United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2011 No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the House reconvenes, we ask Your blessing upon deliberations informed by the experiences and interactions of the Members with their constituents.

We thank You for the time to be together with family and friends as our Nation celebrated 235 years of being a marvelous experiment in the self-governance of a people brought together by ideals and trusting in the ability of a free people to govern themselves in justice and peace.

Mindful of this great heritage, and the hard work and sacrifices of so many American ancestors to us all, may the Members of this people's House deliberate in good faith, mindful not only of short-term interest, but of their place in history and of the tremendous responsibility to govern wisely for a bright future for our Nation.

May all that is done this day in the wake of our national celebration be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BASEBALL DOES IT AGAIN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the University of the South Carolina men's baseball team ended the College World Series this season just as they did last year: The Gamecocks are national champions again, back-to-back victories, by beating the Florida Gators on June 28 at Omaha, Nebraska's TD Ameritrade Park. The University of South Carolina became only the sixth team in NCAA history to win back-to-back baseball national championships.

The Gamecocks won the national title in record-setting fashion. This is the first team ever to go 10–0 in an NCAA tournament. The Gamecocks' streak of 16 NCAA tournament wins and 11 straight in the College World Series are both all-time records.

In the title game, the Gamecocks rode the arm of Michael Roth as he only allowed two runs by the Gators. He was helped by Series Most Outstanding Player Scott Wingo, who not only batted in a couple of runs, but made defensive plays throughout the tournament. Coach Ray Tanner should be credited with putting the pieces together once again in steering the Gamecocks to a 55-win season, capped off by this national championship victory.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE LIFE OF ART HENRI JERBERT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Arthur Jerbert of North Stonington, Connecticut. As we approach the 1-year anniversary of his passing, it's important for this House to remember Art's remarkable service to our Nation and his community.

Art was a member of the Greatest Generation, entering the U.S. Navy during World War II, serving in the submarine force for 20 distinguished years. His career in the Navy included time aboard one of the subs that executed the ''wolf pack'' attack strategy in the Sea of Japan. That strategy was instrumental in asserting allied naval supremacy in the Pacific, an essential ingredient to final victory. During the conflict, he earned the Bronze Star and after the war rose to the rank of commander, retiring in 1962.

After leaving the Navy, Art applied his talents to improving the quality of life in southeastern Connecticut. He taught math to high schoolers all across the State, he coached little league, served on the North Stonington Board of Education, and became Ledyard's first mayor in 1971. What an amazing guy.

Art is deeply missed by his loving wife, Marilyn; his children; grandchildren; and great-grandchild. His example of human excellence and service is an inspiration for us all today and for generations to come.

PERSECUTION OF EGYPTIAN CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we were all glued to our televisions and the

Printed on recycled paper.

Internet watching the Egyptian people, Christian and Muslim alike, demand free and fair elections for the first time.

The history of the Christian church in Egypt far exceeds that of Islam. Even now, Coptic Christians make up 10 percent of Egypt's population of 80 million people.

Unfortunately, some fringe groups of extremist Muslims took this opportunity to attack their fellow Egyptians simply because they are Christians in an attempt to drive them out of Egypt. In some cases, they were successful.

Our country was founded on the principles of religious freedom. As a Christian and a Member of the House of Representatives, I'm hopeful that this example of a broad range of beliefs of our 435 Members will stand as an example to the Egyptian people.

I would ask the Egyptian people and the current military leadership to stand with the Christian minority in Egypt and ensure their ability to freely practice their faith is not impugned by the current leadership or the one that may be elected in the future.

I will continue to keep the Coptic Christians in Egypt in my prayers, and I would ask my colleagues to do the same.

YELLOWSTONE RIVER PIPELINE SPILL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend while most Americans were celebrating the Fourth of July, Montanans were, unfortunately, immersed in what has become a new American tradition: cleaning up oil spills.

After Exxon's Silvertip pipeline failed and spewed 40,000 gallons of toxic oil into the Yellowstone River, Exxon quickly labeled the incident a ''freak accident''—a phrase commonly used by the oil industry after major spills. But an exhaustive history of Big Oil's spills makes it clear that these incidents are not ''freak accidents'' but evidence of Big Oil's neglect.

Perhaps the most blatant, recent exhibit of empty safety promises belongs to TransCanada, who dubbed the Keystone pipeline ''the safest pipeline ever built.'' A year and 12 spills later, Keystone was shut down and deemed an ''imminent threat to life, property, and the environment.''

Before we permit the Keystone XL pipeline—another deadly TransCanada pipeline—we need to reauthorize our pipeline safety legislation because our pipelines need to be as consistent as Old Faithful.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend we celebrated America's Independence Day; and as I visited with constituents, they asked that we create another independence movement, independence from Middle Eastern oil, and I agree.

Unfortunately, rather than pursuing energy independence, the Obama administration keeps fostering an energy-dependence policy that costs American jobs, brings higher prices at the pump, and endangers our national security by making us more dependent on unstable Middle Eastern governments.

House Republicans have responded by introducing and passing four bills to increase our domestic energy production and create American jobs. But the Senate has taken no action. Liberal Democrats are obstructing the opportunity for jobs for Americans, lower energy costs, and a new era of independence.

It's time, Mr. Speaker, to declare independence from Middle Eastern oil and start using our own resources for the benefit of all Americans.

U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN LIBYA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, within the next 24 hours, the House will have the opportunity to end U.S. military involvement in Libya. And we should do so for the following reasons:

First, the war is illegal under the United States Constitution and our War Powers Act because only the U.S. Congress has the authority to declare war, and the President has been unable to show that the U.S. faced an imminent threat from Libya. The President even ignored his top legal advisers at the Pentagon and the Department of Justice, who insisted he needed congressional approval before bombing Libya.

Second, the war has reached a stalemate and is unwinnable without the deployment of NATO ground troops, effectively an invasion of Libya. The whole operation was terribly ill-considered from the beginning.

While NATO supports the Benghazi-based opposition situated in the oil rich northeast, there is little evidence that the opposition has the support of the majority of Libyans. The leading opposition group, the National Front for the Salvation of Libya, which had been reportedly backed by the CIA in the 1980s, should never have launched an armed civil war against the government if they had no chance absent a massive NATO air campaign and the introduction of NATO troops.

It's time to put an end to this war. Vote to cut off funds.

□ 1410

REPUBLICAN JOBS PLAN

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, rising unemployment continues to populate the headlines. An article last week by the AP points out that several cities in my State of Michigan, including Battle Creek, which I have the privilege of representing, endured big increases in unemployment. Michigan's unemployment stands at over 10 percent. The policies of this administration exacerbate bad situations. We do not need more overspending, higher taxes, rising energy costs, government takeover of health care, and more regulations.

My Republican colleagues and I have put forth a jobs plan. We know government cannot create jobs. Instead, we can support an environment where the private sector flourishes and creates jobs. Our jobs plan will reduce regulatory burdens, which are currently costing small businesses over $10,000 per employee each year, requiring congressional approval for any regulation that has significant impact on the economy. Our jobs plan will fix the Tax Code, streamlining and lowering tax rates. Our jobs plan will encourage entrepreneurship. Our jobs plan will increase domestic energy production and will cut unsustainable spending that creates crushing burdens of debt.

At home last week, I was constantly reminded how the lack of good-paying jobs is affecting my constituents. It's truly time for America to stand up for its liberty and its next generation.

MINNESOTA GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this week in Minnesota our State government is shut down due to a budget crisis. I want to applaud Governor Mark Dayton for negotiating in good faith, making productive compromises, and for never forgetting the needs of Minnesotans, especially our most vulnerable citizens.

The Republicans controlling the Minnesota Legislature issue ultimatums, and they want to mortgage our State's future by cutting health, education, and law enforcement. In Congress and in Minnesota, Republicans use the same playbook: First, create a crisis, put jobs at risk and the economy in peril; then ignore the needs of middle class families, and then fight to protect the interests of millionaires and billionaires.

What we are seeing in Washington and St. Paul is the radical tea party Republican extremism threatening jobs and the economy with destruction in the name of political advantage. This is a dangerous political strategy, and it needs to end now. Democrats and Republicans need to work together to solve our Nation's problems. The American people and Minnesotans expect that of their elected leaders.

ALLOW THE JOB CREATORS TO CREATE JOBS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I stand to tell a rare success story that I saw firsthand last week. Custom Aluminum Products, a local manufacturing business employing more than 360 people, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. Throughout those 50 years, they have grown from a small local manufacturer to a nationally recognized leader in the aluminum industry.

I tell their story today because Custom Aluminum is a thriving local business—expanding, employing, and excelling despite the economic and regulatory burdens. We have much to learn from stories like this: that if given the opportunity to excel, our small businesses will answer the call; and that it is never the role of the Federal Government to create jobs. Instead, government must get out of the way of small businesses by reducing job-killing regulations and bureaucratic red tape and allowing the job creators do what they do best: create jobs.

We must bring back certainty to the small business community and rebuild their confidence in our economy so that we can get Americans working again and celebrate many more local success stories like this in the coming months and years.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT DESTROYS PATIENT ACCESS

(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, I wanted to bring your attention to the front page of USA Today. The story is titled, ''Medicaid Payments Go Under the Knife.'' This is an issue that, unfortunately, is going to continue to get worse. Medicaid isn't just going under the knife; it's being slashed.

The simple truth is that Medicaid has become a coverage without access and only an empty promise for the people who arguably may legitimately need its services. And the Affordable Care Act is only going to exacerbate the problem with patient access to physicians. The new health care law has changed what was a program that was designed for the poorest of the poor, pregnant women, children, and the elderly, and turned it into a one-size-fits-all government program. States will add 16 million new people to the program, millions of younger adults, putting an even greater strain on the State budgets.

The health care law never addressed the root problem. We need to ensure that Medicaid spending is directed in a fashion that provides an actual safety net for those in need and allows States to create a range of products to give Medicaid patients access to their physicians and better care. We actually need to get back to the basics. And it is essential that we examine Medicaid and realize the ramifications before our States sink even deeper into a budgetary crisis.

CHINA HOSTED INDICTED WAR CRIMINAL

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, China recently rolled out the red carpet, pictured behind me, for Sudanese President Omar Bashir, an internationally indicted war criminal facing charges on 10 counts, including murder, extermination, forcible transfer of population, torture, and rape.

Prior to the visit, I wrote a letter to President Hu Jintao urging the Chinese Government to withdraw their invitation. Not only is Bashir wanted for his role in genocide in Darfur, but, as I speak, atrocities are unfolding against Christians in the Nuba Mountains—reliable reports of door-to-door targeting and killings, mass graves, Antonov bombers indiscriminately shelling civilian populations.

Consider this reality: Bashir is a wanted war criminal. His murderous aims are unchanged. The Chinese Government treats him as a friend and extends every diplomatic grace. And China owns our debt.

What is wrong with this picture? An indicted war criminal with the President of China.

DISMANTLING MEDICARE AS WE KNOW IT

(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 today in response to our friend from Texas who spoke just a few minutes ago, talking about Medicaid. It is true that entitlement programs need to be reformed. It's also true that costs need to be reined in. That's what affordable health care reform actually did.

The answer certainly does not lie in the Republican budget passed earlier this year on a party-line vote, which would dismantle Medicare as we know it, turning it into a voucher system, the Ryan plan, and would turn Medicaid into a block grant program which would further impoverish our States at a delicate moment of their recovery.

We need reform in entitlement programs, but the Republican budget, Mr. Speaker, is not the answer. It is the death knell for a program that covers a third of all Americans' health care.

SOLVE THE DEBT PROBLEM

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise after spending the week of July 4th in the heartland of America, central Oklahoma, where I had the opportunity to hear the thoughts of the families in my district regarding our economy and the debt.

No one approached me during the last week to tell me they wanted more government spending to create jobs. No one asked me to create more instability in our economy by raising taxes. In fact, no one told me they wanted to celebrate Independence Day by seeing more government dependence.

But over and over again, people asked me to work on solving the problem of the debt, not just voting for another blank check debt ceiling. We need real spending limits to offset our serious budget shortfall. We can't pretend that we can borrow forever with no consequences.

There is a limit to how much debt this Nation can carry and our worldwide markets can sustain. Our current real debt equals our GDP. And I would hope that many others in this House would see that as a problem as well.

Second, we need to address our entitlements. These programs are critical safety nets for the neediest Americans, but they will be worthless for everyone if we allow them to go insolvent.

And, finally, we need a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution, with real teeth to hold Washington accountable. There is simply no other way to bring future stewardship of taxpayer money. Fifteen years ago, the Balanced Budget Amendment failed to pass the Senate by one vote after it passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support. Our fiscal reality would be very different.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads in our nation's history. We do not have a debt ceiling vote crisis, we have a debt crisis. We need to stop focusing on a single vote and instead focus on the future consequences of our actions. It is time to put America back on track to debt reduction and job growth.

□ 1420

THE DEATH PENALTY AND THE MURDER OF ADRIA SAUCEDA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, 16-year-old Adria Sauceda was abducted, raped, and strangled in 1994. Her skull was crushed with a rock and her nude body was left with a stick protruding from it on a dirt road in San Antonio, Texas.

Fifteen years ago, Humberto Leal, a Mexican national, was convicted of the grisly murder and sentenced to death by a Texas jury. Tomorrow, he is to be executed in Texas.

But the Mexican government and the administration say that Texas violated an international treaty and should

have allowed Leal to see a Mexican consulate when he was arrested. So the administration has asked the Supreme Court to stop the execution.

However, the Supreme Court has already ruled that States are not bound by such international treaties unless Congress intervenes. Our Federal Government ought to have as much concern and compassion for murder victims as it does for their foreign killers or Mexico's feelings about the death penalty.

Justice should not be denied for Adria Sauceda.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPORT THE REPUBLICAN ENERGY BILLS

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today we asked President Obama, through his virtual town hall, why he won't support the energy bills that have been passed in this House. We also asked President Obama why his administration is keeping American offshore energy resources off-limits.

An example of those bills that were passed by this House are three that came out of the Natural Resources Committee that would have created 1.2 million jobs. President Obama won't support those.

The sad truth is that we already know the answers to these questions, because the administration has made it clear that they want to export American jobs and invest in other countries' resources rather than developing our own. Republicans want to help our economy by creating jobs and creating energy independence, but liberals in Congress are standing in the way.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider all the good Republican energy bills would do for jobs, our economy, and our gas tanks. It is imperative that the Senate signs these bills and the President signs them into law.

ENERGY CREATES JOBS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, right now the President is hosting his first ever Twitter town hall to gather input from concerned Americans.

Here's some input from some concerned West Virginians: People are having to choose whether to buy groceries or gas as energy prices skyrocket and the economy continues to remain slow and unrecovered. If West Virginians are wondering about one thing, it's why the President isn't doing more to lower energy costs and get our economy back on track.

America is truly blessed to have an abundant supply of natural resources. But instead of tapping into these rich minerals, the President has approved extreme regulations that are killing jobs and are hurting our economy.

Frankly, I am stunned as to why the President hasn't connected that a good, solid jobs plan is a good, solid energy plan. Just last month, AEP announced it will shut down five plants in West Virginia and Ohio, costing jobs and payrolls, and will raise electricity 10 to 15 percent. According to AEP, this is a direct response to new and burdensome regulations levied by the EPA within the last year.

It's time to take advantage of the resources found right here in America. Doing so will launch our economy in the right direction and create thousands of good-paying jobs.

ENERGY

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has moved our country backwards in terms of energy production.

The de facto moratorium on offshore drilling is causing a significant decline in American energy production. When President Obama took office, these offshore areas were open to drilling and production. Since that time, President Obama has taken steps to effectively reimpose an offshore drilling ban.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of common sense. Failure to develop our offshore energy resources is increasing our dependence on foreign sources of oil and denying much-needed revenue to help pay down the national debt. But, most importantly, it is costing us American jobs.

We have an abundant supply of natural resources off of our shores. Common sense dictates the use of our own resources to meet our energy needs.

I cosponsored and voted in favor of H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act. Not surprisingly, the Senate has failed to consider this bill.

We will continue to push for access to our energy resources.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 1, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 1, 2011 at 11:50 a.m.:

Appointments:

United States-China Interparliamentary Group.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam 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. 2219.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 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. 2219.

□ 1427

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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 23, 2011, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2219

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, 2012, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty, (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for

members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $43,859,709,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $27,141,334,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $13,480,436,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $28,264,646,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $4,333,507,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,948,544,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $645,422,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,711,653,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,607,345,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,099,629,000.

TITLE II
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $12,478,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $34,581,321,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $14,804,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $39,385,685,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $6,036,996,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,699,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $36,065,107,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $30,682,265,000: *Provided*, That not more than $47,026,000 may be used for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund authorized under section 166a of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $36,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $34,311,000 shall be made available for the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available for centers defined in 10 U.S.C. 2411(1)(D): *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: *Provided further*, That $8,420,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. First, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member DICKS, and their staffs for coordinating with my office on this amendment and for their work to address operational energy challenges faced by DOD.

According to the Department of Defense, operational energy represented 74 percent of the military's energy costs in 2010; and despite a 9 percent reduction in energy use, costs increased by 19.7 percent. Air conditioning alone for American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan cost $20 million each year. Last year's bill to heat, cool, and light 539,000 DOD buildings represented at least $4 billion in direct costs to taxpayers.

More than 3,000 American warfighters and contractors have been killed in the line of duty while moving or defending fuel convoys. We cannot continue sacrificing American lives as a result of failing to improve energy use by our military.

