hero. He will be forever an American hero in our hearts and in this Nation.

August, we thank you for your service. God bless you, and God bless the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE IRANIAN MASSACRE HAS BEGUN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the people of Iran are embroiled in a noble struggle against tyranny. The Government of Iran is engaged in the massacre of its own people. And what is their crime? They dare to speak out against fraud and corruption in their own government. They question the results of an election steeped in fraud.

Their peaceful dissent has resulted in violent and brutal crackdowns from the hard-line government, a government that has shed the blood of the innocent.

The people of Iran have boldly and bravely exercised the first basic human right, the right of free speech. The crackdown is startling news to the students who believed their government, despite its flaws, had the best interests of its people at heart. That veil has been forever lifted from their eyes.

In America, we faced a similar awakening to the brutality of the Government of England when that ruled us. The city of Boston was occupied by British troops to enforce harsh taxes and punishments intended to exert control over American colonies by force and intimidation. Citizens took to the streets to vocally decry the tyranny. Tense words were exchanged, and the British soldiers opened fire on a group of unarmed patriots. Five people were killed and eight others were injured.

We call it the Boston Massacre. The Boston Massacre has ended, but the Iranian Massacre has begun. And the silent voices of the slain still cry from the graves of the martyred oppressed.

These students have embraced the ideals of liberty and freedom. They value human life and dignity. Now they are faced with the realization that the republic they were taught to believe is not what it claims to be. They suffer the consequences of demanding human rights from a violent and tyrannical government.

The streets of Iran are eerily silent now, but the opposition does continue. A quiet and righteous anger builds in these oppressed and brutalized young people. One young student said, ''My friend, a 26-year-old fellow student, was on the streets last week. She is now

home with a broken arm and a broken leg. 'I saw hell right before my eyes last week,' '' she said. 'You can never imagine the sight of a huge man beating you to death.' ''

It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that these young students of Iran, these sons of liberty and daughters of democracy, have joined the few, the noble few who throughout history have stood and faced vicious tyrants.

A noted historian once said, ''You see these dictators on their pedestals, surrounded by the bayonets of their soldiers. Yet in their hearts there is unspoken, unspeakable fear. They are afraid of words and thoughts, words spoken and thoughts stirring at home that are all the more powerful because they are forbidden to be spoken.''

These young students are not alone, Mr. Speaker. We are kindred spirits. America has earned its freedom through struggle and shed its blood in many countries around the world in defense of freedom and liberty.

You see, Mr. Speaker, each of us throughout the ages of time are born with the unbroken spirit in our soul to be free, to desire liberty and freedom. Tyrants have always tried to enslave people in a brutal dark nightmare for the sake of their personal political power and financial gain. Indeed, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

The closing words written by this young Iranian student could have come right from the pages of America's own history books in the fight for our liberty.

He said, ''One thing we know for certain. This isn't a fight that will end tomorrow or next month. It is not a fight that any group or party can fight alone. The path is uncertain, the road ahead is quite bleak. But my generation, born on the sidelines only to watch and to obey, has now been given the opportunity to write its own history, to tell its own story. And to the best of our ability, we will do that.''

Americans should stand with these young people of Iran who have suffered much in their struggle for human rights and human dignity. Their courage in the face of overwhelming odds is an example to all who honor freedom. They have earned their own place of honor in the pages of history among those who have so valiantly fought and died for the cause of human dignity.

Sam Adams was one of America's sons of liberty, and he said, ''It does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority keen to set brush fires in the minds of people.''

May the students of Iran prevail in their holy cause of freedom.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE CAPE COD BASEBALL LEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today so that my colleagues in the House of Representatives can join me in recognizing a special piece of Americana, the Cape Cod Baseball League of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

Widely renowned as the best summer collegiate league in the Nation, the Cape Cod Baseball League today consists of 10 franchises in two, five-team divisions. In its early years, during World War I and World War II, the league was largely populated by young GIs fresh from their service overseas. The modern era of the Cape Cod Baseball League commenced in 1963, when it was officially sanctioned by the NCAA.

Throughout its existence, the league has been responsible for several Cy Young and Most Valuable Player awards in the Bigs and many Hall of Famers and renowned scouts and managers, all of whom received their start in the Cape Cod Baseball League. Entering its 125th season, the league continues to offer the most talented baseball players from across the country the opportunity to demonstrate their skills in front of professional scouts.

As a pioneer among the Nation's summer leagues in many respects, including the use of wooden bats, the Cape Cod Baseball League is truly America's league. The young players learned the importance of sportsmanship and modesty, not only on the diamond and in the dugout, but also through the generosity of generations of Cape Cod families who open their homes to host them during the summer season.

At a time that has not always been conducive to preserving the integrity of the game, the Cape Cod Baseball League continues to embody the golden American tradition of our wholesome national pastime. That pastime has been kept alive in its pure and amateur state owing to the outstanding efforts of this volunteer organization, which enables fans to enjoy games at no expense where visions of Red Sox, Cracker Jack and lemonade evoke feelings of nostalgia for the bygone days of America's favorite sport, baseball.

The Cape Cod Baseball League stands out as a national treasure that can captivate any young man or woman through nine heart-pounding innings. On this historic occasion I am particularly proud to honor the Cape Cod Baseball League for 125 years of success and its well established, beloved reputation among Cape Cod residents and tourists alike.

Congratulations to the Cape Cod Baseball League, and may you forever be, as the saying goes, ''Where the Stars of Tomorrow Shine Tonight.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAXPAYER-FUNDED SPENDING SPREE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act early this spring, the administration and congressional Democrats argued that a $800 billion taxpayer-funded spending spree was necessary to create jobs and grow the struggling economy. It was rushed through with little time to review the policies that would implement this massive spending plan.

I opposed this unwise scheme for many reasons. It will put an unbearable burden of debt upon our children and our grandchildren. It was loaded down with pork-barrel projects to pay back liberal special interest groups.

But I also opposed it because I believe and continue to believe that it will not grow jobs in our economy. The government is not nor should it be an employment service that mandates private-sector hiring decisions. Predictably, we are now seeing that these reckless spending decisions are not growing our economy. The June unemployment numbers saw the unemployment rate rise to a 26-year high of 9.5 percent. This translates into 467,000 jobs lost in the month of June alone.

Before passage of the ARRA, the Obama administration predicted that unemployment would peak at 8 percent before decreasing this fall. But unemployment has already reached 9.5 percent, and the situation is not likely to improve until long after the White House predicted.

However, the administration hardly has cause to be surprised. In fact, after they sold this massive Federal spending spree as a job creation measure, it turns out that jobs don't seem to be a priority at all.

I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to the funding announcement for the Smart Grid Investment Grants, which received $3.9 billion in the Recovery Act. The Vice President himself announced this grant in April when he said this is about jobs, jobs.

In the information provided to the applicants for this grant funding, one of the frequently asked questions is, Will DOE use a number of jobs estimated to be created and/or retained as

a criterion for rating a proposal for funding? The answer: ''No.''

Le me repeat that again. Will jobs be used as a criteria to determine whether or not this project will be funded? The answer from the DOE is no.

In fact, the guidance goes on to say that DOE removed the criterion on the extent of jobs creation and now will require applicants to report quarterly on the number of jobs created and retained. Job creation was supposed to be the primary requisite for receiving recovery funds, and yet now has been changed to simply a reporting requirement. This is typical Washington. Instead of creating more jobs, we are creating more paperwork.

The Vice President now says they misread the economy, but the truth is they misread the solution. The stimulus bill was a grab bag of Democrat spending priorities, not a timely, targeted and temporary stimulus package. Government spending does not, does not, create jobs or wealth. It consumes it and destroys it.

We are throwing money at a problem that is not increasing consumer confidence, financial certainty or provide a business environment that will encourage job growth. Democrat policies are clearly, clearly, not creating jobs. I cannot, I cannot in good conscience justify throwing good money after bad. That only leaves a legacy of debt for our children and our grandchildren to pay.

I will continue to oppose policies that I believe hurt the American people and the people I represent, and I will gladly, gladly work with my colleagues across the aisle whenever there is an opportunity to do so because good policies that help Texans and help Americans aren't Republican, and they aren't Democrat; they are the right thing to do.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a few minutes today and talk about health care, because that is really the most pressing issue that's facing our country right now. It's inextricably tied to the economic situation of millions of Americans. So even as we struggle to deal with this difficult economy, we can't lose sight of the importance of health care reform.

Now, we have in this country a real paradox with our health care system, because on the one hand America has the best doctors, it has the best nurses, it has highly, highly trained professionals. And I believe, having worked with caregivers for almost 20 years representing providers in Maryland, I think we have the most compassionate caregivers you can find any place.

We have wonderful, fine institutions in my district—the University of Maryland medical system, Johns Hopkins health system. These are some of the finest institutions in the world, year after year being identified at the top of their class.

And we have amazing technology. Every year the advances in technology make it easier for us to address some of the most persistent health care problems in our country. So that's on the one side of the equation.

On the other side we have the highest health care costs in the developed world, we have tremendous shortages of our caregivers, shortages of physicians, shortages of nurses and many other categories of those who provide care.

We have millions of people, millions of people who have no health insurance, and we argue over the number. Some say it's 47 million, some say it's less. But we're talking about tens of millions of people who don't have health insurance coverage in this country. Means we have got a problem.

There are millions more who are underinsured. What does that mean? That means that they have health coverage, but they are one serious health crisis away from pitching over the edge in terms of their families and themselves.

And then those who do have coverage, adequate coverage, are paying premiums that go up by 15, 20, 25 percent a year. So we are all in it together. We all understand at some level that the current system is broken. This is our chance, this is our time. This is the moment to fix it. The American people have been clamoring for this for decades.

So we have to take up the charge. We are not going to borrow anybody's model. We are not going to import a model from England or Canada or France. We are going to design our own brand of American health care, and we are going to fix this system. We can do that.

There are two parts of the discussion. There is a coverage discussion. How do we get to where everybody has decent access to care? I think we ought to pursue this public plan option, because it will keep costs down. It will compete with the private health insurance plans who had kind of a stranglehold on the system, and Americans understand this.

They have moved past this in the discussion. They know we need the public option, because it will create a more level playing field. And, in the words of the President, it will keep the insurance companies honest.

But on the other side of the equation, in addition to the coverage issue, is the delivery of care. And we have got to look at investing in our workforce, and I am glad to say I have introduced legislation that attempts to do that, the health care Workforce Investment Act of 2009, which would create a national workforce advisory board to do just this, look at this question of filling in the workforce.

We have got to focus more on primary and preventive care so we can keep people healthy on the front end instead of just looking after them after they get sick on the back end. We need to change our system and move in that direction.

I like the idea of play space health care. What is that? Instead of expecting people to come to the health system let's figure out how we can take the health care system to people where they are already gathered. Let's go to our schools, where 98 percent of the people between the ages of 5 and 16 can be found 5 days a week, and let's intervene there.

Let's go to senior centers and provide care to our seniors where they are already gathering. And let's go to workplaces and incentivize with tax breaks and tax incentives large employers to put clinics in place to serve working adults right there where they are in the workplace.

These are all things we can do to improve the delivery system.

So let me just close with this: As this health care reform leaves the station, there are three things that need to be on that train so that it's a train to somewhere, not a train to nowhere.

Those three things are universal access to coverage, and I think this public plan option is a wonderful way to go. Second, investment in our workforce, and, third, focusing on primary and preventive care. If we do that, we are going to fix this health care system for millions of Americans across this country.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF LANCE CORPORAL SETH SHARP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, the residents of Adairsville, Georgia, in my district, the 11th, are saying good-bye to a local hero who died while bravely serving his Nation in Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Seth Sharp was killed in action on July 2, 2009, from a gunshot wound to his neck during one of the biggest United States military operations in Afghanistan since the global war on terror began back in 2001.

Later this week, I will join Seth's family, his friends and supporters at his funeral in honor of the life of this brave soldier, a life given as the ultimate sacrifice, a sacrifice of duty and love. For, as it is written in John, ''Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.''

This was not Seth's first deployment in the global war on terror. He enlisted with the Marines at age 17 and was serving his Nation in Iraq at age 18. Even at such a young age, Seth embraced the challenge of the Marine Corps and took pride in serving his country. His service and his sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Lance Corporal Sharp leaves behind his fiancee and lifelong sweetheart, Katie McMahon; his father and his stepmother, Rick and Tiffany Sharp of Adairsville, Georgia; his mother, Angela Preston of Alligator Point, Florida; as well as many other close relatives and friends spread out all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers go out to his family, and my most heartfelt gratitude goes out to Lance Corporal Seth Sharp for his selfless sacrifice for this Nation. I ask all Members to please join me in honoring the distinguished memory of Lance Corporal Seth Sharp.

CLEAN ENERGY AND THE GREAT LAKES REGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, hundreds and hundreds of Americans will gather in Massena, New York, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the fourth seacoast of our country, stretching all the way from Duluth, Minnesota, all the way out to the Atlantic Ocean, and for communities such as Toledo and Port Clinton and Sandusky in my own congressional district, the Saint Lawrence Seaway waterborne corridor is our gateway to the Atlantic and the world beyond.

The seaway is the linchpin in our efforts to create sophisticated, modern, multimodal distribution hubs that can skirt the congestion in coastal ports in our country. The seaway, our corridor that we share with the Canadians, is the vital link of commerce between our Nation's heartland and world markets. Therefore, investments in the seaway are not only investments in our economic future for the Great Lakes States but for the Nation.

As the United States Congress considers clean energy legislation and a national power generation policy, it is important that that policy remediate a major national energy inequity that must be included in any reform bill.

Power costs are just horrendous in the Great Lakes States, in fact, double and triple the rates of our western and southern brethren and southeastern brethren in our country. And when you think about those regions having had the luxury of Federal power support for nearly 75 years—and they have enjoyed those power supports—they were really a product of a Nation that believed in growing to the west and the south. And we made it happen.

But our Great Lakes region, along with some northeastern States, are the only parts of our country without equal access to Federal benefit for electric power generation and transmission, thus denying competitive rates to our residential, commercial, and industrial consumers.

The high costs of power just in my district here in northern Ohio—at 14 to 18 cents a kilowatt hour—is a serious factor contributing to job loss. In fact, the Midwest is put at a competitive disadvantage with the entire rest of the country, not because we have fewer resources or less skilled workers, but because Federal subsidies encourage development in western and southern areas, but not in ours.

The House version of the energy bill includes a provision members of the Great Lakes States worked very hard to incorporate. It begins the process of leveling the energy playing field for these Great Lakes States and creating the startup of Federal energy parity.

The Great Lakes region is home to 116 million people that account for well over a third of our Nation's gross domestic product, and we've long endured these serious competitive disadvantages because of the absence of Federal power parity.

This provision aims to level the playing field with all other regions of the country—the South, the West, the Southeast, the Tennessee Valley Authority—that have benefited for over 75 years from Federal power assistance to develop their economies.

These regions borrow at very favorable Federal funds rates and also receive significant energy infrastructure investments annually, with the Western Power Authority alone receiving over $228 million just in the last year.

In the recovery bill passed earlier this year, there was an additional $6.5 billion just for Bonneville Power Authority and the Western Area Power Authority, along with $10 million for added infrastructure and administration.

For infrastructure, for renewable power generation, really, these Federal supports provide a huge strategic advantage. The language we're offering would propose a similar $3.5 billion borrowing authority to create jobs through the development of clean energy platforms, and if we don't do this in our region, those green energy jobs are going to flow to the other parts of the country.

This provision would allow a Federal instrumentality such as the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to undertake these green energy development activities across Great Lakes communities. And as the energy bill moves to the Senate, Members of this body must continue to demand equal treatment from the Federal Government for all regions of our Nation.

Our region's track record is commendable. It speaks for itself. We're among the three top solar centers in the hemisphere. We have massive biofuels industries, the first solar plant at a U.S. National Guard base, establishment of clean energy incubators at many of our advanced universities, and an expanding roster of startup green companies that are pursuing exciting opportunities in solar, wind, and other green power sectors.

The Great Lakes deserve to be a part of the solution to clean energy in our country, but in order to do this, we need to have that Federal energy power parity with the other regions of the country that have now developed as a result of what the Midwest and Northeast did for them over three-quarters of a century ago.

A true revolution in green energy can only be ushered in in a balanced way when the Great Lakes have the same instrumentalities that ushered in generations of western and southern growth.

ARE WE REDISTRIBUTING THE WEALTH?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Today, the Obama administration has floated an idea that really is rather shocking and is quite different than what I thought we were going to do with the TARP money that's coming back to us. In fact, last week I had two town meetings where I talked to folks in South Carolina's Fourth District about how it is that the $350 billion of TARP I is now coming back to us, the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, $70 billion has been repaid.

We're earning interest ranging from 5 to 9 percent on that. And the last reports we had, it's totaling $4.5 billion that's paid back to us in interest. So you have the principal return of about $70 billion. We have interest coming back to us in the form of the magnitude of somewhere around $4.5 billion.

Today's story indicates that really it's a larger amount of interest; it's $6.5 billion.

Now, what the Obama administration is talking about doing—and this truly is shocking, Mr. Speaker—is that that money would not come back to pay down the deficit from whence cometh the $350 billion that we spent on TARP but, rather, they would divert this money to troubled homeowners.

There are two problems with this, Mr. Speaker. One is a real constitutional question, which is: What gives? The administration gets to decide, not Congress. The administration gets to decide, the Executive gets to decide about how to redistribute this money so that they can basically take it and use it for the Treasury purposes to do something else besides pay back to the deficit or pay back to the Federal Treasury? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. It's a constitutional problem with that. That's the first objection.

The second is: Is this administration absolutely intent on redistributing

wealth? Isn't that what they're doing here? This money is America's money that we invested in trying to save our banking system from collapse, putting $350 million in TARP I into this effort to stop the collapse of our banking system.

When that money is paid back, it should come to all of us, all American taxpayers. We invested it; we should get it back. This is what I was telling in town meetings last week is that we're going to get this money back. And we've got a shot at getting back TARP I, maybe even at a profit.

But now the Obama administration is talking about redistributing that money, not giving it back to all the taxpayers; rather, doting on constituencies that they find favorable or that they are favorable to. So they pick up on a sympathetic case, which is maybe troubled homeowners, and they decide that we'll just slough the money to them rather than pay it back to the Treasury and have it enjoyed by all the taxpayers who invested the $350 billion to the banking system.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's a constitutional objection here that we really should be concerned about as a Congress, and then there's this real question about how far will this administration go in attempting to redistribute wealth.

This money belongs to all of the American people. This money we pledged together to try to rescue the banking system. As it comes back, paid back to us, it should be paid back to all of us, not just to troubled homeowners, not just to sympathetic cases but, rather, to all American taxpayers.

So I urge my colleagues to join with me in watching the constitutional question here and watching the redistribution of wealth, which we must object to, Mr. Speaker.

AGREEMENT ON NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I rise today to congratulate President Obama on reaching an agreement on nuclear arms control with Russian President Medvedev. This agreement will cut American and Russian nuclear arsenals by at least one quarter. This represents a critical step towards more substantial arms control, as well as a milestone in confronting our nuclear legacy.

I, like most Americans, was born in the nuclear age. The 1945 bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki marked its beginning, establishing an uncertain peace in a war-weary world.

□ 2030

But with the global proliferation of nuclear weapons, the threat of catastrophe grew ever closer. Confrontations in Berlin, in Cuba and the Middle East were one miscalculation away from disaster. But rather than learning from these close calls and taking dramatic steps to reduce our stockpiles of nuclear arms, we built more, and so did the Soviet Union.

Our arms control efforts were limited at best, and at worst they collapsed under the pressure of pursuing a global containment strategy against the Soviet Union. Today, the United States and Russia each deploy over 2,000 nuclear warheads. Although both countries exercise extreme care in managing these weapons, only one mistake in judgment could be fatal. That risk has grown as seven other countries have joined the so-called nuclear club over the past half century.

Our nuclear warheads are also expensive to maintain and draw badly needed funding away from other priorities. As former President Eisenhower said, ''Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.''

For this reason I stand here today not only to congratulate President Obama on his progress in Moscow, but also to urge him to take further steps toward reducing the global stockpile of nuclear weapons. Like President Obama, I recognize that we live in a world in which threats to peace are no longer confined to the traditional great powers.

I echo President Obama's sentiment that in this ''strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of nuclear attack has gone up.''

Rogue states and terrorist organizations are dedicated to acquiring nuclear weapons. We must be vigilant in controlling these weapons and making sure that they do not fall into the wrong hands. A nuclear arms treaty with Russia to replace the expiring START treaty is a good place to start. We should also ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which aims to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world.

We must confront the terrible legacy of the Cold War. We must recognize that although this legacy belongs to another generation, it is now our responsibility to enact change. We must stop wasting money on the excesses of the Cold War and start thinking about improving the present. We must show the world that we are committed to reducing this nuclear threat. We must do everything we can to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TROUBLING INCREASES IN STATE-FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the vote that I took this afternoon on H.R. 3081 was one of the toughest votes that I have had to take in this House since I have been here in my 4½ years. The problem with the bill and with the decision that had to be made is because the bill contained funding for aid to Israel, our best friend in the world.

I have always been and will continue to be an extremely strong supporter of Israel. Israel has always been a good friend to the United States, and the people of this country and the people of Israel share the same values. However, the bill had so many flaws that it made it very difficult for a pro-life fiscal conservative such as myself to vote for the bill despite my very strong support for Israel.

The bill, when emergency supplemental funds were not taken into account, was still 32 percent more than the regular fiscal year 2009 appropriations. I am taking the liberty of using some of the figures from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), which were also presented today on the floor in terms of explaining the bill that we voted on this afternoon.

We are facing a fiscal crisis in this country. This administration and this Congress, led by Speaker PELOSI, are spending this country into a terrible, terrible situation. We are mortgaging our children and grandchildren's future with excess spending; and it has to stop somewhere.

Had this bill merely contained the funding for Israel, it would have been very easy for me to have supported it, although I was quite concerned that the bill reduced the funding for Israel by 7.2 percent below last year's funding level and 23.3 percent below the request. But, as I said earlier, the total bill had an increase of 33.8 percent compared to last year.

One of the most troubling increases in this bill was a 20 percent increase to the United Nations Population Fund and a 19 percent increase to International Family Planning. The United Nations Population Fund aids China's one-child policy, coercive abortion, and sterilization. International Family Planning goes to organizations that promote and provide abortion services through International Planned Parenthood Federation and Marie Stokes International.

In addition, the Democrats had rejected four cost-cutting Republican amendments that had been presented which could have made this bill a lot more palatable to the 97 Republicans who voted against it.

Another problem with the bill is that there was a false assumption that the Obama administration will live up to

its promise of no more war supplementals for Iraq and Afghanistan. The President has gone back on every promise that he made during the campaign. He has already asked for a supplemental this year, says it was a carryover from last year, but that won't happen again. However, before the ink was dry on the amended full committee report of this bill, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Congressman MURTHA, publicly stated that another supplemental is necessary to fund the troops because of the low fiscal year 2010 Defense allocation.

So the promise was that all of the money for the war was going to be here and we wouldn't have to do more supplementals. That isn't going to happen.

This bill also avoids making hard fiscal choices about spending abroad while we face a financial crisis here. This is not the way we should be going. We should be funding our friends and our allies. We should be helping Israel which is the only true democracy in the Middle East and who stands by us year after year, day after day. But funding things like abortion and international family planning is not the way to go.

WASHINGTON IS OUT OF CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America has been the light of liberty and a beacon of hope to the world for centuries, truly centuries. We are the greatest Nation the world has ever known. We have provided more hope and more opportunity and more liberty and more freedom for more individuals than any nation in the history of mankind.

But today, July 9, 2009, folks in my district and folks across this land are not just concerned; they are fearful. They are afraid that the very Nation that they know and love and that has been the greatest Nation in the history of the world is slipping away from them—in so many ways, so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, we all just got back to Washington from a week many of us spent at home over the July 4 break, and I heard people come up to me and tell me that they were concerned and worried and fearful about the amount of spending and the amount of borrowing and the amount of taxing coming out of Washington. They say Washington is out of control. Mr. Speaker, they are right. They are absolutely right. The deficit this year, $1.8 trillion; four times the largest previous deficit. Four times.

Borrowing. We are borrowing 50 cents of every single dollar we are spending. Mr. Speaker, it is out of control. Taxing, raising taxes on every single American. I don't care what the President tells you, Mr. Speaker, it is not true. They are raising taxes on every single American.

Now the solution, one of the solutions, is to allow this deliberative body, this greatest deliberative body in the history of the world the opportunity to allow the Representatives in this body to work their will, to say I believe I am going to represent my constituents in this way and offer this amendment on this bill and thereby allow the House to make a decision.

We are in appropriations season, Mr. Speaker. It is a time when we decide how to spend Americans' hard-earned money, the money that they send to Washington. During that season in the past, the House has allowed appropriations bills to come to the floor under what is called an open rule which means that everybody gets the opportunity to amend the appropriations bill. They get the opportunity to offer an amendment in the House, and the House gets to vote on the amendment.

There have been amendments offered on recent bills that have not been allowed. In fact, this is the most repressive majority in the history of the Republic if you use the number of closed rules, not allowing amendments to come to the floor.

This, Mr. Speaker, this is the most repressive majority ever in the history of this Republic.

An amendment that was offered but not allowed to the bill we voted on today would have prohibited funding for any new international organization for the purposes that would tax American energy companies from abroad. The only conclusion I can draw is that the Speaker and the Democrats in charge want American energy companies to be taxed by foreign governments.

An amendment that wasn't allowed would have reduced the spending 15 percent on this bill to 2009 levels, a savings of $17 billion. That amendment, Mr. Speaker, was not allowed. I can only assume that the Speaker and the Democrats in charge want to increase spending by $17 billion over 2009 levels.

An amendment that wasn't allowed, an amendment to prevent U.S. funds from being used to pay the legal expenses of United Nations employees who have been charged with malfeasance, not allowed. Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that the Speaker of the House and the Democrats in charge want the American taxpayers to pay the legal expenses for United Nations employees who are charged with malfeasance.

Mr. Speaker, an amendment that wasn't allowed would have prohibited assistance to members of foreign terrorist organizations. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I am left to conclude and the American people are left to conclude is that this Speaker and the Democrats in charge want the American taxpayer to provide assistance to members of foreign terrorist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't the way the House is supposed to be run. It is not the way that the House has been run for the last 233 years. It is not the way that the American people learned about democracy, that their Representatives would be allowed to represent them actively and aggressively so that people had the opportunity to represent their constituents equally with every other Member.

Mr. Speaker, right now in this Chamber we have tyranny from the majority, tyranny that is not allowing the voice of the people to be heard. Mr. Speaker, I demand that this Chamber, that these Members of this House of Representatives make certain that the rules are appropriately followed and end the tyranny of the majority in this Chamber now.

DEMOCRATS ABUSE RULES PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend from Georgia was saying, about tyranny in this House. We were promised the most open government in the Nation's history. That's what we were promised.

There is the Speaker's Web site that even talks about how open it is going to be. Well, it isn't. And as a result, the Nation is being punished because some of the things that our friends across the aisle said before they were elected to the majority to control this city and this country were true.

□ 2045

You do better when you have open government and open amendments and can debate these ideas. But that's not what we've gotten. Oh, no. We've had an abuse of the rule process. Why? Because they can.

I was asked, as I was around the district this last week, Why do you let them get away with all these things that are going on? And I said, Well, you're not following what's going on. Every time we make a privileged motion, we try to enforce the rules, it's tabled every time, so it's not going anywhere. So no one is held to account for abuses. Why? Because they can—and they didn't want an open government.

You know, the founding of this country tells so much. Those guys were so brilliant. They were so much better read than most of the people in this body now. They knew what government led to. They knew what the abuse of power led to. And so they weren't content to have one body elected, they said, let's have two. And not only should we have two bodies, let's make them at odds with each other. We need friction so that there is not this abuse.

And not only that, we don't want to do like we've seen some parliaments do where they elect their executive. No, no, no, no. We want the people to elect an executive, and then he will be at

odds with those two houses and he will be able to veto what they do. That will give us some protection—because you can't have enough protection from government—but that's not enough. We want another branch. We will have a judicial branch, and then they can veto things that are inappropriate and outside the Constitution. They saw all this coming, and they knew it could be abused if they didn't have these safeguards in the way.

But what's happened? Well, we can have an executive that the Congress just says, well, whatever you want. Oh, you wanted an Auto Task Force that will meet behind closed doors, be accountable to nobody? Put together a bill, a plan that is signed by a lazy bankruptcy judge because he doesn't want to have all the hearings the law requires, and it puts people out of business. It's a constitutional taking, but where is the Supreme Court? They start to stop the process and then they say, Go ahead, we'll let you be unconstitutional, we won't stop it.

And what has the Congress done? Well, look, Mr. President, if you'll let us keep abusing and running this country into the dust heap of history then we will let you keep doing what you want. It's abusing the process.

That's why we had a bill this evening that should have been clean, it should have given money to a friend, a good friend like Israel, but, oh, no, we've got to put all this baloney in there that ends up doing more harm to the purposes for which this Nation was founded than good. So I couldn't vote for it in the end.

The stimulus. We couldn't do anything with that—presented at the last minute where no one could amend it. I tried to tell the President and friends in here, look, how about a tax holiday for the people that earn the money? How about that? You let them have it, then you'll see stimulation. And what happened? The President liked the idea. And I heard him on the radio talking about, We're going to leave money in your check—except he said if you jump through all the obstacles, then you could have $65, maybe, in your check. I was talking about $6,000, not $65. Then you would have seen stimulation of the economy. But the process won't let us do that.

With the ''crap and trade'' bill, we're driving jobs out of America. We're sending manufacturers to countries that pollute four to 10 times more than we do. How does that help the environment? It doesn't.

And a health care bill that's being written behind closed doors so that we will not be able to get the best ideas in there. I'm trying to get a bill put through. Leg counsel said, Well, the Democratic leadership is taking all our time, we can't put yours in a form to bring to the floor. So we're having to try to go around behind other ways to get it done.

There are Nation-ending things that are happening, and the Founders put in place ways to stop it. We need to start following those ways.

AMERICANS ARE ABOUT TO LOSE THE HEALTH CARE THEY HAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to warn the American people that they are about to lose the health care they have, to warn the 83 percent of Americans who like the health care coverage they already have and to caution them that it is about to be taken away. It is about to be taken away, quite frankly, in an undemocratic process that will occur essentially in the dark of night. You see, as you have just heard from the last two speakers, democracy does not exist in this body today as it has in the past.

I sit on the primary committee that should be writing this health care bill. I have not been allowed to participate in any way, shape, or form, not in any way, shape or form. The majority has written their bill all alone, behind closed doors, consulting only the majority. They can roll right over the minority, and they don't care. But that's wrong, that's dead wrong, and only the American people can stop it.

Now, you heard me say, I rise to warn you that you are about to lose the health care you have. And you may have said to yourself, No, wait, Congressman, I've heard the President say again and again and again that if you like the care you have, you may keep it. I, too, have heard the President say those words, but they are not true. They are absolutely not true.

You see, while we do not have a bill to read yet, we have a discussion draft. We will mark up a bill next week in all three committees with jurisdiction, but we don't have a bill yet. But we do have a discussion draft. That discussion draft makes the most sweeping changes to American health care—indeed, it is the most sweeping piece of legislation I have seen in my 15-year career in the Congress, and the most dramatic piece of legislation in decades. And yet, it will completely change health care in America, it will change one-sixth of our Nation's economy, and it will destroy the health care you have now.

If you like what you have now, if you're one of those 83 percent of Americans who like their health care—maybe it's not perfect, its cost is going up too fast, you would like more control over it, but your employer has the control or the plan has the control; you would like to pick your doctor, but you can't; you would like a better system, but you still like what you have now? If you like it, be prepared to lose it because, under this bill, you will lose it.

Every health care plan in America will change. The bill says that in almost those exact words. It says that they are creating a new health care bureaucracy to exist between you and your doctor. This chart shows that bureaucracy. You are the patient up here in the upper left-hand corner, your doctor is in the lower right-hand corner. Every single little box you see is a newly created agency, bureaucracy, program, plan, or bureaucrat standing between you and your doctor.

But here's the one that counts in terms of changing the plan you have. They are creating a new, nicely named board. This nicely named board is called the American Health Care Benefits Advisory Committee. I love the word ''advisory''; it sounds like they're going to give you some advice. Wrong. This board will be a Federal board that will decide what is in every health care plan in America. If your employer has a plan today and it doesn't fit every dot and tittle of what the new Health Benefits Advisory Committee requires, it must change. And that means every plan in America will change.

Now, they're being gracious; they will let the current plans stand for those who already have them for 5 years, but at the end of that 5 years every plan will change. If you like what you have, it will change. They are inserting all of these bureaucrats between you and your doctor, 48 new agencies.

Here's the Health Choices Administration, one of the new agencies they're creating, the risk pooling mechanism, the Health Benefits Advisory Committee, the many government health care plans. Here is the Public Health Investment Fund, the QHBP Ombudsman, the Medicare Trust Fund—we already have that one—and on and on and on and on. And they're putting them between you and your doctor. If you like what you have, be prepared to lose it because that's the mandate of this bill.

Now, what are some of the other mandates? Every employer in America must provide health care coverage for every full-time employee and every part-time employee. Every. You heard me say ''every'' employer in America, not every big employer, but in the House bill, every employer. If you employ yourself, you must insure yourself and create a plan that meets the demands of this new government agency.

Now, they do have a small business exemption, but guess what? In the House bill, there is no definition of small business—it's left blank. I wonder why. I guess they don't want to tell us that they can define a small business as as little as one employee.

It creates a new government health care plan. That government health care plan will compete with your plan. Very interesting. The President was asked on ABC television last week, Mr. President, you've said if Americans like the health care plan they have, they can keep it, and yet it appears you're going to take things away. What do you mean by that, Mr. President? And the President of the United States responded, The government will not, on

its own and directly, abolish any plan. And the interviewer said, Well, but wait a minute, what if you write a new set of rules that makes it impossible for American employers to offer the plan they're currently offering? The President's response was, Well, that's not the government taking away your plan; that's your employer taking away your plan. If you believe that, then I've got some land in Florida to sell you.

The American people need health care reform. We can give them better health care reform. We can give them choice and control over their own health care. We do not have to choose between the flawed current system and a government takeover of American health care.

Americans, now is the time to engage. You don't have another minute to waste. Please get involved in this debate.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker. I also want to thank the minority leader and the leadership on the minority side for providing this hour for us to talk in some detail about health care and what is pending before this Congress over the next 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that as we sit here on the literal eve of the markup of this bill in the Committees of Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, all beginning next week when we return from our districts, as we sit here on the eve of that markup, there is no House bill. And it makes it very, very difficult. We're told, if you have amendments, let's get them all together because we want to have a good look at them before we start the markup. How do you amend a bill that you haven't seen yet? Well, that's the task that's before many of us on the committee and that's where we have been placing our efforts during this past week, but it is a task made much more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I will just tell you, as someone who was involved in the campaigns last fall, I was a surrogate for Senator MCCAIN. It meant that I went all over the country debating health care with surrogates for President Obama. It seemed a virtual lock that there would be a presidential directive for a health care bill that would come shortly after the election, and certainly by Inauguration Day. In fact, Senator BAUCUS convened a great group over at the Library of Congress at the end of last October and produced a white paper that for all the world looked like a blueprint for a plan for a health care bill.

Election Day came and went, President Obama won, no health care bill. We had the holidays, Christmas, New Years, no health care bill. The Inauguration, all the festivities that took over Washington, but no health care bill. And here we are, the week after the July 4 recess, still waiting for that bill. What happened to the promises on the campaign trail last fall? Were they really that ephemeral that they could not be condensed into legislative language and produced for the House floor? Well, that's where we find ourselves.

Now, in March of this year, the President did convene a group of us down at the White House. He spoke very eloquently. He said the words you've already heard spoken on the floor of this House tonight, If you like what you have, you can keep it. Let me emphasize that, he repeated it, If you like what you have, you can keep it. And of course he says if you like what you have you can keep it because polls show anywhere between 60 to 80 percent of Americans like what they have and want to keep it; 160 million Americans receive their health care through employer-sponsored insurance, another 10–15 million through individual insurance policies, and they like what they have and they want to keep it. In fact, their greatest fear is that something will happen to their employment or their ability to make those premium payments, and they will lose what they have because they like what they have and they want to keep it.

□ 2100

But the second thing the President said was, The only thing I will not accept out of this Congress is the status quo. But wait a minute. If you like what you have, you can keep it would imply if you like what you have, you can keep it. How do you do that? How do you keep what you have and not accept the status quo? And therein is the quandary that has been presented to the other side, and that is what has taken the incredible length of time.

Now, coupled with that are the beginnings of some bills began to leak out of the Senate side at the end of June. We got into the issue of cost and coverage. And the initial reports that came out of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was a price tag of $1 trillion. That wasn't the whole bill because we hadn't quite figured out all the Medicaid parts, but $1 trillion for the opening salvo, and it would cover about a third of the reported uninsured. Well, that's not a great bargain. That's not great value for your dollar.

The Senate Finance Committee came up with another bill. Another score was given to that bill, and the cost was over $1.5 trillion. And they immediately went back and started to rework the bill to bring that price down to at least $1 trillion. That appears to be now the new high-water mark for health care legislation.

The House bill, as scored through the Committee on Ways and Means just this week, also scored at $1.5 trillion. No word, no word on the number of people that would be covered. If you like what you have, you can keep it right up until the time we tell you that you can't. And that apparently is the game plan, is the mission statement for the health care bill that will be brought to us from the Democratic majority.

Mr. Speaker, I'm joined by a number of other people who wish to speak on this very important topic, and I do want to give everyone the appropriate amount of time.