Included in the bill is a targeted investment of $82 million for Marine Corps expeditionary energy equipment to prevent our marines from carrying more than 13 million pounds of gear and will help taxpayers avoid nearly $40 billion in annual energy-related costs.

Thank you, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS, for including this funding in the bill. This bipartisan amendment would complement that investment in operational energy by increasing funding for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, known as SERDP, from 56.4 to 66.4 million, which matches both the President's budget request and the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act recently passed on a strong bipartisan vote.

I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. HINCHEY of New York. As members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, respectively, they have been leaders in the efforts to improve our energy security. And I appreciate the bipartisan support of this amendment.

Unfortunately, without the funding that this amendment would provide, the Pentagon would be forced to delay or cancel several strategic environmental programs. For example, this funding would support the joint sensitive technology and munitions program which develops alternatives to TNT. These alternatives are less toxic and have lower cleanup costs. The amendment also supports sustainable wastewater treatment technology for forward-operating bases in combat zones. The purpose of this program is not to protect the environment near the bases but to reduce water and fuel consumption associated with waste treatment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will also help our military adapt to climate change. In Virginia, the Norfolk Naval Base is located at sea level. We are largely witnessing rising water levels already in the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Ocean. This amendment simply provides funding equivalent to that which was authorized already by the House Armed Services Committee and by the full House and recommended by the President.

I do not believe we should risk delaying or canceling these critical defense programs, and I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would realign 10 million from defense-wide accounts to support additional work within the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. The program was established in 1990 and is jointly planned and executed by the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other Federal agencies and industry.

The program improves DOD mission readiness and environmental performance by providing new scientific knowledge and cost-effective technologies in the areas of environmental restoration, munitions response, resource conservation, and weapons systems and platforms.

SERDP enhances military operations, improves military systems' effectiveness, enhances military training and readiness, sustains DOD's training and test ranges and installation infrastructure, and helps ensure the safety and welfare of military personnel and their dependents by eliminating or reducing the generation of pollution and use of hazardous materials and reducing the cost of remedial actions.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would offer $10 million to restore a cut that the committee had already made in the operation and maintenance, defense-wide account. Actually, the Defense Department offered this up when we were looking to achieve $9 billion in savings to reach our allocation. This is one of the areas where the Defense Department indicated that there was no problem with taking a cut. You will hear me discussing this throughout the day and evening as long as we're dealing with this bill.

We had to come up with $9 billion in reductions from the President's request. This is a part of where we found the $9 billion. And since the Department did not have any objection to this, in fact, offered this up as a possible way of helping with the savings, I must oppose this amendment and ask that the Members do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $216,556,400)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $216,556,400)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the operating budget of the Office of the Defense Secretary by 10 percent, moving roughly $217 million to the spending reduction account.

I have spent a considerable amount of time here on the floor of the House during this appropriations process working hard to find spending cuts across every level of the Federal Government and across nearly every agency.

The Office of the Secretary has roughly $2.1 billion included in this bill for its operation for this fiscal year, which is four times the combined operating budget of the Secretaries in our three previous fiscal year 12 appropriations bills.

□ 1440

I understand the challenges that the Secretary of Defense faces on a daily basis and the enormity of the department he is tasked with overseeing, but even the Department of Defense must do its part to reduce the deficit. I urge support of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in very strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The decrease appears to be directed at funding provided in operation and maintenance defense-wide for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The operation and maintenance defense-wide account received a thorough review during the committee process

and has already been reduced by $258 million from the budget request.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense account has similarly been reduced by $36.4 million based on a detailed review of specific programs within this account. Adjustments have been made to duplicative efforts and to programs that were poorly justified.

Further reductions risk harm to operations in the defense-wide account such as special operations activities; education programs like the National Defense University and the Defense Acquisition University; and organizations that perform basic operational functions like finance and human resources.

I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Actually, this just cuts the money, 10 percent, out of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It doesn't go into cutting Special Ops or other funds that the gentleman from Washington, my good friend, Mr. DICKS, was talking about. It just cuts 10 percent out of the Secretary's operating budget.

I just wanted to clear that up. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. Unfortunately, that is not the way the gentleman wrote his amendment; so I would stand with my provision which says further reductions risk harm to operations in the defense-wide account.

So if you take 10 percent out of the account, it is going to affect Special Operations activities; education programs like the National Defense University, Defense Acquisition University—and Lord knows, we need help in acquisition; and organizations that perform basic operational functions like finance and human resources. I stand by my statement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so reluctantly because I know my good friend is very sincere about this. However, Mr. DICKS has spoken the position established by the subcommittee very well, and I endorse the comments that Mr. DICKS made and rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. CAPPS, who were unable to arrange flight schedules to get back here for this consideration.

Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendment would increase funding for the Environmental Security Technology Certification program by $15 million to match the authorization of the National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House earlier this spring.

According to the Department, facilities energy represented at least $4 billion in direct costs to the taxpayer in fiscal year 2010. The Department is paying to heat, cool, light, and operate 539,000 buildings and structures that hold 2.2 billion square feet.

The Environmental Security Technology Certification program is focused on finding ways to decrease energy demand, develop smart distribution systems, and increase the use of alternative and renewable energy at U.S. military installations.

ESTCP was established in 1995 to promote the deployment of proven innovative technologies to field or production use. The program demonstrations collect cost and performance data for new technologies to help these new technologies overcome the barriers to development. The goals are to identify the most promising new technologies to help DOD improve its environmental remediation, such as unexploded ordnance, cleanup, energy performance, and cost savings.

ESTCP funds projects in five program areas: energy and water; environmental restoration; munitions response; resource conservation and climate change; and weapons systems and platforms. The program uses an energy test bed concept that is focused on finding ways to decrease energy demand, develop smart distribution systems, and increase the use of alternative and renewable energy at military installations worldwide. These projects include energy-efficient lighting, heating, and air conditioning such as daylight harvesting, personalized dimming, combustion control systems, and high-performance cooling technology.

ESTCP is funding initiatives that will make advancements in building control and retrofits such as the advanced building energy management systems and the Zero Energy Housing, which generate 100 percent of their power requirements through on-site renewable and demand reductions.

Another project, the LED street lighting system, will deliver 50 percent energy reductions over existing street light systems at DOD facilities around the United States.

An additional $15 million above the President's budget request will help address the immense challenge our military's facilities' energy requirements represent. The HASC has authorized ESTCP at $45 million, which includes a $15 million increase; and in doing so the authorizers created account number 82A for that purpose.

I appreciate Mr. BLUMENAUER's work on energy security issues, including this amendment; and I ask for its favorable consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would redistribute $15 million of Army operation and maintenance account funding in order to finance the Energy Security and Technical Certification program. The program is not authorized. It was added by the House Armed Services Committee, but the defense authorization bill is not law. This program currently is not authorized; and because of that, the amendment had to be written in such a way, as just a straight increase or decrease, without actually mentioning the actual program, to avoid being out of order.

Further, the Army operation and maintenance account is funded at over $34.5 billion. Should this project remain in the final authorization bill and the Department concurs that it is a high enough priority, then there are more than enough funds for the Department to execute the program.

Unfortunately, however, I don't have the ability to make that determination for the Department on the floor. And because of these and other objections, I must oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Regrettably, I have to oppose this amendment. My good friend from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, is one of our most thoughtful Members and has been a leader on environmental issues. But in this case, we have already doubled the funding for this. I think this is unnecessary at this time. We have to constrain spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,600,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,600,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,600,000)''.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, today, along with the support of my colleague, Representative ESHOO, I am offering this amendment to help an estimated 250,000 ailing veterans of the first gulf war, over one-third of those who served. It will bring the modest budget for the Gulf War Illness Research program within the congressionally directed Medical Research program in line with that of its peer programs, to $10 million.

□ 1450

Too many veterans of the first gulf war suffer from persistent symptoms, such as chronic headache, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, unexplained fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medical or psychiatric diagnoses. Research shows that, as these brave soldiers age, they are at double the risk for ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease, as are their non-deployed peers. There may also be connections to multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for the lifelong pain these veterans endure.

In a new landmark report, the Institute of Medicine has recognized that and has called for a major national research effort to identify treatments. The scientific community has responded with a dramatic increase in the quality and quantity of proposals that are submitted to the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, otherwise known as CDMRP.

In the FY12 Defense appropriations bill, CDMRP programs, with direct relevance to current forces, received a 25 percent increase. The research conducted by the Gulf War Veterans Illnesses Research program is vital not only for ill gulf war veterans but also for other U.S. military forces. As summarized by the IOM committee chair on the topic, Dr. Stephen Hauser, gulf war illnesses research is ''vital to the health and effectiveness of current and future military forces in addition to gulf war veterans.''

Most encouraging, CDMRP-funded researchers have completed the first successful pilot study of a medication to treat one of the major symptoms of gulf war illness. Just last month, a report was released on the first successful medication treatment study in the history of gulf war illness research. The study showed that the low-cost supplement, CoQ10, produced significant improvement in one of the most serious symptoms of gulf war illness, fatigue with exertion, as well as improvements in nearly every other symptom. It is not a cure, and the study needs to be replicated in a larger group; but the result is extremely encouraging. The next step is for clinical trials, which will only be funded by the CDMRP.

The amendment's offset comes from the Pentagon channel, which is costly—over $29 million in the past 3 fiscal years. It's redundant. There are eight other Armed Forces Network Television services which provide news, entertainment, lifestyle, documentary, and religious programming to servicemembers and their families across the globe, and it doesn't provide a vital service; but this research is critical to our troops in the field now as well as to those who will be fighting in the future.

According to the VA's Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, the known causes of gulf war illness are from exposures incurred in Iraq, like certain pesticides, or are from exposures incurred before deployment, like pyridostigmine bromide, which is a drug taken as an antidote to the nerve gas sarin. There is also some evidence of a link between gulf war illness and a low-level exposure to nerve agents, a close proximity to oil well fires, the receipt of multiple vaccines, and combinations of gulf war exposures.

Current forces in Iraq and Afghanistan can still incur each of these exposures. That is why the chair of the IOM committee's report on gulf war illnesses said: ''This IOM report makes findings and recommendations vital to the health and effectiveness of current and future U.S. military forces in addition to gulf war veterans.''

This is a time for us to say thank you to those who have served, to say that we understand the suffering that gulf war veterans have had with this illness and that we are dedicated to finding higher levels of research to make sure that we can relieve their suffering.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Gulf War Illness Program is an important medical research area, the program to which Mr. KUCINICH speaks; but this bill already contains $6.4 million for the program. In addition, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill has already included an additional $15 million for the program.

The committee has been extremely careful to guarantee that medical research programs are funded at the level at which they can be adequately dealt with as far as the medical researchers are concerned. But in the days of having to reduce our budget by $9 billion, we believe that we have already adequately funded this program at $6.4 million, in addition to the $15 million added by the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs. Therefore, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I have followed this issue closely ever since the gulf war, and I feel that the gentleman has made a very compelling case. I think we should add this money, and the offset is acceptable. So I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Kucinich amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $650,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to express my appreciation to Mr. YOUNG, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and to Mr. DICKS, who is the ranking member, for their long years of service.

To my colleagues, good news today: the announcement came that the President of the United States would send the same sympathy letter to families of those soldiers who committed suicide in battle as of those who had fallen in different ways in battle. The reason that is good news is, in a sentence I am reminded of, the President and his office indicated that they did not want to stigmatize the mental health concerns of our soldiers.

I want to pay tribute to the Defense appropriations committee for its work on post-traumatic stress disorder and

to make note of our late friend, Congressman John Murtha, who worked with Houston on establishing a new post-traumatic stress disorder center. I am grateful for that because, as in all of our States, many of us are facing a large numbers of returning soldiers from both Iraq and Afghanistan.

So I ask for my amendment to be supported to increase research and development funding for post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, which affects our men and women who serve selflessly and bravely in our Nation's armed services. My amendment would increase research and development funds for PTSD and TBI by $500,000. It will be offset by reducing general operations and maintenance and activities of the Department of Defense.

□ 1500

I believe this is critical in ensuring our country's military strength as we move toward the 21st century.

We obviously were aware of post-traumatic stress for those who follow the military in all of our wars. We've seen it every day by our Vietnam soldiers, those who came home without welcome. We see it in the numbers of homeless soldiers, many of them Vietnam vets.

Over the years, members of the military and veterans have seen a drastic increase in the number of cases of PTSD and TBI. PTSD cases in the military have risen from 1,614 total cases in 2000 to 88,719 total cases in 2010. Additionally, it is reported that 17 percent of all active duty soldiers, 25 percent of reserve soldiers, and 19 percent of Vietnam veterans suffer from PTSD. Traumatic brain injuries in the military have increased from 10,963 total cases in 2000 to 178,876 total cases in 2010.

We know that the kinds of explosives that are now used in war cause greater damage, or more damage, or damage of this kind to our soldiers. Also, in May of this year, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that the Department of Veterans Affairs' treatment of mentally ill veterans is so inadequate it is unconstitutional. We are grateful for the work that has been done, but this court said many veterans with severe depression or post-traumatic stress disorder are forced to wait weeks for mental health referrals and are given no opportunity to request or demonstrate their need for expedited care. This is simply unacceptable. The courageous men and women of the Armed Forces brave IED attacks, injury, and horrific violence to protect the safety and security of the United States.

I was listening to a soldier on the television speak about his injuries and then he mentioned the fact that a soldier in front of him, his comrade, his friend, stepped on the IED, but the vast damage was to all of those who were around him. And so we know the collateral damage is as severe as it might be in any other form of mass war.

We see the loss of life, but we see the injuries remaining. We must in turn care for them, and when they return home we must make it a priority—as I know this committee has done—to increase the resources. Members of Congress may disagree when it comes to the level of commitment and resources of the United States to foreign wars and conflicts, however we must not allow these debates and discussions to cause us to fail to properly care for these brave soldiers when they return home or when they are injured. I believe in Congress and its wisdom, and I believe it is committed to taking care of our warriors.

As the members of the military return to their homes and their families, they come without the desire for glory or appreciation. But whenever you talk to a vet, they are looking to make sure that they have the care that they need. Increasing the amount of resources, however small this amendment offers, helps in finding ways to prevent and better treat post-traumatic stress disorder and TBI, and is the first step that Congress can add to the work that is already being done. Access to post-traumatic stress disorder treatment is especially important since veterans living in areas that are outside of some of our largest centers are less likely to be diagnosed.

We should not wait. I believe we are of good mind and good will when it comes to our soldiers. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, today I rise to ask for support of my amendment to increase research and development funding for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, and Traumatic Brain Injury, TBI, that affects our men and women who serve selflessly and bravely in our Nation's Armed Services. My amendment will increase research and development funds for PTSD and TBI by $500,000, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenances and activities of the Department of Defense. I believe this is critical to ensuring our country's military strength as we move forward into the 21st century.

Also in May of this year, a three judge panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the Department of Veterans Affairs' treatment of mentally ill veterans is so inadequate, it is unconstitutional. The decision said, "many veterans with severe depression or post-traumatic stress disorder are forced to wait weeks for mental health referrals and are given no opportunity to request or demonstrate their need for expedited care."

This is simply unacceptable.

The courageous men and women of the Armed Forces brave IEDs, attacks, injury, and horrific violence to protect the safety and security of the United States, and we must, in turn, care for them when they return home. We must make this a priority and increase the resources available to help prevent and treat PTSD and TBI.

Members of Congress may disagree when it comes to the level of commitment and resources of the United States to foreign wars and conflicts. However, we must not allow those debates and discussions to cause us to fail to properly care for these brave soldiers when they return home or when they are injured. Congress must separate the war from the warrior, and Congress should never fail to care for our warriors.

As the members of the military return to their homes and their families, they do not come home seeking glory or appreciation, but no soldier should have to come home to inadequate treatment or care for the injuries they sustained protecting the freedom of all Americans.

Increasing the amount of resources specializing finding ways to prevent and better treat post-traumatic stress disorder and TBI is the first step Congress can take to providing veterans with the services they need. Access to post-traumatic stress disorder treatment is especially important since veterans living in such areas are less likely to be diagnosed and treated for post-traumatic stress disorder.

America shouldn't wait until soldiers with these injuries are discharged to begin treatment. The Department of Defense needs to spend more resources on how to detect and treat PTSD and TBI earlier.

These soldiers need to be certain that Members of Congress will ensure that they receive the necessary treatment to guarantee that their adjustment back into society is a successful one. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment to ensure no solider is left behind.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this is a tremendously important issue. Traumatic brain injury is something that we don't even know what the needs are going to be in the future.

Our warriors are coming home wounded, yet full of high spirit, morale, and wishing to go back to the fight if they were medically able. Some of our warriors today don't even know that they have or will be exposed to having traumatic brain injury in the future. It is something we just don't know the answer to.

We also know that the medical professionals tell us that they cannot use money just to spend it, but they have to use it effectively, and they have to use it where it has produced results. In view of this, I think it is important to guarantee that we have an adequate source of funding for this medical research and the treatment of these wounded warriors who suffer with this affliction. And so in view of that, I rise in support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would just point out that the committee has added $125 million this year and $454 million over the last several years, going back to when Mr. Murtha

and I were chairmen. So we completely concur that this is an important issue. The gentlelady has made a very compelling case. I rise in support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am a physician, and I represent Fort Gordon, Georgia. We have a tremendous amount of soldiers as well as vets from the Vietnam area with post-traumatic stress disorder. I am also in the Navy reserve. I was seeing patients earlier today, and I saw a lady who was a sailor, who was an intelligence sailor in Afghanistan. She is suffering from PTSD and all the problems associated with that.