Just one housekeeping detail, the Congressional Doctors Caucus had an open forum during this past week down at George Washington University. Different from the White House infomercial on health care, this was an open forum. It was open to anyone who could come in and question Members of Congress who also happened to be physicians. It turned out all of us who were Republicans who showed up, but they could come and question the Republican House physicians on the issues related to what is going on with changes in the health care system. And we had a very lively hour and 45 minutes, a number of questions that were delivered by the staff and faculty there at George Washington and a number of questions that just came from the audience. But it was a lively hour.

The event was Webcast live at the time that it was carried out, and that Webcast has been archived and is available on the Congressional Health Care Caucus Web site. That's www.healthcaucus.org. Go to the appropriate tab for archived events, and the George Washington health care event has been archived on that Web site.

Well, again, we are joined by many Members of Congress. People are eager to speak about this. Goodness knows we're not going to get a chance to have a legislative hearing in our committee. But let us begin this evening, and we are going to hear from one of the doctors who was there at the forum at George Washington, an orthopedist from the great State of Georgia, a member of G–7, Dr. TOM PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, Dr. BURGESS, for your leadership on this issue and so many others. And I want to thank you for your participation we had at the event at George Washington University and really the wonderful perspective that you bring as a physician to the table.

In my previous life, I was an orthopedic surgeon. I spent 20-plus years practicing orthopedic surgery in the Atlanta area.

As we move forward with health care reform, it's clear that something is coming. And I get asked by folks: What kinds of things don't we want? What kinds of things can they do to us that would be bad? And I would suggest, Dr. BURGESS and colleagues, three things that would be a death knell for quality health care in the United States.

The first is ceding the definition of quality to the Federal Government. If we say as a society that we are going to allow the bureaucrats, nonmedical individuals, to decide what quality health care is, as has been proposed by the President through his Comparative Effectiveness Research Council and others with the list of programs that you've heard Mr. SHADEGG describe just a moment ago, then that would be a death knell for American medicine. Quality truly is only known by compassionate, caring physicians and patients and their families who know what is best for them because there is no way that the government can define what's best for each and every individual.

The second death knell for quality health care I believe to be any mandate, any individual or employer mandate. If individuals are required to purchase health insurance, that's a death knell. If employers are required to provide health insurance, that's a death knell. Why? Well, it's a mandate, which is a bad idea. But more importantly, when we here in Washington mandate something, what we do is define what we are mandating, and in this instance we would demand what qualified as health insurance or health coverage.

Dr. BURGESS, you well know that this Congress would define something that doesn't include all sorts of robust things already out there in the marketplace like health savings accounts, medical savings accounts, high-deductible catastrophic plans, some cafeteria plans. They wouldn't only be unavailable, they'd be illegal. This Congress would make them illegal. So the notion that if you like what you have, you can keep it is just folly. It's power fiction.

And the final death knell to the quality of American health care I believe to be any government-run program, any government takeover of any portion of our health care system beyond where it already is, the public option as it's described, which is a euphemism for a government takeover. And why is that? Well, I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, and really folks across this land, to think about your health care principles. What are your health care principles? What do you believe ought to be foremost in any bill that we produce? I've got six of them. They're accessibility, we ought to have accessibility to the health care system for all Americans; affordability, it ought to be affordable. It ought not to have the costs rise more than they should; quality, we need to have the highest quality of health care; responsiveness and innovation, we need a system that's responsive and innovative; and then choices, we need choices.

Those are my six: accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, and choices. I would suggest to my colleagues that none of those, in fact, I would suggest that none of the principles that any American could come up with, are improved by the intervention of the Federal Government. None of them are improved by more government control. None of them are improved by an administration that believes that a health czar is what we need as opposed to the highest quality of medicine.

There are wonderful solutions, and I know we will be talking about them this evening.

I want to commend my colleague from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for his leadership on this issue and can only hope that as we move forward, we are allowed to have an open and a vibrant discussion so that the Congress of the United States can have the benefit of the wonderful experience of people on both sides of the aisle as we move forward to solve this remarkable challenge in the area of health care.

Mr. SHADEGG. I commend the gentleman from Arizona for his comments about mandates, and I couldn't agree more. But I thought maybe it would be useful for the audience to illustrate the kind of poster child for mandates that the other side often recites and talks about, and that's mandatory auto insurance.

The gentleman pointed out that individual mandates tend not to work, and, indeed, the individual mandates in the health care plan in Massachusetts are not working. People are refusing to go along with those. People are choosing to be fined instead of complying with the government mandate to buy health care. But as the gentleman knows, most of the States, as a matter of fact, 48 out of the 50 States, mandate auto insurance.

I wonder if you and I could have a little discussion about how well mandatory auto insurance works, because that's the reason we're told, well, if mandatory auto insurance works, why not mandatory health insurance?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate my friend from Arizona's comparing it to auto insurance because that's what you oftentimes hear. You hear folks say, well, we require folks to have automobile insurance, why shouldn't we require them to have health insurance? And you allude to the fact that mandatory automobile insurance doesn't result in everybody having automobile insurance.

Mr. SHADEGG. It actually doesn't work.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It doesn't work. That's why you don't do it for health insurance.

But more importantly, if one mandated health coverage, then we, again, cede the definition of what that coverage would be to the Federal Government. And ceding the definition of what automobile insurance is is one thing; ceding the definition of quality health care, something so personal to each and every one of us and our families, I would suggest is a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. SHADEGG. I agree with the gentleman completely. But we don't mandate a single auto insurance policy for the entire country in auto insurance. We let the 50 States define what constitutes auto insurance in their State.

But let's talk about how mandatory auto insurance actually works. I don't know if the gentleman knows it, but 48 States have mandatory auto insurance. So if you own and drive a car, you are compelled by law to buy liability insurance. Two States don't: Wisconsin and New Hampshire. Guess what? The percentage of people in those two States who are uninsured is lower than the average percentage in the States where it's mandatory. That's right. In the 48 States where the government says you must have auto insurance, fewer or a lower percentage are actually insured than in the two States where they don't have mandatory auto insurance. I think that proves mandatory auto insurance doesn't work.

But what I really love when the other side cites the beauty of mandatory auto insurance is of the 48 States that mandate that you cannot drive a car in that State without auto insurance, 22 of those States mandate that you must also buy uninsured motorist coverage.

Wait a minute. Let me see if I understand this. We have told all the people you must buy, as a matter of law, auto insurance, but in 22 of the States where they've done that, they are so confident that many people will break that law that they mandate also, the government putting a gun at your head, uninsured motorist coverage. Now, if everybody was going to comply with the first law and buy auto insurance, why in God's name would you need the second law? And the answer is mandates don't work. In at least those 22 States, the legislatures have openly acknowledged that mandatory auto insurance doesn't work, so we're going to require mandatory uninsured motorist coverage.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. You said that 48 States mandate auto insurance, two States don't, but the two States that don't have a higher level of insured motorists?

Mr. SHADEGG. A higher level of insured and a lower level of uninsured.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So the moral of the story is?

Mr. SHADEGG. Mandates don't work.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mandates don't work.

Mr. BURGESS. Reclaiming my time briefly, for a mandate to work, there has to be a broad recognition that the mandate exists and there has to be a broad understanding of the penalty involved, and the penalty administered must be significant.

If we look at the number of the rate of insured in this country, it's about 85 percent of people voluntarily carrying health insurance and 15 percent do not. Well, where is a model for that broad recognition that there is a requirement that you do something and a very swift and severe penalty if you don't?

Certainly the IRS fits that bill. Everyone knows in this country you must pay your income taxes, that you must

file on time or face a swift and sure penalty. And I'm not even entirely sure what the penalties are, but I do know I don't ever want to experience those penalties. And what do we see with compliance rates with the IRS in this country? We see 85 percent comply and 15 percent do not. In other words, it is unchanged from the voluntary compliance that we have under health insurance.

Mandates are an anathema in a free society. Rather than trying to create the mandates and requiring people to do something that they are disinclined to do, what if we tried to build programs that would attract people just as we did with the part D part of Medicare where Dr. McClellan, to his credit, created the protected classes of drugs, created the programs that people actually wanted, and what do we have now? We have 92 percent of seniors with credible drug coverage, satisfaction rates in excess of 90 percent. So that's a success story from a government program that actually worked because the emphasis was put on delivering value to the customer, value to the patient in this case, value to the Medicare recipient in this case, rather than just simply you do what we tell you to do because we can. We are a free society, after all.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will my colleague from Texas yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SHADEGG. Briefly, we serve on the Commerce Committee. We're going to get to have a markup next week on this bill, but we will not have ever had a hearing on the bill. And as we pointed out earlier, there is no bill yet. But in the discussion draft that has been released, there is stunning information. It's one thing to talk about the stuff in the bill that's goofy; it's something else to talk about stuff in the bill that's outright absurd.

□ 2115

The gentleman talked about penalties. There is a provision in the bill that is outright absurd, and it goes to the point the gentleman just raised. The bill not only has a mandate that individuals must buy care, it has a mandate that employers must provide care. Okay. Maybe that's a good rule. But guess what—here's the absurdity. If you, as an employer in America, comply with that law, and you buy health insurance for every single one of your employees, and one of your employees says, ''You know what, I don't want your insurance. I decline it,'' you, the employer, must pay a penalty of 8 percent of that employee's salary because the employee chose to turn down the coverage. So you are penalized not for failing to offer the care. You are penalized because the employee said they didn't want it. What if the employee didn't want it because they preferred their spouse's coverage? That's the story in the SHADEGG family. For years my wife worked for the school district in Arizona. She was offered health care coverage. She declined it because she took it under my coverage. There's no point in buying two policies. Apparently under this bill, were she to decline it in the future, the Federal Government, that pays my health insurance, would have to pay a fine—of course they wouldn't apply the penalties to the government—of 8 percent of her salary because she turned down the care. You've got to be kidding me. You can't come up with stuff that goofy, but they did.

Mr. BURGESS. That is a very valid point brought up by the gentleman.

I want to now go to our other doctor from Georgia, a fellow obstetrician, Dr. GINGREY, who was actually the leader in bringing the Doctors Caucus together for that rather spirited and insightful afternoon down at George Washington earlier this week. I will yield him the floor for whatever time he will consume.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for organizing the hour tonight and for bringing this important issue before the Members of this body and the American people. Of course, as my colleagues have said, next week in the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the Education and Labor Committee of this House, markups are going to begin on this bill. So we are at the dividing point where people need to understand what this is all about. And as my colleague from Texas said, yes, we have formed a Doctors Caucus on the Republican side. We asked the Members of the Democratic side who are also health care providers to join that group. They declined. But we have a group of about 14, including a number of doctors who are on the floor tonight participating in this special hour, with over 330 years of clinical health care experience and has any one of that group—and in that group, I think we're talking about 10 or 11 physicians. We're talking about an optometrist, a clinical psychologist and three dentists. And not one of those Members, Mr. Speaker, has been asked to participate in the drafting and crafting of legislation that would improve the health care system that we have in this country.

And when I talk about improvement, I mean exactly that, Mr. Speaker. We do not need to destroy a good system. We need to make it better, and we can do that. That's why the District of Columbia Medical Society at George Washington Hospital this week invited this group of physicians, this group of health care providers to come and be on a panel and to answer questions from their doctors, from employees of the hospital, from nurses, from people from all walks of life, really, to let's talk about this issue and give an opportunity for another town hall meeting. President Obama had one with ABC or NBC, one of the major networks, coming from the White House, but it was totally one-sided. So as my colleagues have said, we can fix this system. We can do it. We don't need to throw the baby out with the bath water, as the old expression goes. We feel that if there are 10 million people in this country who cannot afford health insurance or are denied it because of a pre-existing condition, that's too many.

There are a number of things that we can do, and I will just briefly mention a couple. Clearly we can agree with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with regard to the efficacy and money-saving aspects of electronic medical records. I would hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle could agree with us that meaningful tort reforms, where doctors weren't constantly having to order just tons of unnecessary tests, and hospitals doing the same thing, knowing that they're unnecessary and maybe downright harmful to the patient. But with this fear, this constant fear of frivolous lawsuits facing them, all this extra money is spent for naught. So these are just a couple of things that we can do. Certainly the insurance industry, the health insurance industry needs to reform. There are a number of things that they could do, and hopefully later in the hour we can get back to that. But I think the most important thing for our colleagues and the American people to understand is that we do have the best health care system in the world, and we have the capability of coming together in a bipartisan way. My colleagues who have already spoken have plans, have bills that they've worked on for years. But do they get to see the light of day? Absolutely not. The President and this majority is so focused on this public plan. One of my colleagues is going to speak in a few minutes; and he is going to talk about, Well, since that public option is so darn good, then maybe President Obama, Mrs. Obama and those two precious children ought to be on that public option plan rather than a Blue Cross/Blue Shield or some other Federal Employees Health Benefits plan. If it's good enough for the general public, it ought to be good enough for Members of Congress. I may be stealing somebody else's thunder. At this point I will yield back to my colleague from Texas, as he continues to control this time.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for his insight. I thank him for the passion that he has brought to this. I wonder if, just very briefly, I could go back to the gentleman from Arizona on the issue that he brought up in an earlier speech he gave on the House floor which wasn't part of this hour. I want to be certain that we have it for the DVD that's prepared, Mr. Speaker, if we were to prepare a DVD of this transaction.

But you have talked about an advisory panel or an advisory board. Health care czar is a term we've heard, commissioner or commissar of health care, putting someone in there to make a decision for us. I wonder if you would

briefly expound upon that again so we could have that as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this discussion.

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have worked on health care reform since I got here in 1995. It is a passion that I have. I believe we can do better than the current system, and I applaud the President for calling for health care reform. I personally believe the current system is damaged by the fact that it's controlled by third parties. Your employer picks your plan, and your plan picks your doctor. What I heard the President say and what I heard, quite frankly, the current Secretary of State, Mrs. Clinton, say when she was a candidate was, ''If you like what you have, you can keep it.'' You know, I think if most Americans hear that, they're going to be fairly comfortable because many of us are worried really about two things: We're worried about the cost escalating too quickly, and we're worried about the uninsured. But as I said earlier, some 83 percent of Americans are satisfied with their care. Guess what—that promise ''If you like what you have, you can keep it,'' by the current President and by Democrats in this Congress, is simply untrue if you read the discussion draft that's out there. It is blatantly, patently, clearly, unquestionably untrue. Here's why: As the gentleman from Texas points out, the legislation creates the Health Benefits Advisory Committee. As my colleague from Georgia pointed out, what that committee is going to do is it's going to define what constitutes health insurance in America. It's going to set the standard for every single health care policy sold in America. We are going to have literally a one-size-fits-all mandate or dictate from this Health Benefits Advisory Committee. They're going to say, ''That's a policy, and it qualifies.'' ''That's not a policy, and it doesn't qualify.'' There is no chance that the rules they issue will, in fact, allow the policies sold all the way across America today to all of the employers who provide health care to actually fit into their new rules. So as a practical matter, virtually every American—I suggest indeed every American in the span of 5 years—will lose the health care plan they have. So if the statement, ''If you like what you have, you can keep it'' turns out not to be true because, as my colleague Mr. PRICE from Georgia pointed out, we're going to have a board that constitutes a policy, no policy currently sold by employers will fit what that board dictates. Therefore, in 5 years they will no longer be able to give you that plan. You might lose your health care plan the first year, but you will certainly lose your health care plan and not be able to keep what you have in 5 years because the law says, In 5 years every plan must fit the dictates of that new advisory board. So if you like what you have—as I said today earlier, and I say it again—if you like what you have, be prepared to lose it because you are going to lose it.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for his quick summation of that.

We've also been joined this evening, very fortunately, by the ranking Republican on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, one of the true leaders on our side on this issue who as I started this hour, I said, Here we are on the literal eve of the markup of this bill without a bill; and apparently the ranking member has some new information about when we might expect that bill and what we might find contained therein.

So I'll yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. BARTON from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I want to apologize to Dr. FLEMING for coming ahead of him.

I was watching the debate in my office, catching up with some paperwork. I was very impressed that Congressman SHADEGG has apparently read the draft—or his staff has—so we have at least one Member. And I'm sure Dr. PRICE, Dr. GINGREY, Dr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT and Dr. BROUN have also read it. But I am the senior Republican on the committee of primary jurisdiction, the Energy and Commerce Committee; and as such, I communicate with the chairman of that committee, Congressman WAXMAN of California, and my chief of staff with his chief of staff. As you all know, we had scheduled opening statements next Monday. We were going to start the markup on Tuesday. At least until today we were led to believe that it would be a full and fair open markup. Well, we just got word about 30 minutes ago that apparently, as Congressman SHADEGG has said, there is still no bill. As we are here on a Thursday evening, there is no bill to mark up. There is not going to be a bill tomorrow, apparently. There may be a bill over the weekend. There may be a bill on Monday, but there may not be. We had asked that there be a hearing once the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, scores whatever it is they are going to mark up, that we have a day of hearings, which is normal procedure. Well, apparently we're not going to get a hearing. We're going to get a closed-door briefing, and we're going to start opening statements on Tuesday of next week. Then we're going to start the markup. Assuming that there is a bill to mark up, we'll have a markup that begins on Wednesday, and they will conclude it by next Friday. So I just want the country and Members of Congress and those who are in their offices, like I was, listening to the debate to understand, the health care industry, which is 15 percent or 20 percent of our GDP, in which the preliminary scores on the draft and the bill in the Senate is somewhere between $1 and $2 trillion over 10 years, which is somewhere between $100 billion and $200 billion per year, which is 2 percent of GDP. A bill that's going to add 2 percent of GDP, which is not yet written, if we're really, really lucky next week, we may get 2 days of markup in the committee of primary jurisdiction.

Now I want to put that in context. I've been in this body 25 years. I have seen major bills that were not half as important as this bill have weeks of hearings on the legislation once the legislation was out and weeks or months of markup.

□ 2130

Former chairman of the committee, JOHN DINGELL, in the Clean Air Act in the 1990s marked that bill up in committee. He worked on it for several Congresses, but the final work product he marked up over I want to say a 6-month period.

It is arrogance beyond explanation not just to the minority Members of this body, to the moderates and conservatives on the majority side, but to the American people that we can attempt to move a bill that affects 20 to 25 percent of our GDP, which adds 2 percent of our GDP cost per year for the next 10 years, not even have that out so that it can be studied today. When they get around to introducing it sometime next week, they are going to start marking it up on Wednesday and report it out on Friday.

Now the reason I came over to ask time to speak is because right now I am in a debate with the administrator at the EPA, Administrator Jackson, in which back in April, they issued an endangerment finding on CO_2 saying that CO_2 is a harm to public health. It is a dangerous element, and therefore it has to be regulated to protect the public health. We have e-mails that show a reputable senior Ph.D., a doctor, a researcher within the EPA, prepared a report, as required by law, that stated that the science that they had based the endangerment findings on was faulty and out of date, and in all probability there really wasn't a danger. That report was not made a part of the official record. The e-mail says it wasn't because his direct supervisor says that the decision has been made at levels above you. We are going to go forward with this regardless of what the facts are.

So here we have on climate change and cap-and-trade the facts be darned, we are going forward. And now we are coming to the next big issue in the Obama administration, and they are saying, the public be darned, we don't want anybody to know what is in the bill. We are going to make the majority vote for it no matter what. And we are going to do it in 2 days.

Now most of you here are medically trained. You went to medical school for years. You had an intern program for several years. Most of you practiced in private practice for decades. You have got experience. You had your patients that trusted you because you were

open and transparent and you had experience behind you.

The majority that is running this body doesn't have enough trust in the population to tell them what is in their bill a week or two ahead of time so we can study it, prepare amendments, and have an open and fair markup process.

I think that is outrageous. We don't know what is in the bill. Mr. SHADEGG has done a pretty good job of going through the draft. And he knows that the draft is scary enough that we ought to have a long, fair markup on it. Most of that stuff will probably be in the final bill. But we don't know. So the reason I came over, Congressman BURGESS, was to encourage you and all the other Members that are participating in this Special Order and the people that are watching it. They need to get on the phone tomorrow. We want openness. We want transparency. We want time to see what the bill is. We want to post it on official Web sites so that the public can understand it. We want to give Members on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to draft amendments. And we want a markup process in the committees of jurisdiction that those amendments can be made, they can be debated, and they can be voted on in public. And maybe, just maybe, the work product that comes from that will be worthy of being reported to the floor.

But one thing I'm certain of, the bill that we don't have that has been drafted in secret is not worthy of becoming public law. I can say that sight unseen.

In the Revolutionary War, ''one if by land, two if by sea, the British are coming,'' rationed health care is coming. No-doctor-choice is coming. Private insurance is going away if we let this—I'm trying to think of a polite way to describe what is about to happen. But it is a travesty of the process. It is a policy that will do much more harm than good to health care in America.

Mr. BURGESS. We had, of course, a meeting of our committee this afternoon where we talked about amendments. We thought we had 3 or 4 days, which, in fact, seemed pitifully short in that context. I know our office had submitted 50 amendments. I think I saw a list of almost 200 amendments that was being discussed.

There is no way in the 10 to 12 hours that will be available to us to debate that bill to allow Members on our side, let alone if any Members on the majority have ideas about how the bill might be improved. It is a virtual guarantee that only a very limited number of voices are going to be heard, if any, to try to improve that bill in the time that we have allotted to us.

I will yield back to the ranking member.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I plan on talking to Chairman WAXMAN immediately in the morning and saying at a minimum we need a day to look at the bill once it is out. We need several days to prepare amendments. And then we need at least 1 week or 2 weeks to do markup. It is not just the minority Members, but there are a number of Members on the majority side that have substantive concerns and substantive amendments.

This Congress can do good work. But it can't do good work in the dark with a handful of Members making deals in the back room and then forcing the majority to almost automatically rubber-stamp that product.

What you're doing here is excellent work. I commend you and the other Members. But I strongly, strongly encourage people that if they believe in an open and fair process, we need to figure out a way to get this bill out there in public and give us enough time to study it before we go forward and try to mark it up.

Mr. GOHMERT. Do you think there is any chance that something as ridiculous as amendments being filed in the middle of the night might happen? Do you think it is possible around here?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Apparently, if they do what they have been doing in the past, we won't get the product that is going to be marked up until Chairman WAXMAN introduces a manager's amendment in the nature of a substitute sometime Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. GOHMERT. Or 3:09 a.m. perhaps?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. He has to put something in play to actually start the markup. But if the past is a predictor of the future, whatever he puts in play will not be what is going to be marked up. It will just be a placeholder.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I congratulate the gentleman for suggesting the American people contact their Members of Congress. I just want to say I just explained to the American people when we as Members of Congress say I associate myself with those comments, that means I agree wholeheartedly. And I do associate myself with those comments.

I want to remind the American people that former U.S. Senator Dirksen one time said that when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The American people need to put heat on the Members of Congress in the House and the Senate because the Senate has a bill too that is disastrous. It will do just the things that Mr. SHADEGG was talking about. In our shop we have looked at those proposals over there on the Senate side, and it is going to be disastrous if that bill as we see it thus far is passed.

The only way we are going to stop it is for the American people to get on the telephone, to call their Members of Congress, call their U.S. House of Representatives as well as their U.S. Senators and say ''no.'' We as Republicans have been accused of being the Party of No, n-o. Frankly, we are the Party of Know, k-n-o-w. We know how to fix this problem. We know how to lower the cost of health care. We know how to give patients choice and give them ownership of their health care plan. We know how to fix this problem. We know that government intrusion into health care decisions and the health care decision-making process and reimbursement and all the reasons it is so high and unaffordable today.

I just wanted to associate myself with the comments that you made and encourage the American people to get on the telephone, to get on their e-mail, to get on their fax machines, to call their neighbors and their friends all over this country and encourage their neighbors, friends and family to contact their Members of Congress. Let's shut the telephone system down tomorrow, across this Nation, people calling, faxing and e-mailing to say ''no'' to this travesty, ''no'' to this piece of garbage. I will be outright and say it. You were looking for a nice word. But it is garbage. And it is going to destroy the quality of health care.

I am a medical doctor. I practiced medicine for 38 years. And this is going to place a government bureaucrat between the doctor and the patient. It is going to be extremely expensive. The quality is going to go down. Innovation is going to be for naught, and it is going to go away. People are not going to like this, and we need to have it in an open process.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. The comment ought to be ''show us the bill.''

Mr. BURGESS. Let me reclaim the time briefly. I appreciate the ranking member taking the time out of his evening and spending some time with us. There are a number of Web sites where people can go and sign online petitions. Americasolutions.com has a petition, galen.org has a petition, another group called Let Freedom Ring actually has a downloadable responsible health care pledge where you ask your Member of Congress or Senator to have at least read the bill in its entirety and have the bill available for 72 hours on a Web site so the public can view this bill prior to a vote being taken in the House of Representatives.

He has been very patient. He is a new Member. And he is probably more patient than I deserve him to be, but Dr. FLEMING is from my neighboring State of Louisiana. He is one of two new Louisiana doctors who have joined the Republican Caucus. I want to thank him for his time tonight. He has a very interesting proposition that he wanted to share with us.

So I yield whatever time he may consume, bearing in mind we have 15 minutes left of the hour.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank the gentleman, and I will be quick here because I do have something very important. I want to draw the camera's attention to this placard and particularly the Web site outlined below, fleming.house.gov regarding House Resolution 615 that really gets to the meat of the matter. And again this is another effort to appeal to the grass-roots.

Over the past few weeks, Members of Congress and the American people have come to know the details of the proposed health care plan advanced by the

administration and the Democrats. Call it whatever you like, but at the end of the day, the proposal is still a government-run health care system.

Now with its health care plan, the administration and the liberal leadership of this Congress are guaranteeing this democracy is on the solid path towards socialism. As a physician, I am amazed at the number of bureaucrats in this House who are quick to claim a government-run health care plan is the reform this country needs.

So I come before this body to announce a resolution that I just mentioned, House Resolution 615, saying very simply that any Members of Congress who votes for legislation creating a government-run health care plan should lead by example and enroll themselves and their family in the same public plan.

Again, to repeat that, very simply, any Members of Congress who vote for this legislation, that is one that includes a single-payer or government-run health care plan, should be willing to commit to enroll themselves in that. You see, it is very interesting how Congress tends to carve itself out and create sort of a lead state in many things, and this is one good example. The plans that we see thus far, which we don't know the details of, of course, suggest to us that for the next 5 years the Congressmembers will be still on the Federal health plan exchange and not be part of the single-payer system.

In closing, I just want to suggest that to those who are viewing this evening and along the lines of Dr. BROUN and Dr. GINGREY, is yes, please call. Call your Representatives. Call your friends. Let everybody know we need to defeat this single-payer system. And the way to do it is to hold our Congressmen accountable for what they do. If it is good for you, it should be good for them as well.

□ 2145

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I realize we are running short on time, but I just wanted to comment on the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING's resolution. Mr. Speaker, it would be akin to a member of a public school board, let's say in your own community or in my community. In fact, I was on a public school board, and do you think I would have had the audacity to have my children enrolled in a private school while I served on the local public school board? Absolutely not. All four of my children went to that public school. It wasn't a perfect school, but it was my job to make it perfect, as perfect as I could.

And so for this Democratic majority, and this President, I would take it a step further than what Dr. FLEMING said. I would say to the President, and to Mrs. Obama and to the children, you know, Sign up for this public health plan, because you are purporting it to be the best thing since sliced bread, better than any private, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, WellPoint, whatever is out there in the private market.

This is a wonderful hour, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for bringing up this commonsense point.

Mr. BURGESS. I also would thank the gentleman from Louisiana. I would also point out that in the last Congress I introduced a bill that would remove Members of Congress from the Federal employee health benefit plan and give them a $3,000 voucher to go out into the individual market and purchase insurance, figuring that if we became uninsured it would make us more creative about seeking solutions for people who seek this problem.

I did not get any cosponsors. I did offer it to then-Senator Obama through his surrogates at several points, but I never got any takers.

I also prepared an amendment, when we do get our bill in committee, and I have hesitated on this, because I don't want my more conservative friends getting angry at me for expanding an entitlement, but I have prepared an amendment that would make Medicaid available to every Member of Congress. In fact, to make Congress a mandatory population to be covered under Medicaid, so that again we could experience for ourselves firsthand the frustration that patients find when they go to find a Medicaid provider, because in many States, my home State of Texas, Medicare reimburses poorly, Medicaid reimburses abysmally. And it's very, very difficult to find a provider on Medicaid. But I think the gentleman is on the right track, and I thank them for bringing that to us this evening.

I would like to take a few minutes. We have two doctors from Georgia, two from Louisiana. I was only able to attract one doctor from Texas, which is me, but I do have a Texas judge. I yield to him if he has a few comments to make on the subject of the evening.

Mr. GOHMERT. I wanted to thank my friend, Dr. BURGESS, and to be among such wonderful physicians. And I have been listening, a trained judge, I got to listen a great deal. And I heard so much wisdom from my friend Dr. PRICE, Dr. FLEMING, Dr. GINGREY, Dr. BROUN and Dr. BURGESS over the last 4½ years I have been here, and I have come to know their hearts and know their heart is for the good of America.

When we hear about transparency, and we look at what's been happening, look at the Federal Reserve. My goodness, what's going on? And you look at the auto task force and what they have done with that, and now they are going to do that with health care? It's the doctors that save our lives. It's the health care that will save lives.

Well, that's what it used to be.

And so then we hear, and I don't know if, Mr. Speaker, if the American public knows what former Chairman BARTON was saying, but manager's amendments have been filed after committees have done their work, and what little work was done.

And the manager's amendment just completely replaces all the work that was done, and it's put in at the last minute. And then we have amendments, as we did on crap-and-trade, that were filed at 3:09 and then supersedes everything and then right up here at the Speaker's desk. There was not a complete copy, as that was made clear.

And I have been listening to these things, and I appreciate so much the work of all of these people trying to come together with a plan. And I have been trying to get alleged counsel to put together a compilation of these ideas in a bill, but they will not. They have not so far. Former Chairman BARTON has submitted this request, and I hope we have a bill so America can know about what's out there.

But I think Dr. FLEMING has a great point. Congress ought to be part of anything we make anybody else comply with. And that's why how about a system where instead of Medicare, Medicaid and SCHIP, we just put money in a health savings account that the patient controls and get out of what Mr. SHADEGG was pointing out, all this bureaucracy, all these insurance companies coming between the patient and the doctor, and then have catastrophic care to cover everything above the health savings account amount where the patient and the doctor decide on treatment. These are things we could do. These are things that will be good for America. These are things that all of us, we have talked about, we would be willing to do ourselves. That's what we ought to do for America.

And I am broken-hearted for what this body is going to cram down into the lives of people. And if they think they didn't like some of the things that were dictated from Washington, wait till Washington gets to control your life, because I am guaranteeing you, when the government takes over health care, they have every right to tell you what to do, what to eat, how to live. They will have a right to monitor your credit card receipts. Oops, you had too many Twinkies you bought last month.

I mean, that stuff is coming once the government controls your health care. It controls your life.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his valuable insight. It brings up a valid point, Mr. Speaker, and the American people are going to be asked to undergo significant change in the way they receive their health care.

Yes, it may be change they voted for in November. Yes, it may be change they can believe in, but I don't know that it's necessarily going to be change they like.

So I do, Mr. Speaker, if I could, I know I must address my comments to the Chair and not to the public at large, but, Mr. Speaker, if I could address the public at large, I would tell

them they need to be very, very skeptical of what this body is doing, typically in the middle of the night, without much scrutiny and without much study of these bills and processes as they go through.

The individual Members of Congress do need to hear from their constituents on this issue. It's too important, too important for the American people to remain silent. There are Web sites out there where there are petitions that may be signed, AmericanSolutions.com, galen.org are two that I know have petitions up. This one that I was recently made aware of, Let Freedom Ring, which has a responsible health care pledge that they have posted online.

These are very worthwhile efforts that the American people can undertake and make certain that their representatives know how they want it to be, how they want to be represented.

And it is, I think, people got the message on cap-and-trade but they got the message a little late. We may, in fact, have been able to turn that vote had we been able to have one additional half day of debate on that topic.

Let me now turn to the doctor from Georgia, who we heard from briefly earlier. He may have some wrap-up comments that he wants to offer the body.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. American people need to understand what is in this bill, as little as we know about it. There are some things that we do know about it. Our friend, JOHN SHADEGG, just talked about that, the untruth of your being able to keep the health care policy that you currently have, is absolutely in this bill. People are not going to be able to keep their health care policy. We know that.

We also know, without a question, that there is going to be a Washington bureaucrat put between the doctor and the patient. So a Washington bureaucrat is going to be making your health care decisions, is my message to the American people, Mr. Speaker. It's going to make your health care decisions for you, Mr. Speaker.

You doctor is not just going to be able to make those decisions. You are not going to be able to make those decisions. Your family is not going to be able to make those decisions. And the decisions are going to be rationed. In other words, some Federal bureaucrat, some Washington bureaucrat is going to tell the patient what tests that they can have, what medicines they can have, what surgeries they can have, what X-rays they can have and what they can't have.

And there are going to be more can't-haves than can-haves, because this is going to be extremely expensive.

We know this that's in this bill: Right now, today, when people have insurance provided by their employer, that is a tax-free benefit. We already know that this Democratic bill is going to put taxes on your health insurance, and you're going to have to pay those. So what you're getting now, Mr. Speaker, the American people, at no tax consequences to you, you're going to have to pay taxes on it.

We know this, too—that Mr. Obama said a few weeks ago that he had to push through this, what I call cap-and-tax bill, the cap-and-trade bill, that it wasn't about the environment, because he said himself that he needed those taxes to pay for his health insurance program, this single-party payer program that we're going to; some Washington, bureaucratic-directed health care system. He needs those taxes to pay for it. So people's taxes are going to go up. Business taxes are going to go up. We're going to have these energy taxes, which is going to increase the cost of all goods and services—gasoline, heating oil, natural gas, food, medicine, everything is going to go up because of the energy tax that's over in the Senate. And I hope the American people will call and tell their Senators ''no'' to that, too.

It's critical at this late hour, which should be a very, very early hour but it's a late hour because the majority is going to force down the throat of the American people this health care plan that's going to be disastrous and take their choices away, increase their taxes. It's going to destroy our economy, and it's going to destroy the quality of health care. I hope they'll call, fax, e-mail their Members of Congress and say no, let's put everything out in the open so that we can know what it is and so that alternative systems can be looked at.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the doctor for coming down and participating. It may be late on the East coast but it's early on the West Coast, and he has a perfect point to make—that your voices must be heard. Again, the Webcast of the Doctors Caucus meeting over at George Washington earlier this week. The open forum that was held on health care, The Web site www.healthcaucus.org has an archive of that.

Additionally, there are many, many interviews with other thought leaders and headline-makers in health care that have been accumulated on this site in the last 6 months. I do encourage, Mr. Speaker, people to consider going. Americansolutions.com has a petition, galen.org has a petition; and there is the Let Freedom Ring group that is available on your search engine that also has a petition. I would encourage people to weigh in with that.

Don't discount calling the Speaker's office. You can find that at www.speaker.gov, hit the ''Contact Us'' button and find the number to call into the Speaker's office to weigh in on this important issue. And finally your calls and faxes, Mr. Speaker, that constituents will make to their individual Member's office are going to be extremely important in this endeavor. I hear all the time from people back home, What can we do to help you? Now is the time. You need to make your voices heard on this very important issue. Whichever side you may reside, wherever your feelings lie on this, you need to make your feelings known to your Member of Congress. The time for that action is now. The markup starts next week. We will vote this out of the House of Representatives by the end of the month. Don't ask me why we have that arbitrary, condensed timeline, but that's what we've been given by the Speaker of the House.

So now is the time to make your voices heard on this very, very important matter. As the ranking member of the committee said, this is the ''one-if-by-land, two-if-by-sea'' moment. The American people need to make their voices heard on this very critical matter, which will affect not only their future, their children's future and their grandchildren's future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the time.

□ 2200

PATIENTS BEFORE PROFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am KEITH ELLISON and I am a Member of the Progressive Caucus. It is late and the hour is moving toward when a lot of people are looking to retire for the evening, but we have to talk health care. Before I do, let me introduce the Progressive Caucus message that we have for people tonight. The Progressive Caucus message is we come to this Chamber every week to talk about a progressive vision for America.

What is a progressive vision for America? It is a vision, Mr. Speaker, in which people can live free of discrimination; people can live in harmony with the Earth; workers can work with dignity. Workers can have respect and safety on the job and earn decent pay. Where all Americans can have health care and enjoy the benefits and the bounty of this great country of ours.

A progressive vision, a vision similar to the one that Martin Luther King had for our country, a vision similar to the one that the great Rachel Carson, author of ''Silent Spring,'' had for our country. A vision similar to one which Walter Reuther, a great labor leader, had for our country, a progressive vision which embraces all, which includes all, where human beings live in harmony, free from fear who do not disrespect or abuse our environment, believe all people have dignity, and we should have health care so people can have a decent standard of living.

This is the progressive vision that we talk about with the progressive message and it is what we do when we come to the House floor to talk on this House floor about what we believe in.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus is the group that I speak for tonight. This is our Web site, Mr. Speaker, which is cpc/grijalva.house.gov.

What are we talking about tonight? We are talking about health care reform, patients before profits.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I think this presentation could not be possibly more different, it could not possibly be more different from the hour you just heard because the hour you just heard a moment ago talked about what we couldn't do, who couldn't get care, why we have to have the status quo, why things have to be the way they are and why we cannot have reform. That is what you just heard, horror stories and fear-mongering like we have been hearing for many decades.

It was the same thing in 1994. Remember the Harry and Louise ads? Oh, the government is going to take your health care away; the government is going to make medical decisions for you.

It is not true. Don't fear. The American people should not fear health care reform. The American people, 300 million strong, know that 50 million, nearly 50 million of our number, are without any health care at all. The 250 million who do have health care know that the private insurance companies have been reaping enormous profits while you've been paying higher deductibles and higher copay, and you have been paying higher premiums and you have been being denied coverage for preexisting conditions. The time for change is now.

I think for the first time in a long time, real change is right within our hands. Mr. Speaker, if the American people have a will for a greater level of health care, for a greater level of quality of life in which all Americans don't have to go to bed at night afraid that they are going to be without, this is the time for them to raise their voices.