At Fort Gordon, Georgia, we are trying to expand the facilities there to treat PTSD, to do the research and development—that's a teaching hospital as well as a hospital that cares for soldiers. So I applaud my friend from Houston's amendment here. It is certainly an extremely important issue that we are going to face. We are going to face this issue for the next five, six, seven decades as a Nation. We cannot put as much emphasis as this issue is going to demand over the next few decades even. So it's actually an extremely important amendment. I congratulate Ms. JACKSON LEE on this amendment, and I rise in support of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $600,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I want to take a moment, since I have just followed my amendment, to thank Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DICKS for seeing an expanded category of individuals suffering from PTSD and accepting my amendment and working with us. I want to thank Dr. BROUN for his service and for his direct view of what happens to great Americans, soldiers who have sacrificed and they cannot function because of PTSD. So I am grateful for that.

And the reason why I say that, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS, is because many people don't realize the work that the Defense Appropriations and the Pentagon does on a number of health issues. One of them happens to be cancer. I have heard in coffee clutches or around dinner tables that cancer is an epidemic. It seems appropriate for the Defense Department, which has been at the cutting edge of technology over the years, such as the Internet—can be in the lead.

So I intend to offer an amendment that I would like to discuss with Mr. YOUNG and Mr. DICKS, but I intend to withdraw. But it is very important. This amendment would increase funding under title 6, Defense Health Programs, by $500,000 in order to fund research related to triple negative breast cancer, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenance and activities at the Department of Defense.

□ 1510

I am hoping my colleagues will work with me on this, and I hope they will be reminded of a young woman by the name of Yolanda Evette Williams, who was an outstanding medical professional who fought against this triple-negative strain of cancer and left behind a husband, a mother, and two children. It is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer ''an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates.''

I offer this amendment to increase funding for research, not to take away moneys from others, but I would certainly like to, out of this discussion, have this kind of cancer looked upon as we are doing our research to develop a targeted treatment for the triple-negative breast cancer strain. Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods such as hormone- and gene-based strains have higher survival rates than the triple-negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Just to say a word about Yolanda, she was a dedicated member of the Good Hope Baptist Church. She was a graduate of Texas Southern University. She received a number of degrees. She was a member of the Jack and Jill. Her mother was a medical professional, Dr. Lois Moore. She was a chief clinical officer for the Atrium Medical Center Hospital in Stafford, Texas, having a long history, even though she was very young, of her commitment as a nurse to medical care. This young woman did not have a chance because of this enormous strain that does not have a high survival rate. It is treatment, is hormone- and gene-based strains, and it has, as I said, a difficult time of survival.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the sincerity and the gentlelady's commitment to these programs. I have been a supporter of these programs over the years. Triple-negative breast cancer is a very, very aggressive and difficult type of cancer. As the Department goes through its work, peer-reviewed research, we will bring this up next year in our hearings and ask them what they're doing about this.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I appreciate it.

Let me just say, breast cancer accounts for one in four cancer diagnoses among women. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2011, more than 26,000 African American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and another 6,000 will die. This impacts all women, of all backgrounds, and my interest is to make sure that every subset has a seat at the table, Chairman YOUNG, so that no matter what ethnic background you come from, you will not, in essence, suffer the opportunity for full research.

My amendment was $500,000. It is in tribute to the honor and the leadership and the life of Yolanda Williams. I would like to ask my colleagues here on the Appropriations Committee to allow me to engage with you and to possibly modify, as we go forward, language to just say that this money will be available for difficult strains of cancer so that her life will be honored and that we would be able to move forward.

In conclusion, I would indicate that I had the privilege and honor of paying tribute to Ms. Williams at her homegoing service. I want to offer to her family again, her husband, her children, her mother and all her family members, my deepest sympathy for this valiant American woman. With that, I know that we will work together.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment #67 to H.R. 2219, the "FY2012 Department of Defense Appropriations Act." My amendment would increase funding under Title VI Defense Health Programs by $500,000 in order to fund research related to triple negative breast cancer, and will be offset by reducing the general operations and maintenances and activities of the Department of Defense.

Triple negative breast cancer is a specific strain of breast cancer for which no targeted treatment is available. The American Cancer Society calls this particular strain of breast cancer "an aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates." I offer this amendment to increase funding for research in order to develop a targeted treatment for the triple negative breast cancer strain. Breast cancers with specific, targeted treatment methods, such as hormone and gene based strains, have higher survival rates than the triple negative subtype, highlighting the need for a targeted treatment.

Breast cancer accounts for 1 in 4 cancer diagnoses among women in this country. It is also the most commonly diagnosed cancer among African American women. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2011, more than 26,000 African American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, and another 6,000 will die from the disease.

Between 2002 and 2007, African American women suffered a 39 percent higher death rate from breast cancer than other groups. African American women are also 12 percent less likely to survive five years after a breast cancer diagnosis. One reason for this disparity is that African American women are disproportionally affected by triple negative breast cancer. More than 30 percent of all breast cancer diagnoses in African American are of the triple negative variety. Black women are far more susceptible to this dangerous subtype than white or Hispanic women.

Mr. Chairman, last month, I spoke at a funeral for Yolanda Williams, one of my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Yolanda died from her battle with triple negative breast cancer. Like many other women who are diagnosed with this aggressive strain, she did not respond to treatment. Yolanda, wife and mother of two daughters, was only 44 years old.

This strain of breast cancer is not only more aggressive, it is also harder to detect, and more likely to recur than other types. Because triple negative breast cancer is difficult to detect, it often metastasizes to other parts of the body before diagnosis. Seventy percent of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

Research institutions all over the nation have started to focus on this dangerous strain of breast cancer. In my home city of Houston, Baylor College of Medicine has its best and brightest minds working tirelessly to develop a targeted treatment for the triple negative breast cancer subtype. It is time for the Department of Defense to follow that example and commit additional funding to study the triple negative strain.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting women across the nation from this deadly form of breast cancer by supporting my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,047,033,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,323,134,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $271,443,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $3,310,459,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $6,979,232,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplying and equipping the Air National Guard, as authorized by law; expenses for repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment, including those furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $6,094,380,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $13,861,000, of which not to exceed $5,000 may be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $346,031,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $308,668,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $525,453,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $10,716,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $276,495,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561 of title 10, United States Code), $107,662,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union and, with appropriate authorization by the Department of Defense and Department of State, to countries outside of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $508,219,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $105,501,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $6,487,481,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,464,223,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,178,886,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,952,625,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $9,371,952,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,804,750,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $2,975,749,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $633,048,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long lead time components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $554,798,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,221,314,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,461,361,000;

CVN Refueling (AP), $529,652,000;

DDG-1000, $453,727,000;

DDG-51, $1,978,314,000;

DDG-51 (AP), 100,723,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,755,093,000;

LHA Replacement, $1,999,191,000;

LPD-17, $1,833,444,000;

Joint High Speed Vessel, $185,106,000;

Oceanographic Ships, $89,000,000;

Moored Training Ship (AP), $131,200,000;

Service Craft, $3,863,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $84,076,000;

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $270,639,000; and

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $73,992,000.

In all: $14,725,493,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2016, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other

such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,996,459,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,453,602,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $13,987,613,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $5,689,998,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities, authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $522,565,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $17,260,619,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $5,046,447,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $29,964,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $9,381,166,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

□ 1520

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $25,798,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $25,798,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. This amendment eliminates both the Environmental Quality Technology Research account and the management support set to accompany that research under the Department of Army, sending $25.7 million to the spending reduction account.

Much of the research conducted by the Army is of merit and deserves the funding provided. Without some of these research programs, we would not have many of the technologies that protect our servicemembers and make them more effective soldiers. However, I do not see the need for the Army to conduct research on technologies pertaining to environmental quality. This type of research would be best conducted in the university or in the private sector.

Asking the Army to research something that does not directly coincide with their direct mission is imprudent, and these funds would be better used in reducing the burden of debt on our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The Army's environmental research program develops technologies that support the long-term sustainment of Army training and testing activities by improving the Army's ability to comply with the requirements of Federal, State, and local environmental and health laws and reducing the cost of this compliance.

The program develops technologies to decontaminate or neutralize Army unique hazardous and toxic waste at sites containing waste ammunition, explosives, heavy metals, propellants, chemical munitions, and other organic contaminants. This research concentrates on technology to avoid the potential for future hazardous waste problems by reducing hazardous waste generation through process modification and control, materials recycling, and substitution.

This program also supports military readiness by developing technologies to predict and mitigate range and maneuver constraints associated with current and emerging weapon systems, doctrine, and regulations. This program supports both DOD and environmental stewardship and military requirements. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Army budget documents submitted to the committee during our lengthy hearing process—and they were lengthy—stated that funding in the request for this purpose is to support the long-term sustainment of Army training and testing activities by improving the Army's ability to comply with requirements mandated by Federal, State, and local environmental laws.

In other words, what we're dealing with here is an issue that the military is mandated to comply with by existing law.

We have already—and I said this before, and I'm going to say it again probably numerous times today—we have already reduced the President's budget request for the defense bill for fiscal year 2012 by $9 billion. It wasn't easy. We made a lot of cuts, and I just don't think that we should take this cut. And so I object and I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $22,796,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $22,796,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment zeroes out the HIV research RDT&E funding under the Department of Army, moving $22.7 million to the spending reduction account. Again, here we see research being conducted by a military that does not focus on the core mission of national security.

HIV research is being conducted in my home State of Georgia at the Centers for Disease Control, as well as at the National Institutes of Health. It is this type of duplication the American people have demanded that Congress eliminate.

This may mean agencies and departments coordinating more effectively to share information, but we must all work together, more sufficiently in the name of reduced spending. I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. HIV poses a threat to military personnel in terms of readiness and force protection, and may affect the stability and security of many nation states.

American troops deployed to areas of the world such as sub-Saharan Africa and Asia face an increased risk of exposure to the HIV virus. Targeted research into prevention of infection, treatment, and cures is needed to reduce this threat to U.S. military personnel, protect U.S. military readiness, and decrease treatment costs for the Department of Defense health infrastructure.

The bill provides a total of $24 million above the request, including $8 million in the defense health program and $16 million in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, related to HIV/AIDS research. This funding will enhance efforts to prevent new HIV infections in the military, develop better tests and treatment options for military personnel and health care beneficiaries, and provide for a comprehensive program of research and development on preventive HIV vaccines. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, which would eliminate all of the funds for the Army's military HIV research program.

Since 1986, the military has recognized the HIV epidemic as a threat to U.S. and allied forces worldwide, and this program has evolved to become an important international partner in efforts to combat this disease. With over 33 million infections worldwide, HIV poses a significant threat to our own military who are serving our Nation throughout the world.

Additionally, HIV has been identified as a national security priority in the President's national security strategy since 2002.

□ 1530

Previous funding for the Military HIV Research Program has helped ensure a safe blood supply for our warfighters. More recently, funding has supported the first vaccine clinical trial, which showed a reduction in the risk of HIV infections to humans.

This funding for the Military HIV Research Program will continue to support the development of an HIV vaccine, ensure accurate HIV testing for the Army, track the prevalence of HIV in the military population, and assess the risk of HIV exposure to U.S. and allied forces deployed overseas.

This amendment would eliminate all $22.8 million of funds for this very important Army program, and so I must oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,798,950,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Cobra Judy program.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 18, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $21,714,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $21,714,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the environmental protection research under the Department of the Navy, sending $21.7 million to the spending reduction account. Again, we see research being conducted that is not directly related to the Armed Forces' mission, which could and should be conducted elsewhere.

Currently, the Department of Energy, EPA, Department of the Interior, and NASA are all conducting similar environmental protection research like the Department of Defense. This is yet another example of duplicative programs conducting duplicative research. Instead, let's free up the Navy to research technologies that fulfill their constitutional obligation of providing for the common defense of our Nation and its citizens, while decreasing unnecessary spending.

I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Many environmental laws, regulations, and policies impose restrictions on Navy vessels, aircraft, and facilities that would impede Navy operations if not met. The Navy must be able to conduct its national security mission in compliance with applicable environmental requirements in the U.S. and abroad without compromising performance, safety, or health, while simultaneously minimizing the cost of compliance.

This program develops and evaluates processes, hardware, systems, and operational procedures which allow the Navy to operate in U.S., foreign, and international waters, air, space, and

land areas while complying with environmental laws, regulations, Executive orders, policies, and international agreements. Projects funded in this program support Navy compliance with the Clean Water Act, the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, and numerous others.

I come from an area where the Navy operates very effectively in the State of Washington, and these kinds of onboard waste disposal are absolutely critical; because when you serve on a nuclear submarine, you are out there for many, many days, and you have got to have things onboard ship as well to deal with these kinds of problems.

So I think this is in the best interests of the Navy, and I urge a ''no'' on the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 18, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $9,140,000)''.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $9,140,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate the Navy's funding for NATO research and development and transfer $9.1 million to the Israeli Cooperative Program.

The Secretary of Defense has gone on record stating that, and I quote, ''The NATO alliance has been used by many European nations as a means to subsidize their own defense spending with U.S. taxpayer money.'' I cannot agree more with the Secretary. Many members of NATO refuse to bear their share of the cost and risk.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, we should invest our valuable research dollars in an ally who is more than willing to pull its weight and take the fight to the enemy. The Israeli Cooperative Program is a ballistic missile program comanaged by Israel and the United States that will ensure the capability of our two missile defense programs.

Mr. Chairman, we have never had a greater need for missile defense, not only in this Nation, but in the Middle East with our great ally Israel. We have no greater ally in the Middle East than Israel. And our research programs should reflect our commitment to those allies who stand ready and willing to partner with us to protect our mutual interests. This would strengthen that mutual interest and strengthen that partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. NATO funding in this bill should not be curtailed because the U.S. and the NATO nations are one another's closest partners, and the NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to its formation in 1949. While the alliance must evolve in light of changing world events, there is no other practical option to structure U.S. strategic and security cooperation with our European allies.

For all NATO nations, the alliance allows for security capabilities and a structure to control operations that the allies on their own could not afford to maintain. Active participation in NATO also allows the U.S. to pursue defenses against emerging threats, such as implementation of improved missile defense capabilities. To maintain its commitment to NATO, the U.S. must continue to contribute funding to NATO programs.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

NATO has been a very, very important part of keeping peace in the world. Are there some changes that might be necessary in NATO as we see the world unfold and the world develop differently? Maybe so. But it should not be done in a hit-or-miss, helter-skelter way.

Mr. DICKS and I, as the leaders of the Defense Appropriations Committee, have already had several lengthy meetings on this subject. And we have agreed that following the completion of this fiscal year's Defense appropriations bill, we plan to hold hearings and look thoroughly into what we see as the role of NATO today, tomorrow, and next year. But in the meantime, it's important that we don't do any serious damage to NATO, which is probably one of the most effective international organizations at maintaining peace that we have in the world. So I must object to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1540

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $26,313,196,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $297,023,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $297,023,000)''.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, as you know, to govern is to choose. To write a budget is where governing makes choices.

My amendment raises the question as to whether or not spending $297 million for research in the next generation of fighter is the right choice to make at this time.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. It's not a fighter; it's a bomber.

Mr. WELCH. Bomber, yes.

Mr. DICKS. It's a much different type of airplane.

Mr. WELCH. I misspoke. The gentleman is correct—$297 million for the next generation of bomber. Is that the right choice?

Here's the question: Number one, it may be desirable, but is it affordable? The Office of Management and Budget did not include this as a recommendation in the budget, nor did the President, who is charged more than anyone else in this country with our national defense. We have the right, as a Congress, and the constitutional responsibility to make our own judgments.

Mr. DICKS does a great job at that, as does Mr. YOUNG.

But we have to ask the question as to whether or not, when our Office of Management and Budget, our House Armed Services Committee both say that the current fleet of bombers—bombers, Mr. DICKS—is functioning very well, can we afford at this time $297 million for additional research?

Now, the question is, it may be desirable but is it affordable when we have this horrendous budget squeeze that we know is dividing this Congress because we have to make some very tough choices in the future.

The second question that comes up is whether something that may be desirable comes at a cost that is unacceptable. Now, the Defense budget is large,

unnecessarily so; but it is the one item of spending that has been exempt from cuts.

The Environmental Protection Agency is going to be down 15 percent, NASA down 10 percent. Yet the spending increase in the Pentagon is going to be substantial despite the enormous budget pressures in this ongoing, very serious debate we are having about revenues and taxes that embraces both sides of the aisle.

The third question is if it's necessary, is there some burden on those who have the responsibility of overseeing taxpayer dollars in the Defense budget to poke around and find that $300 million somewhere else in a nearly $700 billion budget?

So those are the questions. It's not a direct assertion that we must suspend forever research on the next generation of bombers, but it is asking those questions in this time: Just because something is desirable, does that make it affordable?

If it's desirable, at what cost does it come and, if it's necessary, are there other places in a $700 billion budget that we can find this $300 million to do research that will allow us to proceed, and that's what this amendment asks. It says tough choices for America have to begin here, and they have to include tough choices within the Pentagon budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in very strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I have to again correct the record here that the President of the United States, OMB and Defense Department requested $197 million.

Our committee held hearings with the Air Force and found, from a lot of dialogue with the three companies that are competing, that we might be able to accelerate this bomber replacement program if we could get an additional $100 million. So the President requested $197 million, and we added $100 million to that because we see that this program is vitally important.

Now, I led the fight many years ago in the House on the B–2 bomber, and my colleagues got very tired of listening to me on this. But we started with that program at 125 bombers, and we wound up with only 20. So we need another stealth bomber, which can reach around the world as we have seen the B–2 do just recently.

This is a very high priority of the Air Force. I mean, next to tankers, the replacement of the bomber and along with the Joint Strike Fighter, are going to be the top priorities for the Air Force. So this would be a catastrophic blow to terminate this program.

And though I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Vermont, I would say that I would stay with the committee, which unanimously supported this program, has always supported modernization of our strategic bombers and our strategic modernization of our submarines, which are two of the major issues that our committee is dealing with.

So, again, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

I have suggested so many times that I would not do anything, produce any bill or support any bill, that negatively affects our soldiers or that negatively our affects readiness.

Well, this bomber is a long time from production because it takes time to develop a new bomber due to the nature of that vehicle. But by the time it gets online, we are going to need the new bomber because the old bombers are going to be old.

Now, without going into all the details that Mr. DICKS did, and he did a very good job of explaining in detail why this new bomber is needed, just let me relate a story that happened to me as a freshman and a member of the Armed Services Committee after a lengthy hearing with the United States Marine Corps.

This very, very distinguished, very powerful-looking marine came to me after the hearing and he said, listen, son—he called me son back in those days—he said, listen, son, we marines will go anywhere to fight any war our country sends us to. We will fight on the beach, we will fight on the sea, we will fight in the hills, we will fight in the jungle. Just promise me that as a Member of Congress you will do everything in your power to make sure that any airplane that flies over the battlefield is an American airplane. You can certainly understand why the troops on the battlefield would want that to be the case, why he would want that bomber flying overhead to be an American, why he would want that fighter flying overhead to be an American, why he would want that strike fighter flying over the battlefield to be an American. It just makes good common sense that if you are going to send troops to war, make sure that the aircraft that fly over the battlefield belong to us and not to the enemy.

And, having said that, I again say I strongly oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1550

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $4,424,00)''.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,424,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nearly identical to the amendment that transfers NATO research to U.S.-Israeli missile defense. This one simply takes the $4.4 million in the Air Force's NATO R&D program and places those funds in the Israeli Cooperative Program for Israel and the United States, who are cooperating to develop a missile defense system that will help them and, as well, help us.

We must stand by Israel now and always. My amendment makes a positive step towards growing our relationship and solidifying security in the Middle East. It will help Israel, but it will help the United States also.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. NATO funding in this bill should not be curtailed because the United States and the NATO nations are one another's closest partners, and the NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to the formation in 1949 during the Truman administration. While the alliance must evolve in light of changing world events, there is no other practical option to structure U.S. strategic and security cooperation with our European allies.

For all NATO nations, the alliance allows for security capabilities and a structure to control operations that the allies on their own could not afford or maintain. Active participation in NATO also allows the U.S. to pursue defenses against emerging threats such as implementation of improved missile defense capabilities.

To maintain its commitment to NATO, the United States must continue its contribution to all aspects of the NATO program, including research and development activities.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I associate my remarks with the ranking member from Washington State in opposing this amendment.

NATO is a strong ally. We have a multiple-year generational commitment to NATO. We do a lot of joint projects, a lot of research and development that is jointly developed, and we need their support and they need our support.

I rise in opposition to Mr. BROUN's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is a very good amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

And while I certainly concur with the words of the distinguished ranking member of the committee and the earlier words of the chairman for how important NATO is, the fact of the matter is that, as Defense Secretary Gates told us a couple of weeks ago, the European members of NATO are not pulling their weight. They're not spending the kind of money that we are spending. They're not spending the kind of money that Israel is spending on their own defense. They're not putting in very much effort at all. We're carrying the burden.

And the fact of the matter is, as we're seeing in Libya where they're running out of ammunition after a couple weeks' fighting with a nothing power, NATO, or at least the European allies, simply aren't spending money. They're relying on us to do it. They ought to get used to spending a little of their own money on this.

The fact of the matter is that Israel is spending 7½ percent of its GDP on the military. She has to because she is the object of the Iranians and others who want to destroy her. And we are getting our money's worth because Israel's technical expertise in antimissile defenses in the Iron Dome, which we are helping with, is feeding back to us.

So switching these funds from NATO to Israel will benefit the United States in terms of antimissile technology; will benefit Israel, which is putting in 7½ percent of GDP; and may give a little more weight to Secretary Gates' words when he says to the European members of NATO that if they want to pull their weight, they ought to start pulling their weight and spending a little more money instead of—I think they're spending under 2 percent of GDP for defense now. And if they want to be allies of the United States, which we need them to be and which they should be, it can't be a one-way alliance.

This amendment will help Israel, will help us, will help the cause of opposing terrorism generally, and send a little message to the European allies: Maybe you ought to start thinking, if you're going to pull your weight in NATO, pull your weight in NATO.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his support of this amendment.

And I will remind Members that Iran is developing short-range, medium-range as well as long-range missile technology, as well as it is developing a nuclear weapon. We have never needed this kind of joint research with the Israelis to help prevent not only a missile attack or further missile attacks on Israel, which they get every day, but we need, for our own defense, to put more money into this instead of supporting NATO.

I think this is extremely important that we plus up this missile defense research for Israel, for our own selves, and I thank the gentleman for supporting the amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, to sum up, this helps the Israelis; it helps the United States; it helps the general security; and it sends the message to the European allies they should start looking into maybe putting some real effort into NATO, which they haven't been doing in recent years, as our Secretary of Defense Gates said recently.

Let's support Secretary of the Department of Defense Gates and let's get them to start making a little effort and send them a little message here.

So I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $19,324,865,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $16,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Basically, I am taking 16 million, not billion, $16 million from a part of the Department of Defense budget, which is called defense-wide appropriations, where there's almost 20 billion. So I'm asking to take roughly .0008, or .08 percent, from this defense-wide appropriations which is used for other than military departments. So it is not even applicable to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, not the military departments, but it is used by the Secretary of Defense for the maintenance, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment. And what I'm doing is taking this $16 million and I'm transferring it to the Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program.

Funding levels, my colleagues, for this program, has gone down dramatically since 2001. Right now, it's funded at $64 million. It was funded in 2001 at 100. It has continually come down and down and down. So I'm not asking to take it up to the 2001 level; I'm just asking to take it up to perhaps what it was in 2005.

□ 1600

I think, without going into all of the details, this is a very wise move because funding levels for this program have continually decreased, yet prostate cancer is the second-leading cause of male cancer-related death in the United States, with an estimated 27,360 casualties just last year. There are no noticeable symptoms in early stages. The use of widespread testing, however, has led to 9 out of 10 cases of early detection. That is why this very paltry amount of $16 million in funding would be better spent for prostate cancer research for our military than abroad.

According to the Prostate Cancer Research Program, the PCRP, active duty males are twice as likely to develop prostate cancer than their civilian counterparts. Research funded by the PCRP advances treatment and procedures for warfighters exposed to chemical weapons, soldiers exposed to chemical agents such as Agent Orange, and those exposed to depleted uranium. Congress has consistently supported funding levels of over $80 million annually for this important cause, yet it is only funded at $64 million.

The PCRP funds innovative high-risk, high-reward research projects supporting basic and clinical research in both the individual and multidisciplinary collaborative group setting. Funding for the PCRP enables research to advance faster and to be better prepared to apply for future funding from the National Institute of Health or to advance clinical trials. Unlike any

other Federal cancer research programs, any other, the PCRP award review panels are made up of the country's top researchers and prostate cancer survivors, together making sure that innovative ideas rapidly benefit all men and families burdened by this disease.

In 2010, the PCRP, along with the Clinical Consortium, helped shepherd two new drugs through clinical trials. Both drugs are designed to prolong a man's life with prostate cancer. These drugs moved through the clinical trials process and have made their way to the bedside of men dying from prostate cancer to extend their lives. This public-private partnership is an incredible way to maximize productivity of government funded and privately funded medical research.

So I ask my colleagues to support my simple amendment to transfer $16 million from defense-wide appropriation, which is other than military which they use presently for maintenance, lease, operational facilities and equipment, and it represents a 0.08 percent reduction of this other military-wide funding.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I include the letter to me regarding the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program from the Prostate Cancer Foundation for the RECORD.

PROSTATE CANCER FOUNDATION,
Santa Monica, CA, July 6, 2011.

Hon. CLIFF STEARNS,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEARNS: Founded in 1993, the Prostate Cancer Foundation (PCF) has raised more than $450 million to fund more than 1,500 prostate cancer research programs at nearly 200 research centers in 12 countries. Our research enterprise aims to improve prostate cancer prevention, diagnosis, and treatment for the more than 16 million men and their families battling prostate cancer worldwide. PCF also serves as a primary source for new standard-of-care and research information.

Prostate cancer poses a substantial public health burden in America. A total of 240,890 new cases of prostate cancer and 33,720 deaths from the disease are anticipated in the United States in 2011, making it the most frequent nondermatologic cancer among U.S. males. A man's lifetime risk of prostate cancer is one in six. Prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in men, exceeded only by lung cancer.

At this time, the Prostate Cancer Foundation would like to express our strong support for increasing the $64 million provided for the Department of Defense's Prostate Cancer Research Program (DoD PCRP) by the fiscal year 2012 Defense Appropriations Act, H.R. 2219 by an additional $16 million. Without this addition, the 20% decrease from the fiscal year 2011 $80 million appropriation would effectively return the DoD PCRP funding level to what it was ten years ago. This decrease will mean that we lose hundreds of thousands of American lives to lethal prostate cancer in the next few years.

In a unique public-private partnership with the Prostate Cancer Foundation, the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program co-sponsors the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Network (PCCTC), which is the world's most comprehensive ''first in man'' phase I/II clinical trials group for prostate cancer composed of 13 Centers of Excellence in genitourinary oncology. The Consortium has helped to bring to market 2 new medicines for men with advanced prostate cancer that were approved by the FDA in 2010–11: namely, XGEVA™ (denosumab)—Amgen Inc. and ZYTIGA™ (abiraterone acetate)—Johnson & Johnson. More than 2,700 patients have had access to 83 clinical trials since 2005 through the Department of Defense's sponsorship of this Consortium.

Since 1997, when the DoD PCRP was initiated, about $1.1 billion has been appropriated by Congress and used to fund more than 2,000 prostate cancer research studies across the U.S. Since 2006, this program has been funded at $80 million per year. The Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program is America's leading undiluted support to find and fund the best prostate cancer research. The research funded by DoD PCRP has led to many dramatic improvements in our Nation's prostate health, from decreases in deaths due to prostate cancer to increased life expectancy for men facing terminal diagnoses.

Today, continued life-saving progress for prostate cancer patients is threatened because of the possibility of decreased funding through the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program. The funding for the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program is not duplicative with funding at the National Cancer Institute. While PCF understands and appreciates the budgetary constraints currently facing our Nation, PCF also believes that advances in prostate cancer research must remain a very high national priority.

Critical funding is needed in order to maintain clinical and translational research that will lead to the development of new cancer therapies and technologies that will help prostate cancer patients. On behalf the Prostate Cancer Foundation, our Board of Directors, and the two million men and their families battling prostate cancer in America, I urge you to restore funding for the Department of Defense Prostate Cancer Research Program at $80 million per year in fiscal year 2012.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN W. SIMONS, MD,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

DAVID H. KOCH,
Chair.

THE PROSTATE CANCER CLINICAL TRIALS CONSORTIUM,
New York, NY, July 5, 2011.

PROSTATE CANCER FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Fourth Street,
Santa Monica, CA.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD: The Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Consortium (PCCTC) is the nation's premier prostate cancer clinical research group, established in 2005 in response to unmet needs identified by physician investigators and prostate cancer advocates. Our infrastructure, jointly supported by the Prostate Cancer Foundation (PCF) and appropriations to the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) budget via the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP), enables the 13 member institutions to capitalize on their scientific and clinical expertise in order to fulfill our singular mission: to design, implement and complete hypothesis-driven early-phase trials of novel agents and combinations that could prolong the lives of men with prostate cancer. Crucial to our capacity to turn scientific discoveries into improved standards of care is the continued sponsorship of the PCCTC's unique approach to multi-institutional clinical research.

A model for successful drug co-development, the PCCTC established an organizational structure that accelerates and streamlines the clinical research process by facilitating collaboration between key stakeholders while centralizing scientific, logistical, and regulatory components of trial management. To keep the pipeline primed with promising novel agents, we select and prioritize clinical development opportunities based on the strength of the science and design highly informative trials incorporating biomarkers to measure medically significant results. Moreover, the diverse array of our expertise including genomics, cancer biology, trial design and biomarker development, uniquely qualifies PCCTC investigators to translate discoveries made from highly innovative prostate cancer research funded by the PCF beginning in the early 1990s into robust clinical programs.

By addressing the barriers to efficient trial activation and completion our centralized management of research activities has affected the progress in prostate cancer research beyond PCCTC member institutions. Notable accomplishments include: since inception, the PCCTC has enrolled over 2700 men—greater than 10% from disproportionately affected populations—to 90 clinical trials, evaluating more than 50 therapeutic strategies; PCCTC designated as the clinical trials group for the NCI-sponsored Specialized Programs of Research Excellence (SPORE) in prostate; nearly 25% of early-phase interventional prostate cancer trials conducted in the U.S. are led by PCCTC investigators; over 85% of PCCTC trials are activated within 1 year; consortium investigators integral to the development of the prostate cancer clinical states model, standard clinical trial endpoints (PCWG2) and Bone Scan Tool for uniform interpreting and reporting of bone scintigraphy data; consortium programs have directly led to phase III testing of eight drugs including MDV3100, tasquinimod, ipilimumab and the FDA-approved drug abiraterone (Zytiga).

Despite the PCCTC's substantial advances, the threat of CDMRP funding cutbacks is of great concern to the consortium and prostate cancer community. With no known substitutes for the public-private partnership between PCF and DOD, early withdrawal of funding will drastically compromise our continued progress. The PCCTC depends on these funds to execute an expanding portfolio of services which foster the unprecedented collaboration between investigators and industry sponsors, strategically positioning us to lead exciting new programs (e.g., XL184 and ARN–509). Before we can implement a business model that would allow us to function independently, these vital resources remain necessary if we are to attract potential sponsors with our built-in advisory boards, expedited regulatory processes, unified contracting and budgeting and our track record of quickly accruing patients to trials at diverse and reputable institutions. However, the most significant impact will be on our ability to impact the lives of men with prostate cancer without the infrastructure to support the high-risk, high-reward projects that have become the hallmark of PCCTC research.

Critical unmet needs in prostate cancer remain. Preserving the PCCTC's distinctive drug development paradigm allows the nation's most talented clinical investigators to fulfill our mission of delivering needed therapies to men with prostate cancer faster by designing and executing hypothesis-driven phase I and phase II trials. Your foresight to strategically support the PCCTC and its investigators from inception of the organization is commendable. These investments

originate in many forms and our gratitude for your confidence and continued support is immense.

Sincerely,

Howard I. Scher, MD; Robert DiPaola, MD; Elisabeth Heath, MD; Michael A. Carducci, MD; George Wilding, MD; Maha H. Hussain, MD, FACP; Daniel George, MD; Celestia Higano, MD, FACP; Walter M. Stadler, MD; Christopher J. Logothetis, MD; Charles Ryan, MD; Tomasz M. Beer, MD; Mary-Ellen Taplin, MD.

10 THINGS EVERYONE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT PROSTATE CANCER

1. 1 in every 6 men will get prostate cancer sometime in his life. It was projected that over 192,000 cases were diagnosed in 2009.

2. The chances of getting prostate cancer are 1 in 3 if you have just one close relative (father, brother) with the disease. The risk is 83% with two close relatives. With three, it's almost a certainty (97%).

3. African-American men are at special risk for the disease, with the highest rate of prostate cancer in the world: 1 in 4 men. African American men are 2.5 times more likely to die from the disease.

4. Prostate cancer is the second-leading cause of male cancer-related death in the United States. An estimated 27,360 men died from prostate cancer last year.

5. There are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages. This is why getting tested is so critical.

6. Every man age 45 or over should resolve to be tested annually. African-American men or those with a family history of the disease should start annual testing at 40.

7. Before early detection through PSA testing, only 1 in 4 prostate cancer cases were found while still in the early stages. With the widespread use of testing, about 9 out of 10 cases are now found early—giving men a fighting chance.

8. Nearly 100% of men diagnosed with prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages are still alive 5 years from diagnosis*. Of men diagnosed in the late stages of the disease, 33.4% survive 5 years*.

9. Testing for prostate cancer involves a simple blood test and a physical exam. It takes about 10 minutes and is covered by health insurance in many states.

10. Obesity is a significant predictor of prostate cancer severity. Men with a body mass index over 32.5 have about ⅓ greater risk of dying from prostate cancer. Research shows high cholesterol levels are strongly associated with advanced prostate cancer.

*Does not include those who died from causes other than prostate cancer.

All prostate cancer statistics are 2009 estimates reported by the American Cancer Society.

UNDERSTANDING PROSTATE CANCER

WHAT IS THE PROSTATE?

The prostate gland is part of the male reproductive system; it produces fluid for semen. The prostate is about the same size and shape as a walnut, and sits in front of the rectum and below the bladder, where it surrounds the urethra that carries urine out from the bladder.

WHAT IS PROSTATE CANCER?

Normally, cells grow and divide in an orderly way. Sometimes this normal process can go wrong. If abnormal cells continue to divide, they can form cancer tumors. Prostate cancer tends to occur in the cells lining the prostate. Its growth is usually slow and supported by male hormones. Prostate cancer cells can spread to other parts of the body.