I think a few things are important to know, and that is, just like as in 1994, the scare tactics that we just heard and will probably hear again tonight are in full force. And if the American people don't step forward, you don't know which vision of America will prevail: a progressive vision where all Americans have health care and access to care that says prevention, that says long-term care, that says we are going to have a public option which we desperately need, or this situation which leaves 50 million Americans out with escalating costs and preexisting costs which doom people to a medical nightmare. We will talk more about that in a moment.

First, I want to say that the fight is on. It is raging. It is happening. And if the people want to be heard, Mr. Speaker, they need to be heard now.

Let me say this: in the first 3 months of 2009, in the first 3 months of 2009, the Chamber of Commerce and the Pharmaceutical Researchers and Manufacturers of America, PhRMA, played lobbyists a combined $22.5 million to promote their interests. Okay, you didn't hear me: $22.5 million to lobby people like me, Mr. Speaker, to not give the American people health care, to keep the status quo, to let it be how it is, to let these preexisting condition exclusions continue on, to leave 50 million Americans out in the cold, to continue the increasing premiums and these ridiculous copays people are having to pay.

You didn't hear me? The first 3 months of 2009, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Pharmaceutical Researchers and Manufacturers of America, PhRMA, laid lobbyists a combined $22.5 million to promote their interests; $22.5 million in January, February, and March.

You think that is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker? It's nothing if you compare it to the amount of money they made by denying Americans health care, by denying enrolled Americans health care, as they have been doing and saying we don't cover that. And by reaping all of these excessive profits, oh, $22 million is a rounding error for them, but it is an enormous amount of money for us.

Monday, July 6, The Washington Post said: Familiar players in health care bill lobbying.

The largest insurers, hospitals and medical groups have hired more than 350 former government staff members and retired Members of Congress in hopes of influencing their old bosses and colleagues.

That is not quite one for every Member of Congress, but it is nearly one for every Member of Congress, and that is just counting the former Members of Congress and former staffers. Just to try to twist an arm to say leave the status quo as it is.

Three out of every four major health care firms have at least one former insider on their payrolls, according to Washington Post analysis. Nearly half of the insiders previously worked for key committees and lawmakers currently debating whether to adopt a public insurance option which is opposed by major industry.

So they are getting people who used to work here to try to stop progress and keep us from a progressive vision because they care more about profits before patients. We, in the Progressive Caucus, care about patients before profits.

The hirings are part of a record-breaking influence campaign by the health care industry. This is according to The Washington Post, record-breaking influence peddling campaign by the health care industry. You know, Mr. Speaker, you may have been dazzled, shocked, and amazed by what you saw in 1994 when they in fact killed health care. Now they are pulling out all of the stops, and they are going to make sure that they set a record in the amount of influence that they are trying to campaign for to defeat health care reform.

They want the status quo. We want a progressive vision. Mr. Speaker, just hold onto something because this number might stagger you: $1.4 million a day, nearly $1.5 million a day to stop health care reform by paying lobbyists, and this is just according to what has been disclosed in their records. So $1.4 million a day just to lobby against health care reform? Yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the American people want health care reform, they better say something because $1.4 million a day can speak pretty loud.

The Pharmaceutical Researchers and Manufacturers of America doubled its spending, nearly $7 million in the first quarter of 2009, followed by Pfizer with more than $6 million. If they are right, if this system is good, why have they spent all of this money? Can't they just let the facts speak for themselves? No, the facts need to be adjusted for them.

The Post examined federally required disclosure reports submitted by health care firms that spent more than $100,000 lobbying in the first quarter of this year, and it used current and past filings to identify former lawmakers, congressional staff, and executive branch officials.

□ 2230

This is a quote: ''The revolving door offers a shortcut to a Member of Congress to the highest bidder,'' said Sheila Krumholz, who is the executive director for the Center for Responsive Politics, which compiled some of the data used in the Post analysis. Here's her quote—and this is really a shocker, Mr. Speaker: ''It's a small cost of doing business relative to the profits that they garner.''

So again, $1.4 million a day seems like a whole lot of money to me, but when you think about the money that is reaped from the status quo in their denial of claims, in their denial of preexisting conditions, and all of this stuff, it's really not a big deal at all.

Mr. Speaker, let me show folks just what this profit is doing. Projected spending on health care as a percentage of gross domestic product, Mr. Speaker, has been doing nothing but going up and up and up. If you look at just projected costs in 2007, we're talking about an enormous upward slide from about 15 percent upward to nearly 50 percent if these numbers are projected to 2008. Medicare going up and Medicaid going up, but those lines are relatively flat. If you look at all the other health care costs, it's just jumping up. This is spending, and whatever I spend, somebody else makes. This represents the enormous amount of money that will be made under the status quo, and it represents why they're willing to drop $1.4 million a day just to defeat the real change that we need.

Mr. Speaker, let me just also point out a few other facts that I think are important. We have a growing number of Members of this body, the House of Representatives—many of whom are Progressive Caucus members—who are saying they won't vote for any plan unless it includes a public option. I'm one of those. I know I've been accused of being doctrinaire, of drawing a line in the sand and not being flexible. Well, they're right; I'm flexible, but not on

this. No public option means a red vote, which means no for me.

We've got to have a public option. We have to have it. And I'm proud to say that Speaker PELOSI, CHARLIE RANGEL, and leaders in this body have said that we're going to have our public option. And it's because people out there have raised their voices, Mr. Speaker, and the people in this body haven't let the people in America down and they've stood up for change.

But it's not just in the House, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to say that Members of the other body, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, Senator BERNIE SANDERS, and Senator CHUCK SCHUMER are standing up and speaking out for a public option right now. Senator FEINGOLD, Senator SANDERS, and Senator SCHUMER haven't been quiet, Mr. Speaker; they're trying to make sure that we get this public option through the Senate as we work for it in the House.

What we really need, Mr. Speaker, is for Americans to let their voices be heard. Because if they say, Oh, well, the leaders in Congress got it all under control, that's exactly when we lose it. The American people are like the wind that pushes the boat through the sea. I don't care how big your sail is, how pretty it is, or what you put on it, if there's no wind, it doesn't move. And that's how this democracy is going to work.

As I praise Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, let me tell you what he said on June 18 that deserves our respect, Mr. Speaker. Senator FEINGOLD said, ''A strong public health insurance option is consistent with a healthy private market and effective private insurance plans. We have several insurers that operate in my home State of Wisconsin that provide great health coverage to their beneficiaries. Responsible insurers should have no trouble competing with a public insurance option on the merits of their plans, but a strong public health insurance option will provide a powerful incentive for less responsible insurers to reevaluate their own cost-sharing and benefit plans to ensure that they are actually an attractive option for consumers.'' That's what RUSS FEINGOLD said, Mr. Speaker.

And he went on to add, ''There is another benefit of a public health insurance option which hits particularly close to home. My hometown of Janesville, Wisconsin''—that's RUSS FEINGOLD's hometown—''has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State of Wisconsin. Recently, our GM assembly plant ceased production, and other related businesses throughout the community are struggling to stay afloat during these tough economic times.'' Of course these challenges are shared by many other communities across the State and, I would add, across the Nation.

Back to the Feingold quote. ''A public health insurance option would be invaluable to families in Janesville and many other cities across America who have recently been laid off because it is a guaranteed affordable option that can travel with an individual from job to job. A public health insurance option would also make a tremendous difference for our small business owners who are facing crippling health care costs while trying to keep their businesses open.'' That is the great Senator RUSS FEINGOLD as he spoke passionately and convincingly about a public option.

I just want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker, that in the House of Representatives and in the Senate there are leaders who have heard the cries of the American people, who have heard the demands for change, and who are going to stand up for a public option. And Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a second to say thank you to all those Members in the House, but also these three Senators—FEINGOLD, SANDERS and SCHUMER—and many others who have gone on record for a public option.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to share a few other points that I think are real important at this time as we've just discussed this critical thing. The fact is is that what we need is a real focus on patients, not profits. The way the health care proposal is working now in the draft is that there are basically three prongs.

One is, employer-based health care insurance. If you like the insurance you have, you can keep it. Don't listen to that stuff you heard in the last hour, Mr. Speaker. The truth is, you get to keep your health insurance if that's what you want.

Two, people who are over 65 or who qualify for Medicaid can get health insurance. Those folks who are in those government programs already can share in that benefit.

But the third option is this exchange where private insurance plans and a public option will be available for people and people can bid on these options and purchase their health care. There will be a subsidy up to about 400 percent of the poverty guidelines.

We would ban the exclusion of people with preexisting conditions. And there is a proposal that anyone who wants to put their plan in that exchange would have to have a medical loss ratio of about 85 percent, which would mean that actual health care delivered to people, the money would have to be 85 percent of their overall budget, and that 15 percent would be on administrative costs and other things like that. Medicare already does a whole lot better than that, and so does the VA.

So that's basically an outline, Mr. Speaker. That's basically what it is. But I just wanted to make sure that we really hit this idea of this public option tonight.

Our system wastes roughly about $700 billion on treatments and procedures that cannot be shown to improve health outcomes right now. A public option would make charging these kind of fees to just generate money something they really can't afford to do because you've got real competition that's not driven by a profit motive but is driven by quality health care.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we need ways to drive waste out of the system and we need ways to make private insurers really compete with this public option, which they do not.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, under the McCarran-Ferguson Act, insurance companies are not required to compete with each other. They have an exemption from antitrust laws, and therefore can legally collude. And so we need this public option so that we can make them actually compete.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to get up here and tell you or anyone else that health care costs in America are crushing America's businesses and families, but I will offer a few examples. Our manufacturers spend more per hour on health care than do their counterparts in Canada, Japan, and the U.K. combined. What I'm saying is that if you have a company that is international in scope and has places in Canada and subsidiaries in Japan and the U.K.—that's England and the United Kingdom—their American manufacturers spend more per hour on health care than all these other subsidiaries combined.

□ 2220

That's making America noncompetitive and putting us at a competitive disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, I bet you didn't know, and maybe you did, that health care costs for small businesses have grown 30 percent since the year 2000 alone. We need health care. We need a public option. The average family premium costs $1,100 more per year because our health care system fails to cover everyone. The average individual premium costs $400 or more. Mr. Speaker, we need a public option. We need health care reform.

In 2004, half of all people filing for bankruptcy cited medical problems as a cause. That's half. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have got a chart right here where this is definitely an out-of-date figure because it's much higher than half now. Medical bills underlie 60 percent of U.S. bankruptcies, according to a recent study. Washington Reuters, that's the news company: Medical bills are involved in more than 60 percent of U.S. personal bankruptcies, an increase of 50 percent in just 6 years, U.S. researchers reported on Thursday. More than 75 percent of these bankrupt families had health insurance but were still overwhelmed by their medical debts, the team at Harvard Medical Law School, Harvard Medical School, and the Ohio University reported in the American Journal of Medicine.

''Using a conservative definition, 62.1 percent of all bankruptcies in 2007 were medical; 92 percent of these medical debtors had medical debts over $5,000 or 10 percent of pretax family income,'' the researchers wrote. ''Most medical debtors were well educated, owned

homes, and had middle class occupations.''

Mr. Speaker, this scenario is what the speakers in the previous hour were trying to defend. Is that not crazy? That is not what the American people want. That is not what the American people deserve. The speakers in the previous hour were literally defending this system and standing in the way of reform.

A few more facts, Mr. Speaker. In 2008, just last year, half of all people filing home foreclosures cited medical problems as a cause. Again, medical problems and our broken health care system deeply implicated even in the foreclosure crisis. The fact is high costs lead to people losing coverage, and 14,000 Americans are losing coverage every day in the midst of this economic crisis. The numbers are staggering, and at some point your eyes just gloss over it and you can't really hear them. So sometimes numbers don't even bring as much light to the subject as one would want. But let me just say 14,000 Americans are losing coverage every day in the midst of this economic crisis. Why? Because as unemployment creeps toward 10 percent, when you lose your job, you lose your health care because we have an employer-based health care system.

Mr. Speaker, again, a serious problem. Last month 400,000-plus jobs lost by Americans. Every one of them is either dealing with no health care or has to carry an enormous COBRA payment on their back. Mr. Speaker, that's not good. And 60 percent of Americans say that they or a member of their household have delayed or skipped health care in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reform our health care system. I hope that's obvious to everybody. Actually, you and I both know it's not obvious to everybody though we wish that it was. But let me just talk a little bit about it for a moment. I will bring back up this poster, Patients Before Profits.

Mr. Speaker, reform will alleviate the burden on families by lowering costs. Ensuring timely access to affordable, quality health care, making sure everyone has access to preventative care will help keep the American people healthy and allowing workers to change jobs without worrying about losing health care. Imagine being stuck in the job you have, and maybe you don't even want to be there, but you can't leave because you've got health care.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to a dear friend of mine whom I have known for many years, many years, Mr. Speaker. And I know you know what I mean when you've known someone for years and years and years, but there is something I didn't know about this friend of mine when I had a health care forum in my district in Minneapolis a few weeks ago. I won't mention this friend of mine's name because I'm going to protect her privacy, but this friend of mine whom I've know for years, I didn't know this fact about her. Let's call her Ann. That's not her name.

Ann, after a health care forum that I held in my district in Minneapolis in which 220 people showed up because they demand health care reform, waited around after everybody left after the health care forum and said she needed to talk to me. And I said, Ann, sure, I'll take a minute and we can talk. And this is a strong woman. She is not someone who is easily given over to tears, but she was in tears. She's only about 37, 36 years old, and she has a beautiful family, and she's just a great person all around. Anyway, Ann sat me down and she looked me straight in the eye. And when she looked me in the eye, Mr. Speaker, I knew she was serious, serious, serious. And what she said to me, Mr. Speaker, was this: I'm on my job and I have health care insurance at my job, but members of my family, including my sisters and my mom, have had breast cancer. And, Mr. Speaker, she told me that she is afraid to go get a test to determine whether she may develop breast cancer because if she gets this test, Mr. Speaker, then a health care company might decide she has a preexisting condition and then drop her from the policy. But if she doesn't go find out, Mr. Speaker, if she might develop breast cancer, she can't get treatment that she needs that may save her life one day. And she's a young mom. She's only about 37, 36 years old, and she has kids whom she's trying to rear. So, Mr. Speaker, imagine being in the case where you can't go get the test to find out whether you have breast cancer because if you do, that's going to be a preexisting condition, and yet you can't afford not to do it because if you don't do it, like your mother and your sister, you may develop breast cancer.

This is the system that these folks who are standing in the way of reform are trying to preserve. And, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong. It's time for reform to take place, and the time for reform is now.

Reform will alleviate the burden on families by lowering costs. Reform will alleviate the burden on our economy by creating more efficient insurance and a delivery system which will reduce waste and allow a more rational financing system where everyone contributes instead of shifting costs from some people onto others. Reform will alleviate the burden on business that has been hindered in their ability to compete because of these enormous health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to have a public option. I explained the public option a moment ago. A public option is just one of other health insurance coverage programs that will be offered on the exchange. But, Mr. Speaker, the public option needs to be understood. What the public option is is giving the uninsured an option to enroll in a public health care plan that's like Medicare. The public insurance option would compete directly with health care insurers. Why are they afraid to compete? What are they scared of? The uninsured individuals would get to choose which plan is best for them, which could be a private one or the public option.

Why is having a public option so important? A broad array of research has confirmed that a public health insurance option is a key component of cost containment because it will introduce more competition, something conservatives say they like whenever it makes them exorbitant money. It will lower administrative expenses. I talked about the medical loss ratio a moment ago of 85 percent. I have a bill personally that will raise it to 90, which I think would be better.

□ 2230

Medicare would still outcompete them because they can do better than that and drive cost-saving innovation. According to research from the Commonwealth Fund, the net administrative costs for Medicare and Medicaid were 5 percent and 8 percent respectively. That's why I think a medical loss ratio of 90 percent would be good. They should be able to do it. Mr. Speaker, if you look up the top five health insurance companies, their administrative costs were 17 percent, and the average administrative cost for private insurance is 14 percent. The fact is, they're inefficient, they like it that way, and they don't want to change. But a public option would make them change.

Members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus signed a letter to Speaker PELOSI and to the Democratic leadership, clearly stating that a robust public option must be in the mix. This year in the Congress we must act on health care reform, and that health care reform must include a public option. We believe that only a health care plan with a robust public option will provide more Americans with greater access to treatment and doctors with less interference and obstruction from big insurance companies and other profit-driven special interests.

Mr. Speaker, if you listened to the hour just before I came on, you heard people spinning scenarios and imaginary ghosts and demons and goblins in the air in which a patient would have a government bureaucrat—their words—in between the doctor. Well, that hasn't happened. That's imaginary. It's not going to happen. But now today a patient has to deal with a bureaucrat in an insurance company before they can get the medical treatment that they need. Their claims have been excluded. Some bureaucrat has said, ''Oh, we're not going to approve that.'' ''Oh, we're going to deny that.'' ''Oh, we're not going to allow that procedure to happen,'' even though a doctor has recommended it. That's reality. What they were talking about an hour ago was fantasy, and it's kind of like on the Freddy Krueger order, nothing but a nightmare and a horror film.

We urgently need to fix health care for American families. Every day Americans worry not simply about getting well but whether they can afford to get well. Millions of Americans wonder if they can afford the routine care to stay well. Premiums have doubled over the last 9 years, three times faster than wages. The average American family already pays an extra $1,100 in premiums every year for a broken system that supports 46.5 million uninsured Americans. We need the change for American business. Soaring health care costs put American companies at a competitive disadvantage in a global economy. Small businesses are forced to choose between coverage and layoffs. That's a choice they should never have to make. But what about the fiscal future of America? We have the most expensive health care system in the world. We spend almost 50 percent more per person on health care than the next most costly nation, and we're no healthier for it. We're spending all this money, but we're not healthier for it. If you look at national rankings of Americans' health and wellness, we're not at the top, although spending is at the top. We're at the bottom when it comes to diabetes, when it comes to heart disease, when it comes to cancer, when it comes to all these critical things. What are we going to do about it? We'd better step up and do something, and that something cannot wait. If we do nothing, in a decade we'll be spending $1 out of every $5 on health care. In 30 years it will be $1 out of every $3. Health care reform is necessary, and it's deficit reduction because reform will drive down costs.

What we want to offer is cost reduction, choice, security and quality. President Obama and this Congress want to reduce health care costs and offer people a choice of doctors and plans and guarantee affordable quality health care for all. That's what we're trying to do. This is an American solution. You always hear people talking about what they do in Canada, what they do in the U.K., what they do in France. We're not talking about any of those countries. We're talking about a uniquely American solution. We are not trying to be like anybody else, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, 36 other countries in the world and every industrialized country has national health insurance. We don't. That's why their outcomes are better and their costs are lower. But we're not comparing ourselves to some other country. We're not talking about what other countries do. We're talking about an American solution that will ensure every child in America is covered, that will invest in prevention and wellness, where we'll ensure that doctors and nurses get the information they need to provide individuals with the best care available and never again will your coverage be denied because of a pre-existing condition or your age or your gender or ending a system where profits come before people and millions go without vital health care. Never again. Never again should we make life or a job decision based on coverage, and never again should we let our families suffer financial catastrophe or bankruptcy because of these high costs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm coming to the point where we're probably going to wind up in not too long; but I do want to just make a few more points before I take my seat. One of the things I want to do before we take our seats is just to point out the fact that scare tactics and fear tactics have not served the American people well, not back in 1994 when health care was defeated then, and they won't work now. We've learned a lot since 1994, and we're not going for it. The fact is, health care is a social imperative. It's an economic necessity. And the new study by the President's Council of Economic Advisers demonstrates that the current health care system is on an unsustainable path. Without reform, escalating health care insurance premiums will continue to cause American workers and families to experience eroding health care benefits and stagnating wages while rising spending on health care and Medicaid will lead to massive unsustainable Federal budget deficits. The fact is, we need change.