There are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while it is still in the early stages, which is why testing is so critical. In more advanced stages, symptoms may include difficult or frequent urination, blood in the urine or bone pain.

WHO IS AT RISK?

45 is often considered the age to begin annual prostate cancer testing. Men at higher risk, such as African-American men and those with a family history of prostate cancer, should begin getting tested no later than age 40. All men should start discussing early detection with their doctors at age 40.*

TOOLS FOR EARLY DETECTION

The goal of early detection is to find the disease in its early stages when treatment is most likely to be effective. There are two widely used tests to aid in the early detection of prostate cancer.

Blood Test—PSA. This simple blood test measures the level of protein called prostate-specific antigen (PSA). Normally, PSA is found in the blood at very low levels. Elevated PSA readings can be a sign of prostate cancer; however, PSA levels can be elevated for reasons other than cancer.

Physical Exam—DRE. The digital rectal exam (DRE) is a simple, safe and only slightly uncomfortable physical exam performed by your physician.

These exams are usually done together to increase the accuracy of diagnosis. Although PSA will detect most high-risk cancers, there can be cancers that will be missed by this test and can be detected by the physical exam.

*According to the National Comprehensive Cancer Network.

ZERO, THE PROJECT TO END PROSTATE CANCER,
Washington, DC.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: ZERO—The Project to End Prostate Cancer is the nation's leading prostate cancer organization providing advocacy for increased federal funds for life-saving research, education and free testing. Our goal at ZERO is to create ''Generation ZERO'' the first generation of men free from prostate cancer.

One of the government initiatives that we strongly support is the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program and the Prostate Cancer Research Program. The PCRP strives to conquer prostate cancer by funding medical research that will eliminate death and suffering from the disease. The PCRP labors to reach this goal by funding innovative research with near-term impact, sponsoring multidisciplinary synergistic research, funding translational studies, investing in research on patient survivorship and improving quality of life.

An example of the innovative nature of the PCRP is the Clinical Trials Consortium. To address the significant logistical challenges of multicenter clinical research, the PCRP began support of a clinical trials consortium for rapid Phase I and Phase II clinical trials of promising new treatments for prostate cancer.

Since their first PCRP award in 2005, each site has fulfilled key responsibilities to clinical trails and design and recruitment. Nearly 70 trials with more than 1,800 patients have taken place, leading to potential treatments that will soon be at patients' bedsides. Two recently approved drugs (XGEVA and ZYTIGA) benefited from PCRP funding and the consortium accelerating their approval time by more than 2 years.

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY2012 contains a 20 percent cut to the funding of the PCRP. If enacted, the funding for the PCRP will be cut from $80 to $64 million. This amount would be the lowest amount of funding the program has received since 1999 when Congress allocated $50 million to the PCRP.

ZERO requests that the PCRP funding levels for FY2012 be restored to 2011 levels. Continuing our commitment to prostate cancer research is crucial to the more than 240,800 men that will be diagnosed and the 33,720 who will die from prostate cancer in 2011.

With Sincere Appreciation,

KEVIN S. JOHNSON,
SVP Government Relations and Advocacy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

I have been very much involved in peer-reviewed prostate cancer research in my home State. I have certainly made a commitment to that community to support additional funds. We are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I am so thrilled that the gentleman from Florida has an amendment that I can support. I join with you, and I urge everyone to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEARNS. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Oftentimes, I give him an amendment which he has very little time to look at. Again this happened, but I am very pleased he is supporting my amendment.

With that, obviously I will not call for a vote. I appreciate the appropriators supporting my amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to recognize the gentleman, C.W. ''BILL'' YOUNG, who is a stalwart not only to this Congress but also to the men and women of the United States military, for his hard work in support of not only making

sure our men and women have what they need, but making sure that he stands behind that, making sure that they get money well spent on behalf of the taxpayers.

Also, I would like to thank Chairman HAL ROGERS and certainly the gentleman from Washington (NORM DICKS) for their hard work and dedication and trying to work on traumatic brain injury, known as TBI, and also posttraumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and to thank all three of them, and others in this Congress, for their continued support by increasing funding for TBI and PTSD in this overall bill by $125 million.

While I understand the long-standing practice of the committee for not designating specific TBI funds, my amendment confirms the House's support for this amendment which I have offered many times, and certainly related to TBI in May of this year to the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011.

Mr. DICKS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman explained to me that the $10 million would not be part of the government program, that this would give people with traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, an option to go to the private sector?

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, that is correct. What has previously been in the Defense Armed Services Committee, the policy that would allow men and women of the military who have TBI to be able to take these funds and be able to use them outside of the Department of Defense to what I would call private sector.

Mr. DICKS. What about TRICARE, which is a private company?

Mr. SESSIONS. They could take it where they choose to, not where they are designated to go by the Department of Defense; that would be correct.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. On May 26, 2011, during the NDAA debate, the House unanimously adopted an amendment to create a pilot program administered by the Department of Defense that would begin treating our troops coming back home from theater with TBI and PTSD. Today, Congress has the opportunity to appropriate funds that would be used to treat our active duty and veterans suffering from TBI and PTSD.

My amendment specifically moves $10 million from the more than $19 billion in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Defense Program to increase the defense health program by $10 million. Once again, this money will assist directly these soldiers and others in the military who have TBI-related injuries to be able to go to private sector facilities with the utilization of taxpayer dollars for them to get leading-edge treatments on these issues.

In April 2007, the Department of Veterans Affairs screened veterans who were serving in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 for symptoms associated with TBI. More than 19 percent of these veterans screened positive for TBI symptoms. This is a big issue.

According to the U.S. Army, the number of soldiers leaving active duty service has increased by 64 percent from 2005 to 2009 due to brain health, whether it was TBI, PTSD, or a mental illness. A 2009 Rand study estimates that costs related to depression, PTSD, and TBI in our soldiers ranges from $4 billion to $6.2 billion over a 2-year period of time.

Today, health care providers all over this country are treating brain injury patients with new and innovative treatments with remarkable results. Unfortunately, many of these treatments are not available within military or veteran medical facilities for our heroes that I have previously discussed who are suffering from TBI.

Our troops put themselves on the line every day, and I think they deserve every opportunity to receive this treatment that is available for their recovery. This pilot program created in NDAA will provide for that treatment and recovery.

As has been talked about here on the floor of the House of Representatives, $10 million out of $19 billion should be allocated to this. I appreciate all of my colleagues not only learning more about this issue, also wanting to be a part of how we can help these men and women making groundbreaking treatments for our Nation's veterans and active duty soldiers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1610

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We accept the amendment too.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $191,292,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,575,010,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $1,100,519,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense as authorized by law, $32,317,459,000; of which $30,497,735,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 1 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2013, and of which up to $16,092,272,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $632,518,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,187,206,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount made available under this heading for research, development, test and evaluation, not less than $8,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with United States military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $1,554,422,000, of which $1,147,691,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $103,097,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $30,615,000, for activities on military installations and $72,482,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2013, to assist state and local governments; and $406,731,000 to remain available until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $401,768,000 shall be only for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Program.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for operation and maintenance; for procurement; and for research, development, test and evaluation, $1,208,147,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That $23,000,000 may not be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits an implementation plan for the expansion of prescription drug testing to the congressional defense committees.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $220,634,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, for Staff and Infrastructure: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the intended management and use of the amounts provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the congressional defense committees providing assessments of the evolving threats, individual service requirements to counter the threats, the current strategy for predeployment training of members of the Armed Forces on improvised explosive devices, and details on the execution of the Fund: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $346,919,000, of which $286,919,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; of which $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013, shall be for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $513,700,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $458,225,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $4,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2012: *Provided further*, That transfers among military personnel appropriations shall not be taken into account for purposes of the limitation on the amount of funds that may be transferred under this section.

SEC. 8006. (a) With regard to the list of specific programs, projects, and activities (and the dollar amounts and adjustments to budget activities corresponding to such programs, projects, and activities) contained in the tables titled ''Explanation of Project Level Adjustments'' in the explanatory statement regarding this Act, the obligation and expenditure of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for those programs, projects, and activities for which the amounts appropriated exceed the amounts requested are hereby required by law to be carried out in the manner provided by such tables to the same extent as if the tables were included in the text of this Act.

(b) Amounts specified in the referenced tables described in subsection (a) shall not be treated as subdivisions of appropriations for purposes of section 8005 of this Act: *Provided*, That section 8005 shall apply when transfers of the amounts described in subsection (a) occur between appropriation accounts.

SEC. 8007. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for fiscal year 2012: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by budget activity and program, project, and activity as detailed in the Budget Appendix; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) Notwithstanding section 8005 of this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional defense committees, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8008. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8009. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for a multiyear contract executed after the date of the enactment of this Act unless in the case of any such contract—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to Congress a budget request for full funding of units to be procured through the contract and, in the case of a contract for procurement of aircraft, that includes, for any aircraft unit to be procured through the contract for which procurement funds are requested in that budget request for production beyond advanced procurement activities in the fiscal year covered by the budget, full funding of procurement of such unit in that fiscal year;

(2) cancellation provisions in the contract do not include consideration of recurring manufacturing costs of the contractor associated with the production of unfunded units to be delivered under the contract;

(3) the contract provides that payments to the contractor under the contract shall not be made in advance of incurred costs on funded units; and

(4) the contract does not provide for a price adjustment based on a failure to award a follow-on contract.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for a multiyear procurement contract as follows:

UH-60M/HH-60M and MH-60R/MH-60S Helicopter Airframes; and MH-60R/S Mission Avionics and Common Cockpits.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported as required by section 401(d) of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: *Provided further*, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 2012, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2013.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this section applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8015. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees unless—

(1) the conversion is based on the result of a public-private competition that includes a most efficient and cost effective organization plan developed by such activity or function;

(2) the Competitive Sourcing Official determines that, over all performance periods stated in the solicitation of offers for performance of the activity or function, the cost of performance of the activity or function by a contractor would be less costly to the Department of Defense by an amount that equals or exceeds the lesser of—

(A) 10 percent of the most efficient organization's personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function by Federal employees; or

(B) $10,000,000; and

(3) the contractor does not receive an advantage for a proposal that would reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

(A) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of that activity or function under the contract; or

(B) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than the amount that is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(b)(1) The Department of Defense, without regard to subsection (a) of this section or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, and notwithstanding any administrative regulation, requirement, or policy to the contrary shall have full authority to enter into a contract for the performance of any commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(A) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (section 8503 of title 41, United States Code);

(B) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or

(C) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under at least 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)), or a Native Hawaiian Organization, as defined in section 8(a)(15) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)).

(2) This section shall not apply to depot contracts or contracts for depot maintenance as provided in sections 2469 and 2474 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike Section 8015.

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

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, within the last month, the House has voted to strike problematic and anticompetitive A–76 language from H.R. 2017, the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, and from H.R. 2112, the

Agriculture appropriations bill. The same change and reversal of bad policy should be adopted in this legislation by striking section 8015.

My amendment does just that. As drafted, section 8015 prohibits the Department of Defense from contracting out any function unless it will save a minimum of $10 million or 10 percent of the department's performance costs even if the contractor is less costly overall and can perform the work more efficiently.

Independent studies have found that public-private competitions lower costs by between 10 and 40 percent regardless of whether the competition is won by a private contractor or the government. Rather than stand in the way of public-private competitions, Congress should cut the redtape and make the use of this cost-saving process easier, not harder.

The requirements in section 8015 are largely codified in existing statute. Retaining section 8015 will obstruct and potentially nullify any current efforts to reform the system in ways that improve public-private competitions and bring much needed consistency and reliability to the process.

Instead of complicating the use of competitions that improve service and lower costs, we should be encouraging agencies to find the most efficient way to deliver services. This amendment will send that message by reducing restrictions on the Department of Defense and by making it easier to achieve reforms that will increase the availability of cost-saving competitions throughout the department.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, taxpayer-first amendment to H.R. 2219.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment would repeal section 8015 of the bill, which in various forms has been included in the bill for the past 14 years.

This section requires that, before work is contracted out, the Department of Defense must conduct a formal cost comparison to determine whether privatization would actually save money. The section also provides an exemption to ease contracting with businesses owned by disadvantaged persons, qualified nonprofit entities for disadvantaged persons, or businesses owned by Native Americans. In cases where outsourcing is appropriate, one of the fundamental reasons would be to lower government operating costs.

Requiring the DOD to actually conduct this analysis under the A–76 review is reasonable and should be included in this bill, so I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. I must say we have done these A–76 reviews across the country, and many times we find that the government entity reorganizes itself and can actually do the work at a lesser cost than the private sector.

□ 1620

And the other problem with this whole thing is, once the private sector gets it, the costs go right through the roof.

So you need to have an analysis done after contracting out is done to make sure that you're not getting ripped off. So I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8016. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, the term ''manufactured'' shall include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section, substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8018. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense, herein and hereafter, may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols, or to demilitarize or destroy small arms ammunition or ammunition components that are not otherwise prohibited from commercial sale under Federal law, unless the small arms ammunition or ammunition components are certified by the Secretary of the Army or designee as unserviceable or unsafe for further use.

SEC. 8019. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8020. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $15,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): *Provided*, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code, shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1906 of title 41, United States Code, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part, by any subcontractor or supplier defined in section 1544 of title 25, United States Code, or a small business owned and controlled by an individual or individuals defined under section 4221(9) of title 25, United States Code.

SEC. 8021. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8022. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8023. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $30,945,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $27,838,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counter-drug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $2,190,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $917,000 shall be available from ''Other Procurement, Air Force'' for vehicle procurement.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force should waive reimbursement for any funds used by the Civil Air Patrol for counter-drug activities in support of Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 8024. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development

center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2012 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2012, not more than 5,750 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,125 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to staff years funded in the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Military Intelligence Program (MIP).

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2013 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $125,000,000.

SEC. 8025. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8026. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8027. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or Defense Agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8028. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SUTTON

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 9, insert after the period the following: ''Such report shall also indicate whether such items or parts of such items are available for purchase in the United States.''

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chair, I rise today to shine a light on how America is spending defense dollars.

This week, we will vote on a $530 billion Defense budget. Some of that money will go towards pay for our soldiers; some of that money will go towards ensuring our military families are cared for. But when it comes to buying everything from building materials to fighter jets, as much of that money as possible should go towards buying American. Every dollar we spend on a part or a piece of equipment manufactured overseas when we can easily build it at home is doing our men and women in uniform and our manufacturing base a disservice.

This is a clarifying amendment that will increase transparency within the Department of Defense by having the Department indicate whether parts purchased overseas are available here in the United States.

Taxpayers deserve to know where the Defense dollars are going. They want to see their taxpayer dollars used to purchase quality products and materials produced right here in the United States by American workers; and when that doesn't happen, they want and deserve to know why.

Currently, the Department of Defense is granting tens of thousands of waivers to allow for taxpayer dollars to buy equipment made overseas. If our tax dollars are going to buy a part made overseas, taxpayers deserve to know if that part is available in Michigan or Ohio or anywhere else in the United States. My amendment simply uses the current Department of Defense data and the requirements set forth in this section and adds more transparency by highlighting areas where our government is sending money overseas instead of keeping it at home.

If we are truly to put Americans back to work, we must make sure that Congress is doing everything it can towards that end. This amendment is one small step that we can take right now. This clarifying amendment will only serve to shine a light on taxpayer dollars being invested in the wrong place and show where those funds can be diverted in a way that can make a difference for jobs here at home.

I encourage my colleagues to pass this commonsense clarifying amendment to ensure increased transparency for American taxpayers and encourage our Department of Defense to buy American, because that is what taxpayers want and that is what American workers deserve.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' This amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak to the point of order?

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the point of order. This is simply a clarifying amendment. It clarifies information that is already being gathered in this section.

Since 2007, Congress has mandated that the Department of Defense begin tracking waivers that allow the Department to buy products from overseas. Currently, to qualify for a waiver from the Buy America requirements, the Department of Defense has to comply with one of eight criteria. One of those criteria is proving that there is

no domestic product available. This section of the bill already requires the Department of Defense to report back to Congress on the amount of their purchases from foreign entities and the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived.

My amendment simply uses the current Department of Defense data and the requirements set forth in this section and adds more transparency by highlighting areas where our government is sending money overseas instead of keeping it at home.

□ 1630

As I said, if we are truly to put Americans back to work, we must make sure that Congress is doing everything it can towards that end. It would seem ashamed for this objection to stand to an amendment that just ensures transparency in a section that is already being used to gather information.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to speak to the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order that the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Section 8028 of the bill constitutes legislation. It has been permitted to remain in the bill by way of a waiver of that point of order. Under the precedents, it may be modified by a germane amendment, as long as the amendment does not contain additional legislation.

The amendment modifies the terms of a report required by section 8028(b) of the bill. It requires the inclusion in the report of certain information regarding domestic availability of certain products.

By requiring additional detail in the report, the amendment is not ''merely perfecting'' but, rather, proposes additional legislation. It therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I do so to make this announcement: that there are a number of points of order lying on amendments that we will be considering shortly. It will be my hope that we can reserve the point of order so that the Member propounding the amendment can also have their 5 minutes to explain the amendment. As long as that courtesy is not abused, I will continue to allow that, but if it does appear to be abused, then we will raise the point of order immediately.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2012. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 8029. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8030. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Ellsworth Air Force Base, and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of Nevada, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Minnesota, and Washington. Any such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that the housing units shall be removed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) The Operation Walking Shield Program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

SEC. 8031. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $250,000.