I just have a few more points to make, and then I will hand it over to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I don't know what they're talking about; but if they talk about health care, I want you to remember what I said, Mr. Speaker, because these facts are critical, and we cannot allow anyone to scare us away from the reform that is necessary today. The fact is, the American people want change, and they're going to get change, and they're going to be much, much better for it. The fact is that we do need this public option. We do need health care reform. The fact is that we do need the change, and we can't allow it to be denied. It's time for the American people to raise their voices, Mr. Speaker, if they want to be heard. I talked about my friend Ann—whose name isn't really Ann—but I talked about her fear of going to get that test to determine whether she has breast cancer or not because, as I said, if she gets the test, she could be denied for a pre-existing condition or dropped from her insurance. And if she doesn't get the test, she won't be able to get the treatment that she needs to fight off that breast cancer. She's in a terrible position. But she's not the only one.

I want to talk about a few other folks before I yield the microphone. I want to talk about Mary from Minneapolis. Mary says, ''My daughter needed her wisdom teeth out. At the time with insurance we were told to pay $375, which we did. Then I got billed for over $1,000, resubmitted, and eventually the amount was reduced to $750. Meantime, my husband had no paycheck. I have calcium deposits in my back which make it difficult to walk. I can't afford the copays, so I'm waiting until it is so bad that I can't walk.'' That's what Mary from Minneapolis said which is the status quo, which some people in this body want to preserve.

Denise from Minneapolis says, ''I find more and more often that my family and I are skipping doctor visits for preventive care or when we would have made a visit to the doctor in the past, but now can't afford the copayment to be seen. This is especially true for childhood illnesses as well as allergy visits and medication, dental problems that could potentially be very serious, and injuries that, in reality, should be checked out by a doctor.

□ 2240

''My family is insured, yet because of our current employment situation combined with rising health care costs, it has become out of our reach to have the kind of care that we have enjoyed in the past. I feel we are being left behind for an inability to be able to bear the burden of the cost. This may mean that we will pay dearly in the future for things that could have been prevented or less serious had we been able to see a doctor initially.'' That is Denise from Minneapolis.

Here is Janice from Golden Valley, Minnesota, also in my district: ''I have worked every day since the day I turned 15, and I am currently 51, married with two teenage children. I have a college degree. We have always lived a balanced and frugal life. We do not take exotic trips and mostly buy generic groceries and thrift or discount store clothing. I do not and never have smoked or drank. And I have been in my job for over 20 years, yet I bring home less and less each year due primarily to health care premiums and costs. Health care premiums and copays cost about 25 to 30 percent of my income. Health care premiums cost me more than my Federal, State, Social Security, union dues and retirement plan deduction combined from each paycheck. The increase has been so great that we have stopped being able to contribute to savings for about 4 years ago. The one thing I fear more than anything is me or a family member getting sick because of what treatment will cost even beyond the premium costs. When I have a strange new sensation in my eye, or vein hurting in my leg, or dull pain in my chest, I just pray it will go away on its own because I'm afraid of what it will cost me. We pay out so much for health insurance, yet we cannot afford to really even use it. And I feel even worse for those who have no health care insurance at all. This reflects so badly on what America has become, a place where only the wealthiest survive and the profit by the few takes priority over the basic needs of all.''

Janice, I want you to know that we are fighting for patients before profits today.

I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, about Anita from Roseville, which is

not in my district, but it is very close by. Anita says, ''I work for a public school and my husband stayed home with our daughter. We started paying family health insurance in 2002 at $10,000 out of pocket. This year, we are paying over $12,000 out of pocket, and our copays are $40 and $50 per visit. Our daughter is school-aged now, but my husband started looking for work when the economy took its downturn last summer and still does not have a job. Health insurance costs severely limit our quality of life by using up our disposable income.''

Let me talk about Priscilla from Minnesota. Priscilla says this: ''I got on my husband's insurance after the job I had discontinued coverage for me. We paid over $500 a month for this coverage. I had health issues that came on suddenly with breathing problems. It took several hospitalizations and ICU care before they finally figured out what the problem was. My husband's insurance refused to pay for any of it, calling it a ''preexisting condition.'''

And by the way, these would be banned under the plan offered by Democrats.

''And we were left with a medical bill over $25,000 to pay ourselves. This was at the same time we were spending $500 per month on premiums. The provider sent our bill to collections. It has been a nightmare. My husband is now disabled, and we have no coverage, yet his condition requires regular CAT scans and nine different medications to make sure his condition is stable.''

I urge my colleagues who stand in the way of reform to listen to these good, decent people. They deserve better. They deserve better. Let's not worry about what the Chamber of Commerce and what PhRMA want. Let's worry about our constituents and the patients of America.

I'm going to just read one more story from Doug, Mr. Speaker. And then after that I will make some closing comments.

''I recently refilled my mail-order prescriptions. I get as many generics as possible. However, I am a diabetic, and both types of my insulin are not generic, neither are blood pressure medication nor a cholesterol medication and glucose test strips. My insurance company in a bid to force generic drugs have made them 'free' for mail-order while nongenerics doubled in price. So I had to choose which ones I didn't need. I chose the glucose test strips because I can buy them over the counter for the same price and 'ration' them by testing less than I should. I'm still spending more money than I can afford, and I am afraid that my bank account will be overdrawn. If that happens, I will not be able to afford food or gas for myself and my son. I could borrow from my elderly mother, but it looks like they will be losing their insurance coverage from a failing car company. I have a good job with good benefits.'' That is what Doug said.

His last line was: ''I have a good job with 'good' benefits.''

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more stories, and I hope none of the constituents will be disappointed because I wasn't able to get to every story. But we got a bunch of stories on our Web site and stories people submitted to us, Mary from Minneapolis, Denise from Minneapolis, Janice from Golden Valley, Anita from Roseville, Minnesota, Verona from Mora, Minnesota, Mary from Minnesota, Priscilla from Minnesota, Maria from Minnesota, Cynthia from Minnesota, Doug from Minnesota all calling in, sharing very courageously their health care nightmare that they need to be relieved of.

They need reform, Mr. Speaker. And the time for change is now. They need reform, Mr. Speaker, and the time for change is now.

Let me wrap up my comments by just saying that it is wrong that in the first 3 months of 2009 that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and PhRMA paid lobbyists to combine $22.5 million to promote their interests which is to thwart reform of health care. And it is also very disturbing that The Washington Post had to report recently that the Nation's largest insurers have hired more than 350 former government staffers and retired Members of Congress in hopes of influencing us to thwart reform. And it is actually disgusting that the health care industry is spending more than $1.4 million a day lobbying to thwart health care reform.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Progressive Caucus who has a vision of an America where people who are sick can go to the doctor, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Progressive Caucus that has a vision that we all can have decent, affordable health care, I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to think about these decent people, Anita, Janice, Priscilla and others, because surely in their districts they have people just like these good people who need change.

Let's say ''yes'' to the American people, Mr. Speaker.

It has been an hour appearing here on the House floor with the progressive message and with the Progressive Caucus message. Mr. Speaker, people can communicate by going to this Web site, cpc.grijalva.house.gov to let us know how they really feel.

□ 2250

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker I appreciate the honor and privilege of addressing you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. As I gather here in my preparation for this discussion, I understood the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota that he would be glad if I would, perhaps, address the health insurance and the health care issue here in the country, and I would be glad to do that. And I believe also my friend from Texas would be glad to do that.

What stands out in my mind is this: That the President of the United States campaigned on a promise that he wanted to deliver. It looks to me like a national health care act. It's what I would call socialized medicine. That's what we called it when it was Hillary Care, and I think that's what we will call it if it becomes Obama Care.

But the American people are for the most part very satisfied with their health insurance program, and they are almost completely satisfied with the health care that they get when they do, when they do require that kind of care. The kind of care they get in clinics, the kind of care they get in hospitals, the kind of care that's provided by our doctors and our nurses and our various practitioners is number one in the world.

And, for example, the Canadian people that have an Obama Care plan come to the United States when they really need medical care. And I happen to notice that the people that have a socialized medicine program in the European Union, where sometimes their queue is longer in France than it is in Italy, longer in Germany than it is in Spain. And people that need care might have to move all around the European Union and get in the shorter queue to try to get in to get their hip replacement or their surgery or whatever it might be.

It's not the kind of care that I want to see in the United States of America. We don't have people waiting in line. We don't have people sitting outside the emergency room in a long queue, and we don't have people that are coming to the emergency room for care because it's more convenient to them—unless, of course, somebody else is paying the bill.

Because we have at least the incentive and a component of the free market system. Even though the Federal Government pays for a large share of health care, the reason our health care system in the United States is so good, and the biggest reason that our pharmaceuticals have raced so far ahead in their research and development of the rest of the world, and the reason that we have so much technology, and such high-quality health care, one of those reasons is because of the altruism of the practitioners that are there, they are in the business for the right reason. They want to help people. They want to provide good health care services.

But on top of that, there is at least an incentive for profit. And if you dial that out, if you take it away, it discourages people from going off to med school and discourages them from developing their skills and education, and it discourages the entrepreneurs and the innovators from producing more and more innovation when it comes to health care.

And so the rest of the world's opportunity to benefit from the innovativeness of the United States would be diminished if we adopted socialized medicine here in the United States.

And what are we trying to go fix. I would suggest this: The argument is that there are 44 to 47 million people in America that don't have health insurance. Now, no one should be very alarmed at that when they understand that everyone in America has access to health care. And, yes, it might be in the emergency room and it might not, and it's more often than not covered by somebody else's contribution, or there would be, through their workplace sometimes, or through some kind of government program or Medicare or Medicaid. But they all have access to health care. And a large percentage of us have health insurance.

And the number of 44 to 47 million that are uninsured, according to those who, on this side of the aisle who never come down here to ask me to yield and rebut my arguments, they just simply, apparently, are bewildered by the truth—so I would be happy to yield if any of you have an argument that you would like to make that would add some substance to this argument, but you don't—44 to 47 million uninsured by your numbers. But when you start carving out of that those who are illegally in the United States, if ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, were to deliver a voucher that were to provide for about half of these uninsured, pay for their insurance premium, they will be compelled by law to deport them rather than hand them the voucher check.

So you can cut that number down substantially, you know that to be true. Then if you take out of these 44 million, the numbers of people who are in transition from one health insurance policy to another, and if you take out of that also the young people that just haven't gotten into a program yet because partly because they don't want to pay the premiums for people who have higher health care costs, that 20-to-30, early 30s area, you are down to this number. They are chronically uninsured; according to a recent study, totals about 4 percent of the population.

Now, if we establish socialized medicine, we are going to maybe get covered 99 percent of the population, and we are at this point now where the chronically uninsured are only 4 percent of the population. So why would we upset and completely transform the best health care system in the world to try to narrow down the 4 percent chronically uninsured and maybe, if they would just sign up or participate, we could get them down to 1 percent.

For that 3 percent, we would upset the entire system. It does not make sense to me, and you cannot, you cannot save money in this health care program by turning it all into government unless you ration.

And what's happening now is Medicare is driving down the costs and pushing the costs over on the private carriers. That's the real circumstance.

And I want to also say, Mr. Speaker, to you, I want to make sure the American people hear this.

When President Obama says, don't worry if you like your health insurance program that you have, you get to keep it, he is only the President of the United States. He doesn't get to promise Americans they get to keep their policy. He is setting up and wants to set up a national health care act, a socialized medicine program, an insurance program that competes directly with the private sector.

And when you use taxpayer dollars to subsidize funding directly against the private sector, you necessarily will shrink and outcompete the private sector because it's going to be subsidized from—without the public—the government insurance program, will be subsidized by taxpayers.

And if it is, it can outcompete that of the private sector. It's just a matter of the formula.

And so if you are an insurance company that has to have your costs all added in, your administrative costs added, a margin for the profit, always competing for the best kind of bargain that is out there, which adds to the efficiencies, I will add. And the government comes in, and they say we are going to take you head to head, but we are going to pump in 25 percent of our costs out of the taxpayers here to funnel this in. That means they will be able to lower the premiums down and take these private health insurers out.

I can tell you what happened in Germany. Otto von Bismarck established a national health care plan there more than 100 years ago, sometime in the late 1800s. And today 90 percent of Germans are covered by the public plan, the government plan, the taxpayer subsidized plan. Everybody is required to have a plan, about 99 percent do have a plan. But about 10 percent of them are covered by private insurance. That's all that's left.

They pushed out all of the private carriers except for about 10 percent. That 10 percent are for people who are self-employed who can opt into that, who want a little bit better health care program. That's what's kept that little 10 percent margin there. I don't think 10 percent is a legitimate competition.

And when the government owns and runs everything in the United States, what do you think happens to your prices and your efficiencies and your service? Price goes up, service goes down. Health care gets rationed. President Obama cannot promise the American people that you get to keep your health insurance plan because they are going to drive the health insurance companies out of business.

And even if they don't, the employers who control those policies and the employee providers of health insurance will be making that decision on whether they want to opt into the government plan or whether they want to maintain the same or a different private plan for their employees. Yes, you can weigh in with your employer, you can make a request with your employer, but your employer will have to make a decision on the bottom line. The bottom line will be, is it cheaper to use taxpayer-subsidized health insurance for the employees, or cheaper to provide for the unsubsidized health insurance premiums from the private insurance companies?

That decision will be made on a dollar-per-dollar basis in what looks like it's the best thing for the mid term, short term and long term. And it won't be a decision made by President Obama; it will be a decision made by the employer.

So if the government offers a government plan, and the government plan saves the employer money, and you are an employee that is covered by your employer-provided plan, you can kiss it goodbye. It will be a government plan. It will be a national health care plan. It will be socialized medicine, and you will have one-size-fits-all medicine in the United States of America eventually under President Obama's proposal.

That's a fact. It really is logically irrefutable. No matter how many times they repeat the same mantra over and over again, it comes back to the same conclusion, which is: The American people won't get to decide that they keep their own plan. Employers, if they provide that insurance, will decide. And the government will subsidize the competition to the point where it drives out the private sector providers, and then it's all one-size-fits-all, all one government plan, all socialized medicine, all Canadian model, all United Kingdom model, all European Union model.

And what a cruel thing to do to the Canadians, Mr. Speaker, what a cruel thing.

□ 2300

A good Canadian company today will hire people and promise them this: you have to accept the Canadian one-size-fits-all plan with its rationing and its long lines and its inefficiencies and people waiting in line, dying in line. You have to accept that because it is against the law in Canada to treat somebody without an order of processing. You have to get in the queue. They enforce it differently province to province, but the law exists.

So let's say you need a hip replacement. You get in line with the people who need hip replacements and there is written criteria on what the priorities are. So you are standing in line. No matter how badly you need the hip replacement, you can't cut in front of the line; you are just stuck in that line. So employers, they want to offer a good package to their employees, will package up with this a health insurance plan that flies them out of Canada into the United States so they can get American health care. Now that is a nice plum. Let's say you have two people of such tremendous skill that you

want to hire them because that is what it takes to keep your company. That is what the President thought about Tim Geithner, by the way, who will be before our committee tomorrow, that he was such a valuable person, the fact that he had not paid his taxes was not a large enough factor to weigh against him. If you have those kind of people that you can hire in Canada, you offer them this nice package, which when it is convenient for you, use the Canadian plan. But when you need the health care, we will fly you to Houston and give you heart surgery. Your heart gives you trouble today, we will operate on you tomorrow. Maybe even today if it is early enough in the morning.

That is what happens in Canada: people are flown to the United States of America for their health care because it is rationed in Canada.

Now that is not enough, Mr. Speaker. Would anybody go out and go through the Web sites and the Yellow Pages in Canada and look at the travel companies that package up health care trips to the United States?

Hip replacement is easy to figure out. Let's say you live in British Columbia. No, how about Calgary in Alberta. You have a bad hip, and you finally get into the government doctor and he looks at you and says your socket is burned out, you have to have a hip replacement.

Yes, I stood in hours or days to have you tell me that. I want it fixed.

Well, we have a line over here. Let's say it is 400 long; we do a couple a week. So 52 weeks in a year, about 4 years or so. And I don't know that these are real numbers or hypothetical. But you understand you are in a long queue in Canada. So you understand you can go on the Internet, do a little search and come up with a nice little travel health care company, and there are a number of them in Canada who are in the business of packaging up the health care services.

They will say, you don't want to drive because we will do this surgery in Seattle. We will set this up. We will set up your transportation, fly you down to Seattle, and then here is your transportation.

You can get to the airport?

Yes, I will drive my car.

Park your car here; get on this plane. We will fly you from Calgary down to Seattle, and you can pick up the shuttle to the hotel, the hotel is next to the hospital, check into the hotel, go over to the clinic, the doctor will look you over and schedule you for surgery, which will be the following morning at 8 a.m. You go under the knife. You get your new hip socket. They give you a day and a half of therapy. We will bring you back to the hotel, and from the hotel they will shuttle you back to the airport and you can fly back to Calgary and you can go back home.

All of that for what, turn key. They will cut you a deal turn key so you know what it will cost you to pack it all up from transportation, hotel room, doctors' visits, surgery costs, all of things that you get, including the therapy, the physical therapy on the tail end, and get you back home again, write one check or put it on your credit card. There is a company for you. They are the entrepreneurs that have survived in Canada in the face of socialized medicine because it created a demand for people to come to the United States.

Do we shut that all off? Would we destroy the opportunities for the entrepreneurs in Canada that have so adeptly found and met a market demand? I say, no, we should not do that in this Congress. And I don't know if there is anybody in this Congress who knows that better than Judge, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). I would be very happy to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa, and I appreciate the chance to participate here.

The prior Republican hour, we discussed health care and this socialized medicine that is coming and supposedly is going to be jammed down America's throat next week, at least as far as the House is concerned.

And then I got back to my office and listened to my friend from across the aisle talk about his socialized—well, he called it progressive, but you look at the history of the progressive movement. It is a nationalization of things; it is a socialization of things. That is where it is all headed.

I was intrigued as I listened to my friend from Iowa talk about these horror stories from Canada and we keep hearing horror stories from England and other places that have socialized medicine, and I was struck by our friend on the other side of the aisle saying this isn't Canada, this isn't England, this is America, we are going to do it right. We are going to do it better.

I was struck, and if it weren't so tragic and if it didn't mean that going to socialized medicine as they want, we are going to have people I love dying unnecessarily, it would be a joke. But it is no joke; it is tragic. Because for years, for years we have listened to people say we need to have nationalized health care like Canada. We need to have nationalized health care like England where everybody has all the care they need. That's what we have heard for years.

So some of us, like my friend from Iowa, have gone to the trouble to find out more about this socialized medicine, this nationalized care, this public care in Canada, in England, in Europe and in other places.

What we find is this isn't something we want. So now we are no longer hearing we need to be like Canada and England and just have public health care, whatever the term is they want to use that particular day, because now we know more of the truth.

I talked to a man from Canada last week who was visiting with me. He was telling me about his father who died a year or so ago from a heart attack. And his father knew he needed a bypass surgery and he had to go on the list to get a doctor's appointment. When he finally got the appointment and finally got the diagnostic care, he found out he needed a bypass. So then he went on the list to get bypass surgery. And he was on it for nearly 2 years.

I said I knew the lines were long, and my friend from Iowa pointed out there are people in Canada that will just fly you down to Houston if you are with a company that makes enough money that they can do that, but rank-and-file Canadians can't do that. Rank-and-file Americans have no place to go. They can't do that. They would stay in the line and they would die, like his father did.

I asked, How was it he stayed in the line so long?

Well, he said, bureaucrats moved people in front of him. For over a year, they kept moving people.

I said, Wait a minute, I know enough about Canadian care, and I know this bureaucratic, socialized piece of crap they have up there, it gives them a generalized standard of care. And I know they are very caring doctors. In fact, back 30-some years ago, my mother after a brain tumor was found had checked with one who was revolutionizing some areas of brain surgery. Not any more. You come here for that.

But anyway, my mother got the best care that medicine could provide because there are very caring doctors in this country and because there were no lines.

But with his father, I said as I understand, anywhere you have socialized medicine, you have to have people waiting in line because if you don't, the system goes broke.

□ 2310

You can't give people all the care they need when they need it or you go broke because the government can't collect enough tax to pay everything like that. The government can't do that because the government has no money of its own, it has to rely on taxes until it goes socialist completely—as the Soviet Union did, and then they were able to last 70 years because they would kill people and put them in prison if they didn't do exactly what they said. So they set a record, 70 years of socialism. We won't last that long once we get there, if we don't get it turned around.

But anyway, you have to put people in line, let them die waiting for treatment and care. But I also know you have to make it a crime for people to move themselves up the list or pay somebody to move them up the list. And so how was it that people kept moving in front of your father, they kept bumping him down the list to get the bypass? And he said, Well, you're right, it is a crime to do something to get yourself moved up. But bureaucrats are allowed to sit in their little cubicle

or office somewhere and at their whim decide whoever they may guess ought to be moved up; this guy may need bypass surgery worse than he does, and they kept moving people in front of him. Well, the bureaucrat guessed wrong. The man that needed the bypass surgery the worst died because some bureaucrat wouldn't let him move up the list in a timely manner. That stuff is coming to America.

And so when we were promised about this great, nationalized or public—you know, people have figured out socialized care is not something they want, and so now we're hearing it's public, it's a public care thing. Well, I heard my friend across the aisle say, well, an hour before me they talked about a bureaucrat being between you and your doctor. And he said what they talked about an hour ago was fantasy. Well, if we go to the program they're proposing, it may end up seeming like it's fantasy, but it will be a nightmare, and there will be no waking up and walking away from it. You get stuck in that system until it breaks your country because none that I know of have ever been able to successfully come out of it.

I was an exchange student to the Soviet Union back in 1973. I visited their medical schools. I visited with doctors. I met with doctors. I met families of doctors. People were embarrassed to tell me one of their parents was a doctor because they didn't pay them much. Now, if you were an assistant to the factory manager, you got a couple of weeks on the Niobrara River and you got some benefits, and that was a good thing, but people were embarrassed because doctors didn't get paid much. Folks, that's where this goes.

And I know we've even got some doctors that have said we ought to go to this thing—you know, insurance companies, we hate them, they delay payments, and things need to be done; maybe we need a public health care insurance. The problem is, they may reimburse for a little bit, but eventually you'll get to the salary, eventually the salary does not cover the education it takes to have the level of care we get now and so you have to dumb down the education. Your best and brightest don't apply. I like the top people in my class being the ones that go to medical school. I was encouraged to do that. I had one doctor saying, Lou, you would be such a good doctor, please don't throw your life away and go to law school, but I did.

But nonetheless, we're talking about a nightmare for the American people. And when I hear the sob stories about, you know, if we just had public health care, if we had socialized medicine, then these people would be able to get the mammograms, and they would get the care and they would find out about their breast cancer, and they would get treatment. Well, I've got some hard news for you. The fact is that in this country, for localized tumors we have a 98 percent survival rate at 5 years. That is incredible the progress that's been made. Things like the Komen efforts for the cure, I mean, just done great work.

Ninety-eight percent survival at 5 years for a localized tumor. Well, if you go to the socialized medicine countries, you find about 20 percent worse results. You get it? One in five people have to die because they went to socialized medicine. Now, I've got three daughters and a wife, I would hate to think that among five women, one of them is going to die because we go to socialized care and we have to have these long lists to get a mammogram, once you find it, to get treatment. It is insane.

Now, I agree with my friends, we need change. And I have been to the emergency room, and I've been with my kids, and I've been with my in-laws, and it is not a fun place to be sitting there in long lines. But what you realize is the lines are long because we are having to provide free health care to people that don't pay. And many are undocumented, illegal aliens—whatever you want to call it, and that's why the plan that I proposed is one in which you have to deal with that because that is causing unnecessary pain and suffering in the health care being provided to people that need it, who pay their way, who have health insurance, who have Medicare and Medicaid and SCHIP, they shouldn't have to wait and pay for people who are here to get free care.

Now, the plan I have starts with the fact that if, because we know that we are moving to, as one of my friends, Jim Frogue, just pointed out in some research he has done, we're moving toward a $22 trillion a year Medicare/Medicaid system, $22 trillion—we got about $2.5 trillion in income tax last year, you cannot sustain a Nation at a $22 trillion socialized medicine or Medicare/Medicaid system. We have got to do something. We can make it better and cheaper, but we can't have the government bureaucracy handling it.

So the proposal says, first of all, this is a matter of national security. Our health care is a matter of national security. We saw what happened in the Soviet Union; when you can't pay your bills, you go broke and you cease to exist.

So if we're going to continue to attract people from around the world, then we need to have a country that is not going broke. So under my proposed plan that we're trying to get into a bill—there have been other more pressing things, you know; we had to get a resolution for Michael Jackson, other more pressing things—but under this plan it makes clear that we have to deal with this issue.

So if you're going to ask for a visa into our country so that we will continue to have a country that you will want to come to, then you have to show proof that you will have a health savings account which you will be part of when you get here, and you will have catastrophic coverage to cover everything over that. And if you don't have proof of that, then you don't get a visa and get to come into this country.

Now, we've been told by the Supreme Court that the law of the land is that if you're here in this country, even if you're here illegally, then we have to provide you health care. So that is what we'll do, we'll follow the law. If you're here illegally, you have no health savings account, you have no insurance, then, yes, we will treat you, we will get you well enough to transport, and then you will be deported. And then because this is a matter of national security and our country is entirely at risk here of going broke and ceasing to exist, if you come back into the country after we've given you free health care and you present for further health care or you're caught here, then you're a risk to our national security to break the country and you will be put in jail. It will be a felony offense if you have taken free health care, been deported, and come back. It's too serious not to make it a Federal felony.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman briefly yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, I will certainly yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. And I would point out that, yes, Federal law is that a health care provider can't deny health care to illegals in their locale, and because of that there are no trauma centers in southern Arizona south of Tucson. They have all gone broke providing free health care for illegals that are flowing across our border. But it goes beyond that. We are even providing free health care for people who get injured in Mexico and are brought into the United States for free health care services.

And I point this out, it's not something that you see in any of the data that we have here in Congress, you find these things out by doing things like dropping in on a surprise visit down at Sasabe, Arizona, at the point of entry where I stopped a couple of years ago. I went in and I thought I would introduce myself, it was a surprise visit, but I said, I'm Congressman STEVE KING from Iowa. And the first officer said, I can't talk to you. So I went to the next officer and said, I'm Congressman STEVE KING from Iowa, just dropped in to see how things are going. Can't talk to you. Talk to Mike over there; he's the shift supervisor, and he's ready to retire and he has terminal cancer. He'll talk to you.

□ 2320

Okay. That much fear in place about simply divulging what's going on.

So I was standing there talking to Mike, whom I pray is still alive and doing well, but I'm not very confident that he is, and as he began to tell me what was going on at Sasabe at the port of entry, some of that discussion about how many illegal ports there are

east and west of their crossing the border, he got a phone call and he said, Excuse me a moment. He went away for a minute or so and he came back and he said, Well, I got a call. There's been an emergency that has been created on the Mexican side of the border in this town where they stage illegals, and it looks like there was a fight there. He didn't know if it was a drug fight or a booze fight or both, but there was an individual that was knifed. So he said they'd be bringing him across the border pretty soon in a Mexican ambulance, and I have called the helicopter to come down from Tucson and U.S. ambulances to come in with oxygen because we can't really stabilize the patient with what's on a Mexican ambulance.

I happened to have a paramedic with me, so I asked him, Mike, will you take a look at this man when he comes? I want you to get in there and help save his life if you can, and I also want to know what's going on.

He went in and went to work. And actually the Mexican ambulance came over the border, and the paramedic with me jumped right to work to try to save the fellow who had been stabbed right underneath the ribcage, into his liver it turned out. There was no oxygen. There was nothing in the Mexican ambulance except a little bit of gauze and some surgical gloves. That was it. Nothing else. No other medical supplies. So it was an ambulance that looked like an ambulance, but on the inside it was just simply an empty chamber.

So he did what he could to stabilize him until the two U.S. ambulances showed up. Then they put him on oxygen. Then they stabilized him. Then we loaded him into the helicopter, and he flew off to Tucson University Hospital. Stabbed in the liver in Mexico, brought into Mexico in a Mexican ambulance, transferred out of that onto the care of two U.S. ambulances, and then put on a Life Flight to go up to Tucson where the next morning I stopped to visit to see how our guy was doing. And, by the way, he was covered with tattoos and all kinds of signs of being a bad hombre, and he'd been in a nasty fight and stabbed with something that looked like it was a knife about 3½ inches wide, apparently, was the blade and deep enough to go into his liver.

I went to the hospital and asked to visit him. And as I went up there, I found out, and here's a short version of it, the net cost to the American taxpayers was $30,000, roughly, for the helicopter, for the medical care that he got. He was on parole into the United States to get health care, and he would be escorted back to the border when he was stabilized. All of that paid for by American people, American taxpayers, or American health care, health insurance premium payers, out of those pockets.

So I sat down while I was there with the chief financial officer of Tucson University Hospital. And there they rolled out some numbers where their annual cost was, and this is my recollection, around $14.5 million of health care that they provided to illegals. They told of a circumstance where there had been a bus full of illegals that had been in a wreck and about 25 in there that were injured, and 15 of them were so badly injured that they were brought into the intensive care unit. ICU was packed full of 15 illegals. No room for any people in Tucson who had been paying their health insurance premium to provide for that kind of emergency care. So they were Life Flighting the residents of Tucson up to Phoenix to go into the ICU in Phoenix, and then their families had to drive there to visit because the ICU in Tucson was full. And that is the only and the most southerly trauma center in Arizona.

Another situation where there was a mother that was pregnant with multiple babies, five of them. So in order to avoid the high cost of multiple births in Tucson, and she was from Mexico, lived in Mexico, but they found out about this. They had been sending people down there to train the health care providers in Mexico. They trained them on how to deal with a multiple birth, set it all up so they didn't have this high cost of these anchor babies coming into the United States. Five new American citizens created to go on the rolls of the burden to the taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time for the duration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 25 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the multiple births that were to take place in the home country of Mexico where they had sent American health care workers down to train Mexican health care workers, in spite of all of that investment to prevent the extra costs and five new anchor babies, as soon as she got ready to go into labor, she sneaked into the United States and they had her there anyway. That was $125,000 for that little turn.

This is a thing that's going on because of this law, and I wanted to inject that in. We aren't just providing health care for everybody in the United States, legal or illegal. We are also providing it occasionally for people who are injured in other countries and brought into the United States because we have such a good health care system here. And our taxpayers pay for it, our rate payers pay for it, and the people in the communities pay for it.

I yield back to the gentleman from Texas and ask him to carry on with the thought process that I interrupted.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my friend from Iowa and those wonderful illustrations of exactly what we are talking about.

I know that there are some people in America have concern and I have heard people say, well, I'm afraid, you know, there are so many immigrants coming in, especially from south of the border, that we are going to lose our American culture. And my own personal feeling is that really I think America was blessed with three really central things. One is a faith in God throughout our history, another was a love and devotion to family, and the other was a very good, hard work ethic. So when I see most of the people I know that have come from south of the border up here that have faith in God, that have got a love and devotion to family, and they've got a strong work ethic, I'm actually hopeful that that will strengthen our American social scene here where people have lost faith in God, where they have lost devotion to family, where they don't want to work.

But the problem is we have to be unified. Out of many, one means we speak one language. And that means you don't teach kids in some foreign language. You teach them in a language so they have got a chance to be president of a company, not the manual laborer for the company. So I'm still hopeful that when people come legally and assimilate, it is going to make this country stronger and better. But it has to be legal. We cannot ignore the rule of law. That is what has allowed us to be maybe the greatest economy in the world or maybe in history.

And the country just south of us should be one of the top 10 economies in the world, but it's not because they pay no mind at all to the rule of law. There is graft and corruption. I appreciate the efforts of the President across the border trying to clean things up, and I hope and pray he has some success.

But I wanted to also respond to my friend from across the aisle who said it's time for change now. It seems like I heard a Presidential candidate saying that last fall. And then what we have gotten is about 10 to 20 times more deficit spending than we had when he took office and is about to break the country. So I agree it's time for a change, and let's quit having so much deficit spending. I agree it's time for a change in health care. We cannot allow our government, our country to be brought down because of runaway health care costs. And there's a way to fix this, and it's an American system.

I mean, for somebody to come in here and say before God and America and everybody, we are not talking Canada or England here. We are talking about a uniquely American, basically, socialism.

My friend from Iowa knows I was a history major. I'm a student of history. And sometimes I am just amazed by the thinking in this body that somehow we are so smart and so much better than all of those who have gone on before us that we can do the same thing that's been done throughout history and get a different result. But if

you're smart enough to learn from history, you know, and everybody in this body is smart enough to learn from history, if they just will. And you learn that if you do the same things that historically over and over and over have been tried and gotten the same result, you're going to get the same result too, and you should try something different.

□ 2330

So that's why we've got to fix Medicare, we've got to fix Medicaid, and we can't keep on this course of SCHIP getting bigger and bigger and bigger. So what I came up with, after consulting with experts in all these different areas, is, you know what, for 2007 the latest numbers we've got—we've spent $9,215, with the best Census Bureau estimate of how many households are in America—$9,200 roughly for every one of the 112 million households in America between Medicare and Medicaid. So you look at it, and you put your pencil to it, and you realize that, at most, there were 93 million Americans who either got Medicare, Medicaid or some form of SCHIP or some form of combination. We're better off saying, Folks, we want you to have the best care possible. I want my mother-in-law, who's still grieving over the loss of her husband last August, I want her to have the best care. If you're in America and you are an American legally here, then we want you to have $3,500 in your health savings account that you will control with a debit card, and we'll put that $3,500 cash from the government in your health savings account. You control it with your own debit card, and then we'll pay for catastrophic insurance to cover everything above that. Now that's health care that people can believe in and deserve and look at the cost. Less than a third of Americans would need that or be entitled to that. Those who are on Medicare, Medicaid, that are below the poverty level that we really need to help because they can't help themselves, we're better off doing that. Then not only will it cost less than $9,200, as it is now, but you're doing it for less than a third of the American people. So we should be able to save hundreds of billions of dollars, not this $100 million like the President. We will eventually get to that. Man, we're saving hundreds of billions of dollars. We'll get the country on track. We'll get people the health care they deserve. But of course one of the problems is, you can't keep allowing people to immigrate into this country legally or illegally and give free health care because it's not free. It costs everybody.

So that's something I came up with. Hopefully there are not too many other resolutions being drafted by Leg Counsel so that they can get around to putting ours in the form of a bill, where we can get a CBO score on it because you can't get a CBO score unless you have it done by Leg Counsel and get a real bill. So we're trying to get that done, and I hope we can get that done.

Then one other thing, if I might. You've got to have complete transparency on health care costs because we don't have them now. You get a notice from the hospital, the doctor, you know, $10,000, $20,000, whatever the cost was. ''Wow, thank goodness I had insurance or Medicare. I would have been bankrupt.'' That's not what it costs. It costs a fraction of that. So under this proposal, every health care provider will have to give the exact cost that they charge different entities. They don't have to give the names but the descriptions and how much they charge so that you know what it's going to cost you when you go up there before you give them your debit card to swipe. The card would be coded for health care only. If you try to pay something that's not health care, it wouldn't accept it, and people will get back to controlling their futures. We'll save this runaway health care cost, as it is, and I think save the country as a result.

My friend from Iowa has been so very patient and lenient, but this is something that is so passionate to me. I've known too many people who need good health care, and I am sick of insurance companies or government being between me and my doctor. I want patients to be able to get with their doctor, and I don't want socialized medicine. I've seen that. I've seen the results. You can look at the numbers. My friend from Iowa has all these wonderful examples that just break your heart. I don't want my American friends and our kids and their kids to suffer on our watch in this body because we didn't have the nerve to stand up and call it like it was. So I appreciate my friend for yielding, and I yield back to him.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and looking at the list of housekeeping that I have to do, I'd like to conclude this discussion on health care. I would just point out that Judge GOHMERT from Texas anticipated the item that was on my mind and flowed into the transparency of the costs of health care. As far as I know, we're the only two people in this Congress that are talking about transparency on health care costs. How this works is this: If Medicare doesn't pay the costs of providing the services, if other providers don't pay or if other insurance companies, like the largest ones, they will drive that down, they'll track Medicare reimbursement rates down. That means that somebody else has to pay the difference. It's like pushing on a balloon one way or the other, and that's the transparency that's necessary.

I keep going back to the hip replacement because that's a simple one to understand. If a hip replacement costs somebody on Medicare—let's put a number on it just to pull it out of the air. Let's say it costs somebody on Medicare $7,500, and it costs somebody that's going to write a check out of their billfold $10,000, and somebody who is covered by a good private health insurance company maybe is going to cost them $9,000. Why is that? It's because the government has pushed down the reimbursement rates under Medicare; and because of that, the losses have to be made up somewhere else.