SEC. 8032. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2013 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for advanced research and development acquisition, for agent operations, and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8034. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8035. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $12,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8036. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8037. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to ensure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8038. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to—

(1) field operating agencies funded within the National Intelligence Program; or

(2) an Army field operating agency established to eliminate, mitigate, or counter the effects of improvised explosive devices, and, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, other similar threats.

(3) an Army field operating agency established to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of biometric activities and to integrate common biometric technologies throughout the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8039. The Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, may use funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' to make grants and supplement other Federal funds in accordance with the guidance provided in the explanatory statement regarding this Act.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8040. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

''National Defense Sealift Fund'', 2002/XXXX, $20,444,000;

''National Defense Sealift Fund'', 2003/XXXX, $8,500,000;

''National Defense Sealift Fund'', 2004/XXXX, $6,500,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2010/2012, $90,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', 2011/2013, $55,000,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', 2011/2013, $35,427,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', 2011/2013, $8,612,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', 2011/2015, $110,351,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', 2011/2013, $30,000,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', 2011/2013, $122,500,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force'', 2011/2013, $90,000,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', 2011/2013, $45,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', 2011/2012, $34,771,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', 2011/2012, $105,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' , 2011/2012, $318,000,000.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided may be used for the construction of additional sealift capacity, as described under the heading ''National Defense Sealift Fund'' in Public Law 107–117, Public Law 107–248, and Public Law 108–87, or for the purposes described in section 115 of division H of Public Law 108–199, as amended by section 1017 of division A of Public Law 109–13.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8043. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8044. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2003, level: *Provided*, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

SEC. 8045. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

SEC. 8046. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 103 of title 41, United States Code, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8048. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8049. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following—

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8050. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8051. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): *Provided*, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: *Provided further*, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8053. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8054. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern and at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks area, such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8055. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: *Provided further*, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Intelligence Program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8056. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F–22A advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense may conduct or participate in studies, research, design and other activities to define and develop a future export version of the F–22A that protects classified and sensitive information, technologies and U.S. warfighting capabilities.

SEC. 8057. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8058. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces or police of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8059. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8060. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any new start advanced concept technology demonstration project or joint capability demonstration project may only be obligated 30 days after a report, including a description of the project, the planned acquisition and transition strategy, and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8061. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a classified quarterly report beginning 30 days after enactment of this Act, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Subcommittees on Defense on certain matters as directed in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 8062. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding section 12310(b) of title 10, United States Code, a Reserve who is a member of the National Guard serving on full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, may perform duties in support of the ground-based elements of the National Ballistic Missile Defense System.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a centerfire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (API-T)'', except to an

entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8065. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in section 508(d) of title 32, United States Code, or any other youth, social, or fraternal nonprofit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8066. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: *Provided*, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: *Provided further*, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: *Provided further*, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8067. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $124,493,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into and carry out contracts for the acquisition of real property, construction, personal services, and operations related to projects carrying out the purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That contracts entered into under the authority of this section may provide for such indemnification as the Secretary determines to be necessary: *Provided further*, That projects authorized by this section shall comply with applicable Federal, State, and local law to the maximum extent consistent with the national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8068. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 8069. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $4,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8070. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $235,700,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $110,500,000 shall be for the Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) program, including cruise missile defense research and development under the SRBMD program, of which $15,000,000 shall be for production activities of David Sling Weapon System missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements, consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures, $66,200,000 shall be available for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense architecture, and $59,000,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8071. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command administrative and operational control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: *Provided*, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 2004, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8072. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $73,992,000 shall be available until September 30, 2012, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: *Provided*, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: *Provided further*, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred:

To:

Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2005/2012'': LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $18,627,000.

Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2006/2012'': LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $23,437,000.

Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2012'': LPD-17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $31,928,000.

SEC. 8073. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may exercise the provisions of section 7403(g) of title 38, United States Code, for occupations listed in section 7403(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, as well as the following:

Pharmacists, Audiologists, Psychologists, Social Workers, Othotists/Prosthetists, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists, Rehabilitation Therapists, Respiratory Therapists, Speech Pathologists, Dietitian/Nutritionists, Industrial Hygienists, Psychology Technicians, Social Service Assistants, Practical Nurses, Nursing Assistants, and Dental Hygienists:

(1) The requirements of section 7403(g)(1)(A) of title 38, United States Code, shall apply.

(2) The limitations of section 7403(g)(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, shall not apply.

SEC. 8074. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2012 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

SEC. 8075. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8076. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2013 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: *Provided*, That these documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each contingency operation, for each military service, to include all Active and Reserve components, and for each appropriations account: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for each contingency operation, and programmatic data including, but not limited to, troop strength for each Active and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: *Provided further*, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32 (as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation) for all contingency operations for the budget year and the two preceding fiscal years.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8078. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, he shall make grants in the amounts specified as follows: $20,000,000 to the United Service Organizations and $24,000,000 to the Red Cross.

SEC. 8079. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act:

Provided, That the Air Force shall allow the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron to perform other missions in support of national defense requirements during the non-hurricane season.

SEC. 8080. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for integration of foreign intelligence information unless the information has been lawfully collected and processed during the conduct of authorized foreign intelligence activities: *Provided*, That information pertaining to United States persons shall only be handled in accordance with protections provided in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution as implemented through Executive Order No. 12333.

SEC. 8081. (a) At the time members of reserve components of the Armed Forces are called or ordered to active duty under section 12302(a) of title 10, United States Code, each member shall be notified in writing of the expected period during which the member will be mobilized.

(b) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in any case in which the Secretary determines that it is necessary to do so to respond to a national security emergency or to meet dire operational requirements of the Armed Forces.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8082. The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary changes resulting from inflation, market fluctuations, or rate adjustments for any ship construction program appropriated in law: *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed $100,000,000 under the authority provided by this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not transfer any funds until 30 days after the proposed transfer has been reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate unless a response from the Committees is received sooner: *Provided further*, That any funds transferred pursuant to this section shall retain the same period of availability as when originally appropriated: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8083. For purposes of section 7108 of title 41, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' that is not closed at the time reimbursement is made shall be available to reimburse the Judgment Fund and shall be considered for the same purposes as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in the current fiscal year or any prior fiscal year.

SEC. 8084. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to transfer research and development, acquisition, or other program authority relating to current tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAVs) from the Army.

(b) The Army shall retain responsibility for and operational control of the MQ–1C Sky Warrior Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8085. Up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' may be made available for the Asia Pacific Regional Initiative Program for the purpose of enabling the Pacific Command to execute Theater Security Cooperation activities such as humanitarian assistance, and payment of incremental and personnel costs of training and exercising with foreign security forces: *Provided*, That funds made available for this purpose may be used, notwithstanding any other funding authorities for humanitarian assistance, security assistance or combined exercise expenses: *Provided further*, That funds may not be obligated to provide assistance to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8086. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for research and technology, which shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8087. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior fiscal year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8088. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not more than 35 percent of funds provided in this Act for environmental remediation may be obligated under indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts with a total contract value of $130,000,000 or higher.

SEC. 8089. The Director of National Intelligence shall include the budget exhibits identified in paragraphs (1) and (2) as described in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation with the congressional budget justification books.

(1) For procurement programs requesting more than $10,000,000 in any fiscal year, the P–1, Procurement Program; P–5, Cost Analysis; P–5a, Procurement History and Planning; P–21, Production Schedule; and P–40, Budget Item Justification.

(2) For research, development, test and evaluation projects requesting more than $5,000,000 in any fiscal year, the R–1, RDT&E Program; R–2, RDT&E Budget Item Justification; R–3, RDT&E Project Cost Analysis; and R–4, RDT&E Program Schedule Profile.

SEC. 8090. The Secretary of Defense shall create a major force program category for space for each future-years defense program of the Department of Defense submitted to Congress under section 221 of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2012. The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide overall supervision of the preparation and justification of program recommendations and budget proposals to be included in such major force program category.

SEC. 8091. (a) Not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities pursuant to section 8092 of this Act for fiscal year 2012: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by Expenditure Center, project, and subproject; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this Act shall be available for reprogramming or transfer pursuant to section 8092 of this Act until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing 15 days in advance to the congressional intelligence committees that such reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8092. (a) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1(d)) that—

(1) creates a new program, project, or subproject,

(2) eliminates a program, project, or subproject,

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or subproject,

(4) for which funds have been denied or restricted,

(5) relocates an office or employees, or

(6) reorganizes or renames an office;

unless the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided for the National Intelligence Program in this or any prior appropriations Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds in accordance with section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1(d)) in excess of $1,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that—

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or subprojects,

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or subproject or the number of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress, or

(3) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel costs, which would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or subprojects as approved by Congress;

unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 8093. The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years intelligence program (including associated annexes) reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such future-years intelligence program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 8094. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 8095. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom on a monthly basis in the Cost of War Execution Report as prescribed in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation

Department of Defense Instruction 7000.14, Volume 12, Chapter 23 ''Contingency Operations'', Annex 1, dated September 2005.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8096. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $11,000,000 from each of the appropriations made in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' may be transferred by the military department concerned to its central fund established for Fisher Houses and Suites pursuant to section 2493(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8097. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $22,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this section: *Provided further*, That the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of such transfers pursuant to section pursuant to the reprogramming procedures established in sections 8091 and 8092.

SEC. 8098. Funds appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance may be available for the purpose of making remittances to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund in accordance with the requirements of section 1705 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8099. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

SEC. 8100. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract for an amount in excess of $1,000,000, unless the contractor agrees not to:

(1) enter into any agreement with any of its employees or independent contractors that requires, as a condition of employment, that the employee or independent contractor agree to resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention; or

(2) take any action to enforce any provision of an existing agreement with an employee or independent contractor that mandates that the employee or independent contractor resolve through arbitration any claim under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any tort related to or arising out of sexual assault or harassment, including assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, false imprisonment, or negligent hiring, supervision, or retention.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended for any Federal contract unless the contractor certifies that it requires each covered subcontractor to agree not to enter into, and not to take any action to enforce any provision of, any agreement as described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), with respect to any employee or independent contractor performing work related to such subcontract. For purposes of this subsection, a ''covered subcontractor'' is an entity that has a subcontract in excess of $1,000,000 on a contract subject to subsection (a).

(c) The prohibitions in this section do not apply with respect to a contractor's or subcontractor's agreements with employees or independent contractors that may not be enforced in a court of the United States.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) or (b) to a particular contractor or subcontractor for the purposes of a particular contract or subcontract if the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary personally determines that the waiver is necessary to avoid harm to national security interests of the United States, and that the term of the contract or subcontract is not longer than necessary to avoid such harm. The determination shall set forth with specificity the grounds for the waiver and for the contract or subcontract term selected, and shall state any alternatives considered in lieu of a waiver and the reasons each such alternative would not avoid harm to national security interests of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to Congress, and simultaneously make public, any determination under this subsection not less than 15 business days before the contract or subcontract addressed in the determination may be awarded.

SEC. 8101. (a) PROHIBITION ON CONVERSION OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to begin or announce the competition to award to a contractor or convert to performance by a contractor any functions performed by Federal employees pursuant to a study conducted under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to the award of a function to a contractor or the conversion of a function to performance by a contractor pursuant to a study conducted under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76 once all reporting and certifications required by section 325 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) have been satisfactorily completed.

□ 1650

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8101.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, this month the House has voted twice to strike problematic and anti-competitive A–76 language from H.R. 2112, the Agriculture appropriations bill, and H.R. 2017, the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. The same change and reversal of bad language should be adopted in legislation today by striking this anti-competitive language.

My amendment would strike section 8101 of this legislation, which as drafted prohibits the use of funds in the underlying bill to convert any functions performed by Federal employees to private competition pursuant to a study conducted under OMB Circular A–76.

A–76 cost competitions between the public and private sector bring the best value to the taxpayer. Lifting the current moratorium will reform the way the Department of Defense does business, allowing the flexibility to manage the most effective and efficient cost ways in supporting the mission of the Department of Defense. The role of government should be to govern, not to operate business inside the government.

Currently, the Federal Government employs some 2 million executive branch, nonpostal, full-time, and permanent employees; 850,000 of these employees hold jobs that are commercial in nature. The underlying principle of A–76 is that the government should consider private sector performance of commercial services where appropriate. This notion has been consistently embraced by administrations of both political parties for more than 60 years.

Over the past 2 years, the Obama administration has pushed for an insourcing campaign within DOD. Secretary Gates put a halt on that practice recently due to what Forbes magazine on March 7, 2011, called, and I quote, ''a victim of bad planning and disappointing results.'' Two years of shutting out private competition resulted in zero taxpayer savings.

According to a Small Business Administration study, 71 percent of A–76 goes to small business. This work is important, and must be done well, but should be done also where the taxpayer sees results and the cost benefit. Any time Congress places a restriction on agencies' ability to implement A–76, such action denies opportunity for small business.

Our Nation's unemployment rate stands at 9.1 percent. We must allow the private sector the ability to create jobs without an unfair disadvantage. The A–76 process allows the private sector just this opportunity. If competition is deemed fair, it doesn't matter who wins. As long as both sides are allowed equal opportunity for the job, the taxpayer ultimately wins.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense, taxpayer-first amendment, and to ensure that cost-saving competition is available throughout the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The gentlemen's amendment strikes section 8101 from the bill. This section provides that the Defense Department must certify compliance with a fiscal year 2008 law which requires DOD to provide an inventory of its service contracts, review those contracts, and then integrate those results into the budget process before using the OMB Circular A–76 privatization process. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

This provision is included in the fiscal year 2012 budget request. It requires that DOD exercise responsible stewardship over its contractors by providing an inventory of such contractors, a review of associated contracts, and an explanation of how these contracts are integrated into the budget. The provision requires the Department of Defense to maintain better accountability of the thousands of contractors performing services for the Department every day, and therefore maintain better accountability of funds. Striking this section releases the Department from this responsibility.

And I must tell the gentleman from Texas, who is a good friend, that we had a terrific problem getting the Department of Defense to even be able to tell us how many contractors they have. We had this problem in Iraq, we had this problem in Afghanistan, and we are still struggling. Now they give us a quarterly report of how many contractors and how many contract employees there are.

I have always believed in the A–76 review process. In fact, I had an amendment probably 25 years ago that said after you do A–76, if you contract out to the private company—if they win the competition between the government unit and the private sector—that you have to keep on analyzing what has happened to the cost. And what we found was, as soon as the thing was contracted out, the prices started to go up until we had an auditing process that looked into it. That process was taken out I think in the nineties. So we didn't have this mechanism to ensure that we were getting the best deal. And there were problems associated with pensions. Could you compare government pensions with private sector pensions?

A lot of this was worked out. But the idea of not being accountable, not having these companies, not having the government, the Defense Department know how many service contractors it has and how much. And if we are going to reduce spending, we have got to know that. We have got to understand that. And I hope that we could continue to work on this problem, because the idea that Congress doesn't get the information that is necessary to know how many people we have contracted out to is, I think, ridiculous. And I think Congress has to insist that we get this information.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield, of course.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the gentleman brings up not only very pertinent questions that the gentleman has dealt with throughout his career about how do we effectively utilize taxpayer dollars, but I would like to suggest to you we are talking about commercial activities, mowing grass, painting buildings, lots of other things too, but doing things which are very essential to the upkeep and operation, but that within the Department of Defense the base commander has a good grasp on this.

Those people that are in the architecture group, those people that are in the operations group, they know who they're getting. And they're getting regular people who can come in and do the jobs that are specified, then leave; not have full-time employees that change oil, mow grass, do the painting, do all these things. And not in every location is it advantageous, but in some it is. And we're talking about where they can use it to their advantage. That's where this would be utilized.

So Norm, I'd like to spend a little time with you, but where it's an advantage for the Department, we're giving them the opportunity. That's what this amendment's about.

I thank the gentleman, and I yield back.

Mr. DICKS. I think the A–76 process has been a worthy one. Sometimes the contractor wins, and sometimes the unit of government reorganizes itself, and they compete, and it comes out that the government wins. So I think the A–76 process has worked. I hate to see us get rid of that.

Now, the other thing is, I think the Department has to do a better job of accountability, of being able to report how many civilian employees, how many military employees, how many contractors.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. That is what I am trying to get to. I think the idea that they can submit their budget but not be able to tell us how many contractors there are, how many contract employees there are, is just ridiculous.

Mr. SESSIONS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. If you want to get your grass mowed at a big base, where you have a lot going on, do you care how many employees, or just that you have the guy that's supposed to cut the grass, you hold him accountable even if he has 80 people working for him? That's the point that we're trying to make. You don't have to know how many employees. You have to know that it got done at the right price. We're not doing away with the A–76 process. Your points are well made. The gentleman is dead on, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the gentleman. If we can get a better deal, let's try to get a better deal. If we can do it less expensively, we can do it less expensively.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I am sort of surprised by this amendment. It seems to me that if we want to have control over the contracts in the procurement process, if we want Congress to be able to know what is going on, if we want to be able to save money, which is what we keep talking about, you want the process that we have here.

Perhaps you want an improved process, but you want an inventory. I mean, certainly no one will deny that some, perhaps many, of the private contracts that the Pentagon lets have been wasteful. Many have not been, but certainly an inventory so that Congress can keep a closer eye on it is calculated to reduce the waste, to reduce the wasteful expenditures, to enable us to have better oversight.

So why you would want to change that? And I am given to understand that this provision originated with the Republican Congresses during the Bush administration, and, frankly, it was a good innovation. Congress ought to be able to watch more closely what any government agency that is spending the kind of money the Pentagon is spending, hundreds of billions of dollars, much of it to private contractors—we ought to be able to watch what they're doing, watch what they're doing more closely, keep an eye on it, and be able to rein it in and say, hey, wait a minute, that contract is being well administered but that one isn't; that contract we have a lot of questions about. So why would we want to eliminate that provision that has worked well?