I will go another step beyond the complete transparency that Mr. GOHMERT calls for, and I will say this: If Bill Gates pulls into a gas station and the sign says $2.49 a gallon, Bill Gates, Warren Buffett and the other rich people in the world buy their gas at $2.49 a gallon. The poorest person in the world has a rattle-trap old car, and they went out and scraped together enough money to go buy 10 gallons of gas to put in their rattle-trap car. They are going to pay $2.49 a gallon, sitting at the pump right there with Bill Gates in his Lexus or Mercedes or whatever it might be and Warren Buffett, who probably doesn't drive that nice of a car, actually. Well, why would a gallon of gas be the same price for the poor and the rich but have a hip replacement be different prices for people, depending on whether it's paid for by the taxpayers under Medicare or a private payer who is, let's say, self-insured who has a nice big checkbook and decides not to pay that premium or somebody who has a private health insurance premium? Why three or more different prices? The reason is because the government has pushed down those costs, and they get averaged out through balanced billing and cost shifting from the health care providers. That is one of the root causes of the problems we have with our health providers today. It's kind of like the elephant in the room. Nobody wants to talk about it because it's too hard to fix.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate that. And just on a follow-up on what he's pointing out about transparency, a personal situation, a person I know—I had permission to know about—got hit by another driver. It was totally the other driver's fault. She had 2 days of hospitalization, had all the diagnostic tests, the ambulance, the doctors that she saw. And when all the bills were gathered from all those sources to deal with the car insurance company, it was right about $10,000 in health care. You say, Well, that's kind of consistent with the kind of bills I've seen, people that have been in a hospital 2 days, all the tests and doctors they see. That's about normal. Yet when it came down to the conclusion and the determination had to be made as to how much was actually paid and by whom, all of those health care provider bills that added up to $10,000 said they had been paid in full, consistent with their contract with the health insurance company. So then in checking with the health insurance company as to how much they were actually out of pocket in paying those $10,000 in claims in full,

it was $800. Now, if we get to the transparency that my friend from Iowa is talking about, then everybody in America gets the same deal that health insurance company did at $800. So you could have 2 days of hospitalization, and it doesn't even take but a fraction of your health savings account up.

The other thing I wanted to point out that kind of segues into a topic that I think my friend wanted to get into before he concluded, that is this business of the same costs. And what we saw in the last 2 weeks over the crap-and-trade bill that got shoved down America's throat through the House, at least—and I am hoping and praying that it won't get through the Senate—we're talking about skyrocketing electric bills, as the President promised a year ago back when he was a Senator running for President.

□ 2340

We are talking about skyrocketing gasoline prices. What is so very tragic about what my friend from Iowa pointed out is that with gasoline, it is the same price whether you're rich or poor. Those high electric rates, those high gasoline rates and the high propane rates are going to be inconvenient for Bill Gates. But they are going to devastate the people I know in east Texas and the people I have met in Iowa. They are going to devastate rank-and-file Americans.

We really need America to respond and say we can't handle that. Inconvenience for the rich is one thing, but devastation to rank-and-file Americans is something we should not have Congress do.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Texas. I say, but, Mr. Speaker, we have a stimulus plan. We have a $787 billion stimulus plan that is going to jump-start this economy and get us out of the doldrums and solve this problem with unemployment and put Americans back to work and get the Dow Jones back up above 8,200 or somewhere and make America feel good again and give confidence in the venture capitalists that are out there and in the markets and in the Dow and in the entrepreneurs.

Well, all of that was part of a stimulus plan. I came down on this floor while that was being debated, and I put up a poster that looks a lot like this. Only it didn't have $16.1 million on it. It had $32 million on it. And it had the quote from President Obama here rather than the quote from Speaker PELOSI. And the quote from President Obama was: ''We are not going to do earmarks. We are not going to do Member-sponsored initiatives. And I'm not going to sign any bill that has earmarks in it.'' Well, it depended on how you counted it. It seems to me that the number of earmarks in that bill came to around 9,000, maybe a little less, 8,500, depending on how you defined the earmarks.

This is a picture of this cute little guy. I don't know if it is a girl or a guy. Do you see how cute he is? He is a pet project. This is Speaker PELOSI's pet project, her pet mouse project. This is the not quite yet infamous—and here is what he is. He is the salt water marsh harvest mouse. Now that is SWMHM for short. This little mouse lives out there in the marsh near San Francisco. And he has been a special project of the Speaker. For years, she has tried to get earmarks for this mouse.

Now, take a close look there. You don't see it, but there is an earmark there. Even though I said that this stimulus plan had an earmark in it for the salt water marsh harvest mouse, everybody that spoke for the Speaker and the people on this side of the aisle said, oh, no, that is radical reactionism. There aren't any earmarks in this bill. And, furthermore, the salt water marsh harvest mouse is not going to be one of those earmarks, because that would be a pet project—a pet project—for the Speaker, and that would be inappropriate given that the President has ordered that there will not be pet projects.

Well, this is what the Speaker said on January 25, 2009. After the beginning of this 111th Congress, she said, I don't want to have legislation that is used as an engine for people to put on things that are not going to do what we are setting out to do, which is to turn this economy around. I have the most to prove with this package. The most to prove. The choices we are making are those that will work, that must work. Our economy requires it. America's families need it. This is urgent.

Well, the mouse family may need it. Maybe it is a good thing, $16.1 million for this little old mouse that couldn't quite rise high enough in the priority scale in any previous process of the United States Congress. But here in the desperate straits of 14½ million unemployed and another 5.8 or 9 million looking for a job, 20 million people out there who would like to have an opportunity to fend for themselves, we are going to drop not $32 million any longer, it has been carved down, we are going to put $16.1 million into the salt water marsh harvest mouse earmarked in this little pet project. This little pet project is earmarked now for $16.1 million.

All the people over there that said, oh, STEVE KING is a reactionary and a radical. He is making up things that aren't in the bill. It isn't going to happen. We wouldn't do a thing like that, including the Speaker who has defined that she won't do a thing like that now has $16.1 million going into the marsh for the salt water marsh harvest mouse. His viability—I presume he is doing okay without this earmark. If we need jobs and an economy that works, we don't need to be dumping money into the salt water marsh harvest mouse.

By the way, that is an earmark. It is a pet project. His ears are notched. That is what we do. And that is where the name came from.

I wanted to point that out, Mr. Speaker, while this microphone is still alive here on this day, that this is the day that there was confirmation that the people who pointed this out back then in about this period in time in January or early February were right, and those who defended the Speaker and said it will never happen were wrong; $16.1 million was dropped in to the salt water marsh harvest mouse.

And that should give a person a little bit of pause.

Now I want to put something else into the RECORD here this evening, and that is you have had a couple of votes this week, one today and one the night before last, that I think are important. On the night before last, we had a vote on a resolution that would place a stone in the Capitol Visitor Center that honors the slaves that contributed to the construction of this Capitol Building. They did do that. They contributed to the construction. We ought to acknowledge that. But, you know, we had the huge room over in the Capitol Visitor Center that was designated as the Great Hall. Now the Great Hall brings to mind the Great Hall in Ellis Island. It would honor all of the immigrants that came to America, those that came voluntarily and those that came involuntarily. And it is an image that is very, very moving when you walk through the Great Hall in Ellis Island. I was very happy to name the room over in the visitor center the Great Hall.

But it had to be changed because of the objections of the Congressional Black Caucus that wanted a higher acknowledgment for slavery in this country. So the Great Hall's name was changed to Emancipation Hall.

Okay. No objection here. Emancipation was a big thing for the world when we put an end to slavery here in the United States. At great cost, however. A resolution to do so was traded off in a quid pro quo, and for those people who didn't go to law school like myself, I have to tell you, there was a deal made. The deal that was made was this: the Architect of the Capitol who has been trying to scrub every reference to faith from anything that's developed from this point forward around this Capitol complex and even refusing to allow when a flag is flown over this Capitol, the certificate that certifies that it was flown, if you want to say, July 10 in the year of our Lord, 2009, he wants to scrub ''the year of our Lord'' out of there because that's a reference to religion. Never mind above the Speaker's seat: it says, In God We Trust. It's been there for a long time, that is our national motto, and the Architect of the Capitol sought to block our national motto from being displayed in the Congressional Visitor Center along with the Pledge of Allegiance.

So in order to require the Architect to recognize our national motto In God We Trust and ''one nation under God'' in our Pledge of Allegiance, there had

to be a quid pro quo, a deal made, that in addition to Emancipation Hall, there would be an extra monument put up to recognize slavery.

All right. I'm fine with recognizing slavery. I would have been an abolitionist if I had been born back in those years prior to the Civil War. It's an article of faith, it's an article of Christian fundamentalism that slavery is a sin against God. And a good thing that happened when this country put an end to it, at great cost in blood. But if it's going to be the kind of devil's bargain that if you're going to have a reference to God in the Congressional Visitor Center you first have to pass another way to recognize slavery, in order to pacify the Congressional Black Caucus, a separatist organization in this Congress, in order to get a reference to God, the quid pro quo was, pass this resolution first and then we'll bring up the resolution that lets you vote on whether there's going to be In God We Trust in our visitor center. That took place today. The vote 2 days ago was 399–1. I voted ''no'' on the slavery marker because it was making a deal with requiring that to pass before the word God could go up in the Congressional Visitor Center, even though it's a direct replica of what's right behind me above the Speaker's chair right now. That resolution passed tonight with eight Members of Congress voting against putting our national motto up in the visitor center and against putting up the Pledge of Allegiance in the visitor center because there's a reference to God in each one. Eight voted no. Two voted present. Ten couldn't bring themselves to acknowledge that God's a great big part of what formed this country and those words will stand no matter who stands against it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for being recognized, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of his eldest daughter's wedding.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SARBANES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 16.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 10, 2009, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2546. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Significant Price Discovery Contracts on Exempt Commercial Markets (RIN: 3038-AC76) received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2547. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Butenedioic acid (2Z)—, monobutyl ester, Polymer with methoxyethene, sodium salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0851; FRL-8418-7] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2548. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, butyl ester, polymer with ethyl 2-propenoate and N-(hydroxymethyl)-2-propenamide; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0047; FRL-8418-4] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2549. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0384; FRL-8417-8] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2550. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0387; FRL-8418-5] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2551. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0007; FRL-8417-5] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxirane, 2-methyl-, Polymer with Oxirane; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0861; FRL-8420-9] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2553. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Starch, oxidized, polymers with Bu acrylate, tert-Bu acrylate and styrene; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0856; FRL-8418-8] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2554. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Michigan; Redesignation of the Detroit-Ann Arbor Area to Attainment for Ozone [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0219; FRL-8921-2] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Minor Correction to Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule and Changes in References to Analytical Methods [EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0644; FRL-8920-8] (RIN: 2040-AF00) received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Aerosol Coatings [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0971; FRL-8920-7] (RIN: 2060-AP33) received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Source Category List for Standards Under Section 112(k) of the Clean Air Act; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Area Source Standards for Aluminum, Copper, and Other Nonferrous Foundries [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0236; FRL-8920-9] received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2008-0252; FRL-8417-6] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2559. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Letter Report: Sufficiency Review of the Water and Sewer Authority's Fiscal Year 2009 Revenue Estimate In Support of the Issuance of $300,000,000 in Public Utility Senior Lien Revenue Bonds (Series 2009A)'', pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2560. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board, transmitting the Board's Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard 35 entitled, ''Estimating the Historical Cost of General Property, Plant, and Equipment: Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6 and 23'', pursuant to Section 307 of the Chief Financial Officers

Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2561. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Frenso and Stockton, CA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AL79) received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2562. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 111—56); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2563. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Upper Mississippi River Valley Viticultural Area (2007R-055P) [Docket No.: TTB-2008-0007; T.D. TTB-77; Re: Notice No. 88] (RIN: 1513-AB40) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2564. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Statutory Amendments Requiring the Qualification of Manufacturers and Importers of Processed Tobacco and Other Amendments Related to Permit Requirements, and the Expanded Definition of Roll-Your-Own Tobacco [Docket No.: TTB-2009-0002; T.D. TTB-78; Re: Notice No. 95] (RIN: 1513-AB72) received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2565. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Necessary to Facilitate Business Election Filing; Finalization of Controlled Group Qualification Rules [TD 9451] (RIN: 1545-BF25) received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2566. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tribal Economic Development Bonds [Notice 2009-51] received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2567. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Recovery Zone Bond Volume Cap Allocations [Notice 2009-50] received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2568. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 42.-Low-Income Housing Credit [Notice 2009-44] received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2569. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tier I Issue — Section 965 Foreign Earnings Repatriations Directives #3 [LMSB Control No: LMSB-4-0409-017] received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2570. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Sections 7702 and 7702A to Life Insurance Contracts that Mature After Age 100 [Notice 2009-47] received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2571. A letter from the Office Manager, Department of Health and Human Service, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Health Care-Related Taxes [CMS-2275-F2] (RIN: 0938-AP74) received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2572. A letter from the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program: Rescission of School-Based Administration/Transportation Final Rule, Outpatient Hospital Services Final Rule, and Partial Rescission of Case Management Interim Final Rule [CMS-2287-F2; CMS-2213-F2; CMS 2237-F] (RIN: 0938-AP75) received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2573. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the 24th Actuarial Valuation of the Assets and Liabilities Under the Railroad Retirement Acts as of December 31, 2007, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PINGREE of Maine: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 622. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–195). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3137. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide clarification relating to the authority of the United States Postal Service to accept donations as an additional source of funding for commemorative plaques; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 3138. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for transparency in the relationship between physicians and manufacturers of drugs, devices, biologicals, or medical supplies for which payment is made under Medicare, Medicaid, or SCHIP; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 3139. A bill to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 3140. A bill to rescind unobligated appropriations and repeal certain provisions in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 3141. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a DSH redistribution pool from unexpended Medicaid DSH allotments in order to increase Medicaid DSH allotments for low DSH States and to provide grants for health access networks serving the uninsured; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3142. A bill to establish a program to assist homeowners experiencing unavoidable, temporary difficulty making payments on home mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 3143. A bill to amend the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000, to extend the authorization of appropriations for that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

H.R. 3144. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote obesity prevention, including proper nutrition and exercise; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3145. A bill to amend the securities laws to prohibit credit default swaps and to provide the Securities and Exchange Commission with the authority to regulate swap agreements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 3146. A bill to make improvements to the FHA mortgage insurance programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REYES, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 3147. A bill to establish a grant program in the Department of the Treasury to fund the establishment of centers of excellence to support research, development and planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective programs in financial literacy education for young adults and families ages 15-24 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WATT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr.

CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WEINER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 3150. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, to provide compensation to certain poultry producers whose poultry production contracts were terminated or not renewed because of the closure of poultry processing plants and other cost cutting measures undertaken by a poultry processing company in bankruptcy protection; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 3151. A bill to permit pass-through payment for reasonable costs of certified registered nurse anesthetist services in critical access hospitals notwithstanding the reclassification of such hospitals as urban hospitals, including hospitals located in ''Lugar counties'', and for on-call and standby costs for such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3152. A bill to amend titles XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that low-income beneficiaries have improved access to prescription drugs under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on over-the-counter derivatives transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for grants to increase the number of law enforcement officers on the streets by 5 to 10 percent in areas with high incidences of violent crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana):

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain caregivers of veterans with training, support, and medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 3156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for expenses paid or incurred in non-clinical research for neglected diseases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 3157. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Alexandria, Minnesota, as the ''Max J. Beilke Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3158. A bill to reform health care delivery by providing incentives for place-based health care, which seeks to bring health services to the patient by locating community health centers, federally qualified health centers, and community integrated health centers in or near settings that already serve a particular target population, such as schools, workplaces, and senior services facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 3159. A bill to provide for the apportionment of funds to airports for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 based on passenger boardings during calendar year 2008 to prevent additional harm to airports already harmed by the financial crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3160. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance to Israel for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for an additional judgeship for the western district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make family members of public safety officers killed in the line of duty eligible for coverage under the Federal employees health benefits program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3163. A bill to establish certain requirements relating to area mail processing studies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, make permanent, and index for inflation the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to modify the definition of eligible educator for purposes of such deduction to include preschool educators; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3165. A bill to provide for a program of wind energy research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LEE of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HODES):

H.R. 3166. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to index for inflation the payment rate for payments under the milk income loss contract program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 621. A resolution ensuring access to affordable and quality health care without increasing the Federal budget or contributing to market inflation while providing greater choices for patient-focused care for individuals and families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H. Res. 623. A resolution requesting that the President focus appropriate attention on neighborhood crime prevention and community policing, and coordinate certain Federal efforts to participate in National Night Out, which occurs the first Tuesday of August each year, including by supporting local efforts and community watch groups and by supporting local officials, to promote community safety and help provide homeland security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII,

102. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 42 Urging the honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of each State's legislature of the United States of America to cease and desist, effective immediately, any and all mandates that are beyond the scope of their constitutionally delegated power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 22: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 39: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 49: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 147: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 197: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 204: Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 211: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 393: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 413: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 470: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 555: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 571: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 635: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 649: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 676: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 690: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 750: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 775: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. MACK.
H.R. 836: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 847: Mr. HODES and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 873: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 874: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 876: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 916: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 930: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1064: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1067: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1074: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 1132: Mr. BOYD, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1147: Mr. BACA and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1177: Mr. CASSIDY and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1188: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1203: Mr. ROSS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1207: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1250: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1255: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1283: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1293: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1294: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1349: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 1352: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1354: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1392: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1398: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1402: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1415: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SPACE, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1454: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1458: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1468: Mr. SESSIONS and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1474: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1503: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1521: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1525: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1547: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1548: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WU, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1570: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1588: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1625: Mr. MATHESON and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 1645: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1670: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1693: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1702: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1708: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1751: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1766: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1776: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 1799: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1829: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1831: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. FILNER, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. HILL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1833: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1846: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1881: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1884: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1894: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1970: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1977: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2006: Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2017: Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LEE OF New York, and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 2055: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 2060: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2062: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2068: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2095: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2097: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. REYES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. HILL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. BEAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NYE, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2124: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 2137: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2139: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2141: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2142: Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 2189: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2203: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 2205: Mr. WU.
H.R. 2277: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2296: Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2302: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2304: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 2329: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2345: Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2350: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2373: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2400: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2413: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2414: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2425: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2443: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2452: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 2456: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2478: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. KIRK, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2480: Mr. PETERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2492: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2523: Mr. BACA and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2570: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2575: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2594: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2597: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2662: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2672: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 2688: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2698: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 2699: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 2702: Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 2740: Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2743: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2796: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2804: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2805: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2811: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 2828: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2845: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 2852: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 2855: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2866: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2906: Mr. HARE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2932: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2935: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2936: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2941: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2943: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2963: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3003: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3006: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3012: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3017: Mr. HALL of New York and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3040: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3044: Mr. PAUL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. JONES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3045: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3085: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3088: Mr. MCMAHON.
H.R. 3092: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3119: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CAO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.J. Res. 10: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. WELCH.
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. KIND, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 161: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 89: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CAO, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Res. 111: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. CAMP.

H. Res. 175: Mr. MARCHANT and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 191: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 241: Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 333: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 363: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 397: Mr. LATHAM.

H. Res. 414: Mr. ISSA.

H. Res. 440: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H. Res. 441: Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BOCCIERI.

H. Res. 445: Mr. BRIGHT.

H. Res. 483: Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 494: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H. Res. 533: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 536: Mr. PITTS and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H. Res. 550: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 592: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 600: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 605: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 615: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H. Res. 616: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.