Now, granted, it hasn't worked as well as we have wanted. Granted, we ought to improve it. Perhaps some of you can come up with an amendment with some language that would improve it.

But to get rid of it, to say we don't need that oversight, we don't need that inventory of contracts, let the Pentagon do that in the dark of night, let the Pentagon have their contracts, let their contracts and no one look at it? It seems to me rather unfrugal, rather wasteful, and not calculated to save the taxpayers money. Why would we want to do that? I don't know; so I have to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8102. (a)(1) No National Intelligence Program funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential business management information technology system that is not registered with the Director of National Intelligence. A system shall be considered to be registered with that officer upon the furnishing notice of the system, together with such information concerning the system as the Director of the Business Transformation Office may prescribe.

(2) During the fiscal year 2012 no funds may be obligated or expended for a financial management automated information system, a mixed information system supporting financial and non-financial systems, or a business system improvement of more than $3,000,000, within the intelligence community without the approval of the Business Transformation Investment Review Board.

(b) This section shall not apply to any programmatic or analytic systems or programmatic or analytic system improvements.

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available under this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8104. Within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $132,200,000, shall be available for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Public Law 111–84: *Provided*, That for purposes of section 1704(b), the facility operations funded are operations of the integrated Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility as described by section 706 of Public Law 110–417: *Provided further*, That additional funds may be transferred from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8105. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Directors of the Defense Agencies and Field Activities (in coordination with the appropriate Principal Staff Assistant), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, shall report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days of enactment of this Act their plan for documenting the number of full-time contractor employees (or its equivalent), as required by United States Code title 10, section 2330a.

SEC. 8106. Section 310(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 124 Stat. 1871), as amended by Public Law 112-10, is amended by striking ''2 years'' both places it appears and inserting ''3 years''.

SEC. 8107. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more Senior Executive and General Schedule 15 equivalent employees than are specified in the classified annex: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall select individuals for Senior Executive positions in a manner consistent with all requirements established in statute and all Office of Personnel Management regulations, guidance and procedures governing the appointment of individuals to the Senior Executive Service for other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That the Director of National Intelligence shall certify within 90 days of enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, has revised it selection process for Senior Executive positions to conform with Office of Personnel Management regulations, requirements, and procedures: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2012, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not appoint any individual to a Senior Executive position if that person was not serving in a Senior Executive position in fiscal year 2011 until the Director of National Intelligence has submitted its new policies and procedures to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to pay a retired general or flag officer to serve as a senior mentor advising the Department of Defense unless such retired officer files a Standard Form 278 (or successor form concerning public financial disclosure under part 2634 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations) to the Office of Government Ethics.

SEC. 8109. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8110. Of the amounts appropriated for Military Personnel under title I of the Act, not to exceed 1 percent of each appropriation shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

SEC. 8111. Of the amounts appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $33,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds, to remain available until expended, to assist the civilian population of Guam in response to the military buildup of Guam, to include addressing the need for vehicles and supplies for civilian student transportation, preservation and repository of artifacts unearthed during military construction, and construction of a mental health and substance abuse facility.

SEC. 8112. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to operate more than 1,000 parking spaces provided by the combination spaces provided by the BRAC 133 project and the lease of spaces in the immediate vicinity of the BRAC 133 project.

SEC. 8113. (a) None of the funds provided in this title for Operation and Maintenance may be available for obligation or expenditure to relocate Air Force program offices, or acquisition management functions of major weapons systems, to a central location, or to any location other than the Air Force Material Command site where they are currently located until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force submits the initial report under subsection (b).

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report which includes the following: a listing of all Air Force Material Command functions to be transferred and an identification of the locations where these functions will be transferred from and to; a listing of all Air Force Material Command personnel positions to be transferred and an identification of the locations these positions will be transferred from and to; and the cost benefit analysis and the life-cycle cost analysis underpinning the Secretary of the Air Forces decisions to relocate Air Force Material Command functions and personnel.

SEC. 8114. Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall resume monthly reporting of the numbers of civilian personnel end strength by appropriation account for each and every appropriation account used to finance federal civilian personnel salaries to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8115. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, for an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', to remain available until September 30, 2013. Such funds may be available for the Secretary of the Army to conduct research on alternative energy resources for deployed forces.

SEC. 8116. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the National Intelligence Program or the Military Intelligence Program are available to establish a new federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other nonprofit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense or intelligence FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense or intelligence FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to a National Intelligence Program or Military Intelligence Program from any source during fiscal year 2012 may be used by a defense or intelligence FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the National Intelligence Program or Military Intelligence Program during fiscal year 2012, the total level of funding and staff years of technical effort (staff years) for FFRDCs shall not exceed the allocation included in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

(e) The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall, with the submission of the fiscal year 2013 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each FFRDC during

that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates for the National Intelligence Programs and Military Intelligence Programs: *Provided*, That such information shall be provided in a classified manner.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for National Intelligence Program and Military Intelligence Program FFRDCs is hereby reduced by the amount specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8117. The Secretary of Defense shall study and report to the Congressional Defense Committees the feasibility of using commercially available telecommunications expense management solutions across the Department of Defense by March 1, 2012.

SEC. 8118. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to plan, prepare for, or otherwise take any action to undertake or implement the separation of the National Intelligence Program budget from the Department of Defense budget.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds appropriated in title II in this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance'' may be used for Information Operations/Military Information Support Operations activities.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8120. Upon a determination by the Director of National Intelligence that such action is necessary and in the national interest, the Director may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $1,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act to the intelligence community and the associated Agencies for intelligence functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen intelligence requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That such transfers shall be made only in accordance with sections 8091 and 8092 of the Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2012.

SEC. 8121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, to reflect savings from revised economic assumptions, the total amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by $501,800,000, the total amount appropriated in title III of this Act is hereby reduced by $484,800,000, and the total amount appropriated in title IV of this Act is hereby reduced by $323,500,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionally to each budget activity, activity group, subactivity group, and each program, project, and activity, within each appropriation account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8122. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated $250,000,000, for an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', to be available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall only be available to the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense, or for transfer to the Secretary of Education, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, or supplement other Federal funds to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in order to address capacity or facility condition deficiencies at such schools: *Provided further*, That in making such funds available, the Office of Economic Adjustment or the Secretary of Education shall give priority consideration to those military installations with schools having the most serious capacity or facility condition deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8123. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8124. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) by not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(b) The certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(1) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) maintains effective control over each detention facility in which an individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(3) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) has taken such steps as the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(6) has agreed to share any information with the United States that—

(A) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(B) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies.

(7) has agreed to allow appropriate agencies of the United States to have access to the individual, if requested.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (3), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to the foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such a transfer is in the national security interests of the United States and includes, as part of the certification described in subsection (b) relating to such transfer, the determination of the Secretary under this paragraph.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction. The Secretary shall notify Congress promptly upon issuance of any such order.

(d) For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual who is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(2) The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SEC. 8125. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8126. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available to the Department of Defense under ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' in title II, $1,000,000 shall be available to the Department to commission through a competitive, independent, private sector entity that is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and has recognized credentials and expertise in military affairs, to

conduct a forward-looking, independent assessment of the current and prospective situation on the ground in Afghanistan and Pakistan, its impact on the surrounding region, and its consequences for United States interests. The entity shall examine 4 broad topic areas to include the strategic environment in and around Afghanistan and Pakistan, as well as security, political, and economic and reconstruction developments in those 2 countries.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity described in subsection (a) shall submit to the President and the Congress a report on the assessment conducted under subsection (a), including relevant policy recommendations relating thereto.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the entity described in subsection (a) should be modeled on the Iraq Study Group.

SEC. 8127. Not more than $200,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be expended for military musical units (as defined in section 974 of title 10, United States Code).

□ 1710

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8127 (page 122, lines 6 through 9), relating to military musical units.

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I rise to address an issue that I think is very important to the patriotic men and women who fight and defend our country.

Representative MCCOLLUM, in good graces, asked that we restrict the military band funding by $120 million in an attempt to save money, but the Congressional Budget Office has informed us that this reduction, this $120 million reduction, will not save the American taxpayers one red cent, nor will it reduce the overall DOD spending.

The facts about our bands are that they are an integral part of the patriotism that keeps our soldiers' hearts beating fast. For example, over 10,000 funerals are held per year, and these bands attend these funerals. And many of us, unfortunately, in this body have had to attend military funerals in the past, and they know how much that music means to the parents of the loved ones of our lost heroes.

I have had the real great pleasure of being at welcome home celebrations at Fort Hood, which are very dramatic. The buses pull up at night across the parade ground in the dark, and then the band strikes up military music and out of the dark comes marching our soldiers into the parade ground. And the tears flow. And parents and children of the soldiers and the loved ones of the soldiers, tears come to their eyes. And that music is an integral part of it. The concerts, the ceremonies, the funerals, and the welcome home celebrations are all part of what makes our military the patriotic body that it is.

The individual bands performed as many as 1,200 musical missions during the 12- to 15-month deployments. Military bands also perform at USO and other places. The number of bands right now in the Army is 132 active duty, 51 National Guard, and 17 Reserve; Air Force, 24; the Navy, 14; and the Marines, 14.

And speaking of the Marines, Friday before last I had the first time opportunity to go to the parade at the Marine barracks here in Washington, D.C., and everyone, every red-blooded American should attend that, and every Member of Congress should attend it. And it was my first chance to do it. And that is the most patriotic-striking thing you will ever experience. And to lose something like that will be a tragedy for this country.

The total cost for the bands is $320 million, and 282 million of those dollars is personnel cost. Now, something that many don't understand is these band members that perform, and at least two of the services I'm familiar with, the Army and the Marine Corps, have other duties. Some of them in the Marine Corps are riflemen, just like every marine is a rifleman. In the Army, most of these people work in security or military police. And if the bands were not performing, they would still be in the military. They would still have personnel costs, housing costs, and other things that would be part of the DOD expenses. So this is no extra that we are doing here. These people are still going to be employed by the military, and they're still going have to those costs. So that's why there is no real savings here.

But we are saving something that's important to this country and that is this is what makes patriotic people join the military. This is what causes young men and women to have their hearts beat fast on behalf of their country. And to lose our military bands would be a tragedy. And therefore I am asking that we adopt this amendment and that we replace these funds for these military bands so that we are able to continue this long tradition that goes back to the beginning of our country, to having bands play to celebrate military events.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the gentleman's amendment supports the position of the subcommittee, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. And I do this very reluctantly, but I'm glad that the sponsor of the amendment has arrived, and we will let her talk about this.

Section 8127 limits spending for military bands to $200 million for fiscal year 2012. Now, that is a lot of money and I'm a person who believes in music, believes in our bands. I have been at Fort Lewis out in my part of the country, now Joint Base Lewis-McChord, for many ceremonies. And there's no question about it; the music really does add to the whole event. But we are in a very tough fiscal period here.

During the full committee markup, this was agreed to by a voice vote. The amendment parallels similar language included in section 599(c) in the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012. So we've had the authorization committee look at it, we've had the Appropriations Committee look at it, and I think that we ought to support the position that came out of the full committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Fellow Members, this amendment was adopted by voice in committee, and this amendment was not one that I lightly came up with. At a time when we are cutting back on WIC, which is supplements for children, at a time when we are cutting back on education and health care expenses, I kind of felt I had a duty as an appropriator to look at opportunities in which we could cut back on spending. And so I have come up with a few ideas, and I know that they, at times, haven't been the most popular. But one of them was cutting back on the amount of money we spend on military bands.

And I enjoy military bands. I have listened to a lot of them since birth. But the Army alone has over 100 bands, employing 4,600 professional musicians and support staff. The Air Force and Navy and Marines and the National Guard have dozens of bands with professional musicians we all take great pride in.

Congress needs to conduct oversight on this portion of the budget. It has grown substantially over the years. And I think we need to figure out what is the right note to have with military bands.

So that's why this amendment that I offer that was adopted in full committee did cut, but it also continued to provide $200 million for the Pentagon to continue this fine tradition.

As families and communities across this country see critical services being reduced or eliminated, including music in public education schools all across this country, I think it is time that we ask the Pentagon to make a small sacrifice in its musical budget. And so I would ask the committee to support the original language of the bill and to reject the Carter amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. I will be brief.

First of all, I'm told that the amount in the bill here, $200 million, is essentially the amount that is being spent now; so this is not really a reduction.

□ 1720

Secondly, I just want to add one thing to what the gentlelady from Minnesota said. Over the break we just had, I went to a food pantry operated by a church on Coney Island. There was a line out the door of about 70 or 80 people. They were giving food packets 3 days out of every month; 3 days out of every month, and trying to figure out how to scrounge enough money to give food packets 4 days out of every month. And, of course, we are cutting the budget for Women, Infants and Children. We are cutting the budget for food aid. We are cutting the budget for food stamps. We can maintain the military bands and not expand them. We have to keep this in perspective.

Yes, I love John Philip Sousa. I love military bands. I love marching bands. But people have to eat. And we are being savaged in the budget that we are passing and in the negotiations on the debt ceiling. We are being savaged on things for people to eat.

This seems the least we can do.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I hear what you're saying about these good programs that are being cut and reduced. And if this actually put money in the pockets of those programs, it would be one thing. But the facts are that the cuts that we do here do not change any amount of spending that the DOD does. These people continue to have military jobs, and they continue to get a paycheck.

Mr. NADLER. Reclaiming my time, the limitation in the bill will simply make sure that it doesn't expand. The fact is that with all of the negotiations going on and the debt ceiling and everything else, there is going to be pressure to cut everything. This amendment simply says we can expand here even though we are cutting far more important things. I think the language in the bill is sufficient. The committee did a wise job. I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1730

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 268) reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 268

Whereas the policy of the United States since 2002 has been to support a two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict;

Whereas a true and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the parties and acceptance of each other's right to exist;

Whereas Palestine Liberation Organization Chair Yassir Arafat pledged in a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on September 9, 1993, that ''all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations'' a pledge that served as a critical basis for the Israeli-PLO Declaration of Principles signed 4 days later;

Whereas the unity agreement signed by Fatah and Hamas on May 4, 2011, was reached without Hamas being required to renounce violence, accept Israel's right to exist, and accept prior agreements made by the Palestinians (the ''Quartet conditions'');

Whereas Hamas, an organization responsible for the death of more than 500 innocent civilians, including 24 United States citizens, has been designated by the United States Government as a Foreign Terrorist Organization and a specially designated terrorist organization;

Whereas Hamas kidnapped and has held Israeli sergeant Gilad Shalit in captivity in violation of international norms since June 25, 2006;

Whereas Hamas continues to forcefully reject the possibility of peace with Israel;

Whereas Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has accepted a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and has consistently advocated for immediate direct negotiations with the Palestinians, who, in turn, have prevented negotiations by insisting on unprecedented pre-conditions;

Whereas, on April 22, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton stated, ''We will not deal with nor in any way fund a Palestinian government that includes Hamas unless and until Hamas has renounced violence, recognized Israel and agreed to follow the previous obligations of the Palestinian Authority'';

Whereas United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice, stated on February 18, 2011, that it was ''unwise'' for the United Nations to attempt to resolve key issues between the Israelis and Palestinians;

Whereas Palestinian leaders are pursuing a coordinated strategy to seek recognition of a Palestinian state within the United Nations and directly from foreign governments;

Whereas, on December 15, 2010, the House adopted House Resolution 1765, which reaffirmed that the House of Representatives supports a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states, a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition and opposes any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians;

Whereas current United States law precludes assistance to a Palestinian Authority which shares power with Hamas unless that Authority publicly accepts Israel's right to exist and adheres to all prior agreements and understandings with the United States and Israel;

Whereas the United States annually provides more than $550 million annually and has provided more than $3.5 billion cumulatively in direct bilateral assistance to the Palestinians, who are among the world's largest recipients of foreign aid per capita;

Whereas United States aid to the Palestinians is predicated on a good faith commitment from the Palestinians to the peace process including direct negotiations with Israel;

Whereas Palestinian abandonment of the Quartet conditions and inclusion of Hamas in a government would jeopardize the positive steps the Palestinian Authority has taken in building institutions and improving security in the West Bank in recent years; and

Whereas efforts to form a unity government without accepting the Quartet conditions, to bypass negotiations and unilaterally declare a Palestinian state, or to appeal to the United Nations or other international forums, or directly to foreign governments for recognition of a Palestinian state, violate the underlying principles of the Oslo Accords, the Road Map, and other relevant Middle East peace process agreements, all of which require resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct negotiations only: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its strong support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states, a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition;

(2) states its firm belief that any Palestinian unity government must publicly and formally forswear terrorism, accept Israel's right to exist, and reaffirm previous agreements made with Israel;

(3) reiterates its strong opposition to any attempt to establish or seek recognition of a Palestinian state outside of an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestinians;

(4) urges Palestinian leaders to—

(A) ensure that any Palestinian government will seek peace with Israel;

(B) cease all efforts at circumventing the negotiation process, including through a unilateral declaration of statehood or by seeking recognition of a Palestinian state from other nations or the United Nations;

(C) resume direct negotiations with Israel immediately and without preconditions; and

(D) take appropriate measures to counter incitement to violence and fulfill all prior Palestinian commitments, including dismantling the terrorist infrastructure embodied in Hamas;

(5) supports the Administration's opposition to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and its use of the veto at the United Nations Security Council on February 18, 2011, the most recent example of a longstanding United States policy of vetoing unbalanced United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian peace process;

(6) calls upon the Administration to announce that it will veto any resolution on Palestinian statehood that comes before the United Nations Security Council which is not a result of agreements reached between Israel and the Palestinians;

(7) calls upon the Administration to lead a diplomatic effort to oppose a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and to oppose recognition of a Palestinian state by other nations, within the United Nations, and in other international forums prior to achievement of a final agreement between Israel and the Palestinians;

(8) affirms that Palestinian efforts to circumvent direct negotiations and pursue recognition of statehood prior to agreement with Israel will harm United States-Palestinian relations and will have serious implications for the United States assistance programs for the Palestinians and the Palestinians Authority;

(9) supports the position taken by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton on April 22, 2009, that the United States ''will not deal with or in any way fund a Palestinian government that includes Hamas unless and until Hamas has renounced violence, recognized Israel and agreed to follow the previous obligations of the Palestinian Authority.'';

(10) urges the administration to consider suspending assistance to the Palestinian Authority pending a review of the unity agreement; and

(11) reaffirms the United States statutory requirement precluding assistance to a Palestinian Authority that includes Hamas unless that Authority and all its ministers publicly accept Israel's right to exist and all prior agreements and understandings with the United States and Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 268.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 268, sponsored by Majority Leader CANTOR and Minority Whip HOYER, and would like to thank them for their leadership in bringing this important resolution to the floor today.

We face a perilous juncture in the history of the Middle East. Our adversaries are far from dormant, and are focused on an international effort to isolate and demonize Israel. That is why it is all the more important for the United States to stand by our democratic ally at this critical time. So let's get the facts straight, Madam Speaker.

As even Secretary Clinton noted, this Israeli Government has made unprecedented concessions in pursuit of peace. Israel has always been willing and able to make the tough sacrifices. Israel has proven its commitment to peace. Unfortunately, Israel does not have a partner for peace and security as the Palestinian leadership continues to never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

Abu Mazen can utter all the right words to the Obama administration and the Europeans, who appear gullible enough to believe him; but the problem is, whenever the Palestinian leadership, past and present, has actually been asked to sign a peace agreement with Israel, it has always refused. Abu Mazen also continues to refuse to recognize Israel as a Jewish state, yet demands that Israel recognize a Palestinian state; and the media he controls through the Palestinian Authority publishes a nonstop barrage of anti-Semitic propaganda.

The Palestinian Authority has rejected every offer of peace from Israel. The PA has refused to negotiate directly with Israel. The PA has refused to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. It has failed to crack down on violent extremism and anti-Israel incitement. Indeed, it has even tolerated and encouraged such behavior. It has also supported boycotts of Israeli goods, and the Palestinian Authority Prime Minister, whom some consider to be a moderate, even participated in a mass burning of such goods.

Instead of negotiating directly with Israel, the Palestinian Authority is pursuing unilateral recognition of a Palestinian state, from various foreign governments, with an eye to recognition of such a state by the U.N. this fall. Palestinian leaders also keep threatening violence to extract concessions.

Abu Mazen has not only failed to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, but recently signed a coalition agreement with Hamas, which is committed to Israel's destruction.

To demonstrate that they are true partners for peace, what Palestinian leaders must do is simple, Madam Speaker—the opposite of what they have been doing: sit down and negotiate directly with Israel, without preconditions; encourage Palestinians to accept Israel instead of tolerating and encouraging violent extremism and anti-Israel incitement; and recognize Israel's right to exist as a democratic Jewish state.

We must no longer demand that Israel take actions or make additional unilateral concessions that would compromise our democratic ally's safety and security.

Recent calls for Israel to return to the 1967 borders are unacceptable and dangerous. Continuing to provide assistance to the Palestinians—assistance amounting to $2.5 billion in the last 5 years alone—is certainly not the answer. Congress must not agree to the administration's 2012 budget request, which would provide yet another $400 million bailout to the West Bank and Gaza, including another $200 million directly to the PA.

There are also many other steps that Congress and the administration can and must take to support our ally Israel and to encourage the advancement of peace and security in the region:

The U.S. could show its support for the Jewish state's sovereignty and right to exist by moving our Embassy to Jerusalem, Israel's eternal and undivided capital. We should demand that the United Nations stop its relentless activities to demonize Israel and the Jewish people, and put our money where our mouth is.

The most recent example of this bias is a cartoon posted by Richard Falk, which was apparently taken down just minutes ago. The U.N. Human Rights Council has appointed Mr. Falk as an ''expert'' to investigate and condemn Israel. I'm sure that the viewers could see or they could pull it up on the Internet what this cartoon depicts. It depicts Americans and Jews as bloodthirsty dogs.

This is not the first time that Mr. Falk has spread such venom. He has compared Israel's treatment of the Palestinians to the Holocaust, and has questioned the veracity of the 9/11 attacks, but he continues to work for the U.N. Human Rights Council, with over 20 percent of his expenses and staff support paid for by U.S. taxpayers.

Has the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights ever condemned Falk and demanded that he resign his U.N. post? Never. To the contrary, her office has published an attack by Falk on his critics. I understand that he says now that his account was hacked into and that he has taken that drawing down, but I say enough is enough.

The administration should withdraw from the biased Human Rights Council, and Congress should withhold funding from the council and other U.N. bodies that do not advance our national security interests and condition U.S. contributions on real reforms. What a concept.

Finally, Madam Speaker, instead of dealing directly with the Muslim

Brotherhood, which seeks Israel's destruction and condemned the killing of bin Laden, the U.S. should deny all legitimacy to that group no matter what fake name or label it now uses as it tries to camouflage itself into a legitimate political party in Egypt.

I am glad that this body is doing the right thing today, Madam Speaker. We have much more to do to defend our national security interests and our indispensable ally, Israel.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia, our distinguished majority leader, for authoring this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 268, the Cantor-Hoyer resolution, and I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I believe negotiations are the only path to a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For this reason, the United States Congress has every reason to be concerned about efforts by the Palestinian Authority leadership to attain recognition of statehood while bypassing the accepted negotiation process. These efforts run counter to the Palestinians' own internationally witnessed commitments at the 1991 Madrid Conference and under the 1993 Oslo agreement and the 2003 Roadmap.

That is but one reason I am deeply disappointed by the Palestinian leadership's recent push to seek recognition of an independent state at the United Nations. Indeed, even some Palestinian officials have acknowledged that such U.N. recognition of statehood gives the Palestinians nothing but an empty symbolic victory.

One thing is clear: There will be no recognition of Palestinian statehood by the Security Council, where I feel confident that the United States would use its veto, just as it has in the past, to prevent the passage of an unbalanced, anti-Israel resolution.

And what exactly would the U.N. General Assembly recognition of a Palestinian state do for the Palestinians? Absolutely nothing. It would not solve the Palestinians' need for recognized borders nor would it solve sensitive issues like the status of Jerusalem, water rights, or Palestinian refugees.

□ 1740

It would not enhance their prospect for successful negotiations. In fact, it would be seen by Israel and many others as an act of bad faith, creating yet another obstacle to successful talks.

As President Obama said in May, ''For the Palestinians, efforts to delegitimize Israel will end in failure. Symbolic actions to isolate Israel at the United Nations in September won't create an independent state.'' A glance at recent history shows that he's right. In 1988, Yasser Arafat declared a state and garnered recognition from more than 100 nations. Now, 23 years later, there is still no Palestinian state. The Palestinian people don't want a bunch of declarations of statehood; they want a state—and they should have one through the only means possible for attaining one, negotiations with Israel.

I believe that Palestinian Authority President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad are committed to a peaceful resolution of their conflict with Israel. So I hope they will return to the negotiating table and abandon their flawed U.N. strategy.

The Congress has been very generous in its support of the Palestinian Authority's worthy efforts to build institutions and the economy in the West Bank. In fact, I believe we are the most generous nation in the world in that regard. So I think our Palestinian friends should understand that if they persist in pursuing a unilateralist path, inevitably, and however regrettably, there will be consequences for U.S.-Palestinian relationships.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important pro-negotiations, pro-peace resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to yield 1 minute to our esteemed majority leader and coauthor of this resolution, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlelady, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank the leadership of the gentleman from California as well in support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, we call today on Hamas and the Palestinian Authority to renounce the path they have set in planning to announce statehood in the upcoming United Nations session. By threatening to sidestep the principles of the Oslo Accords, the Palestinian Authority is beginning to dismantle the framework of future peace process agreements.

We have seen the death and destruction that Hamas perpetrated against both Israeli civilians and the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip, yet Hamas refuses to accept responsibility for its actions or rein in terrorists called to strike at the heart of the Israeli people.

Today, we ask and call upon the Palestinian Authority to return to the negotiating table and join the Israelis in direct discussions to end this conflict. Furthermore, we call on the leadership of the Palestinian Authority to renounce the violence Hamas condones and teaches to its followers.

This resolution, Madam Speaker, directs the Palestinian Authority to be responsible actors on the world stage and to return to negotiations. For far too long, the Palestinian Authority has not acted on behalf of its people. Corruption has caused many to discredit its legitimacy. The people of the region deserve an honest broker that accepts and respects the state of Israel.

Israel has stood by America in its fights against extremist ideology. Madam Speaker, we stand by Israel as our most valued ally in a region in need of more who respect freedom of speech and the free assembly of people, a region that, frankly, must follow the example set by Israel in its work in promotion of human progress.

It is time for the Palestinian Authority to accept a peaceful solution to this conflict and teach their children that violence is never the answer to their problems. The Palestinian Authority must understand that peace is only achievable when they are willing to recognize the legitimacy of Israel to exist as a Jewish state. And they must understand that the solution to this conflict will only come through direct negotiations with the Israelis, and not by circumventing the peace process through international parliamentary gimmickry.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. BERMAN for yielding. I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for bringing this resolution to the floor. And I am pleased to join my colleague and friend, Mr. CANTOR, in strong support of this resolution.

I believe there is only one lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a future of two states for two peoples living in security and peace with one another. Such a solution is in the best interests of regional peace and in the best interests of both parties. That is why I strongly believe that ensuring the long-term viability of the Jewish democratic State of Israel also requires supporting a homeland for the Palestinian people.

History teaches us that in conflicts such as this, one peace must be negotiated. It cannot and will not be imposed from outside or else it will rest on an unstable and temporary foundation. That is why I strongly oppose Palestinian efforts to impose a solution to the conflict at the United Nations, as well as Palestinian efforts to unilaterally declare statehood. I am concerned that a unilateral declaration will only encourage both sides to dig in and put a lasting negotiated peace further at risk.

As President Obama said, and as Mr. BERMAN has quoted—and I want to quote a little more of the President's remarks, but I will repeat some of what Mr. BERMAN said because I think it is relevant—I quote the President of the United States: ''For the Palestinians, efforts to delegitimize Israel will end

in failure. Symbolic actions to isolate Israel at the United Nations in September won't create an independent state. Palestinian leaders will not achieve peace or prosperity if Hamas insists on a path of terror and rejection. And Palestinians will never realize their independence by denying the right of Israel to exist.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. I believe the President is absolutely correct. By passing this resolution, the House will make it clear that it agrees that a real peace can only come through negotiations between the two sides. That peace will only last if both sides buy into it. We all know that those negotiations have been and are now relatively nonexistent, and they will be difficult even having been entered into. They will be painful. They will require courage and sacrifice on both sides. But the hard way is also the right way. And if there is to be any hope of peace, as surely all of us pray there is, both sides must return to the table without preconditions.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. And I will continue to urge America's allies to stand against quick, unilateral, and ultimately unstable solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

I thank the gentleman and the chair for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so honored to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is also the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the distinguished chair for yielding. Israel has no greater friend than ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida.

Despite some progress that has been made toward ensuring Israel's continued security, critical challenges still exist. Rejectionist elements within the Palestinian leadership still refuse to sit and negotiate in good faith even as Israel repeatedly expresses its commitment to the establishment of a Palestinian state. These elements spurn Israeli overtures and seek to establish a Palestinian state unilaterally through a vote of the U.N. General Assembly.

Although short-term security may be achievable unilaterally, peace is not. Palestinian rejectionism, whether by Hamas or Fatah, must be abandoned. U.S. taxpayer money should, under no circumstances, go to the Palestinian government, whose members do not all abide by the Three Quartet principles: recognizing the state of Israel's right to exist; renouncing terrorism; and abiding by previous agreements.

□ 1750

And just as the U.S. should not support a Palestinian government whose very composition is anathema to peace, so, too, should it not support an institution that offers an easy alternative to genuine peace through negotiations. That is why I recently introduced a resolution calling on the administration to cut all funding to the U.N. General Assembly should it vote to recognize a Palestinian state in direct defiance of the U.N. Security Council and the U.N. Charter. True Israeli-Palestinian peace will only be made between two peoples, Israelis and Palestinians, and not the 191 other members of the General Assembly.

Israel, like the United States, welcomes those who would make peace even as it fights those who would make war. Time and again, Israel has demonstrated its commitment to a Palestinian state living as its neighbor in peace and security, but there are no shortcuts on the path to this outcome, and there is no getting around the hard concessions that will have to be made. The U.S. must now stand with Israel and against those who would obstruct rather than advance the cause of peace.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which reaffirms support for a solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict reached through negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israelis, and our opposition to any unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood, or recognition of such a declaration by the United Nations.

How can a dispute between two peoples ever be resolved by the unilateral decision of one? The path to peace has been clear for many years, and provided for by Security Council resolutions and by the 1993 Oslo Accords signed by the Israelis and the Palestinians. All these agreements provide for settlement negotiated between the parties, a settlement that will result in two states, a Jewish state of Israel and a state of Palestine.

Unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state is a way of avoiding negotiations on the tough issues: final borders, secure borders, Jerusalem, and the status of the Palestinian refugees of 1948 and their descendants. It is an attempt by the Palestinians to de-legitimize Israel, to impose indefensible borders unilaterally, and to get their state while retaining the ability to keep fighting Israel and to use the refugees' alleged ''right of return'' to undermine the survival of Israel as Jewish state.

The Palestinian Authority should instead explain to its people that a Palestinian state can be achieved only by conceding the right of a Jewish state to live in peace and security next door. And, for that to happen, there must be a negotiated agreement recognizing two states for two peoples. Evading a negotiated agreement is a formula for future war.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is also the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 268, and deeply appreciate Majority Leader CANTOR; STENY HOYER; obviously the chairwoman, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN; and Mr. BERMAN, the ranking member, for authoring this resolution reaffirming the U.S. commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

H. Res. 268 speaks in very clear, unambiguous language about what this means: It means settlement through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations rather than through a highly misguided, counterproductive, unilateral Palestinian declaration of statehood, or by Palestinians seeking recognition from other states or through the United Nations, sadly, the latter, a haven of anti-Israel and even sometimes anti-Semitic activity.

Direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations have been a keystone of U.S. and Israeli policy toward the region for decades, and even PLO Chair Yasser Arafat pledged to accept this way back in 1993. Unfortunately, Hamas in its 2011 unity agreement with Fatah did not accept this commitment, nor did it renounce violence.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 268 also outlines what a negotiated settlement should entail: negotiations in which each accepts the other's right to exist, and which are aimed at a two-state solution. Again, these have been key points of U.S. and Israeli policy, but Hamas, a State Department foreign terrorist organization, has rejected them.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that U.S. law precludes foreign assistance to a P.A. which shares power with Hamas unless the P.A. publicly accepts Israel's right to exist and adheres to all prior agreements between Israel and the PLO. The U.S. Government has been extremely generous to the P.A., providing over $550 million annually.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So the resolution wisely reaffirms this law and urges the administration to consider suspending assistance to the P.A. pending a review of the unity agreement between Fatah and Hamas.

It is our policy, and it is Israel's policy, Madam Speaker, to promote a realistic, sustainable peace process, one that entails negotiations between the two parties to the conflict, represented by groups that seek a two-state solution, and renounces violence. Hamas has shown none of that.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268.

This important resolution reaffirms our Nation's unwavering commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, which can only be achieved through direct Israeli-Palestinian peace talks.

Since 1948, when the United States became the first country to recognize the Jewish State of Israel, we have always stood by her side as a strong ally and friend. This resolution is no exception. As each day brings a new set of complex changes to the Middle East, it is more vital than ever that we protect and strengthen that friendship. From insisting that Hamas reject terrorism and accept Israel's right to exist, to supporting the Obama administration's opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, H. Res. 268 reaffirms the sense of the Congress and the Obama administration that we must continue to stand strong with our democratic ally against hostile enemies and attempts at delegitimization.

In doing so, we continue to demonstrate our stalwart support that we have provided as a country for more than six decades.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida, my colleague, Colonel West, an American hero.

Mr. WEST. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of House Resolution 268, which does reaffirm the strong support of this body politic to a negotiated solution for Israel and Palestine.

The important thing that we have to see happen, though, is to urge the Palestinian leaders to first and foremost ensure that any Palestinian government will seek peace with Israel, as we sat here and listened to Prime Minister Netanyahu say, ''There will not be peace until we have a dedicated peace partner.''

The second thing, we must make sure that the leaders of the Palestinian people cease all efforts at circumventing the negotiation process, including through a unilateral declaration of statehood or by seeking recognition of a Palestinian state from other nations or the United Nations.

But third, and probably most important, that the Palestinian leaders must take appropriate measures to counter the incitement to violence and fulfill all prior Palestinian commitments, including dismantling the terrorist infrastructure that is embodied with Hamas.

Israel is a bright and shining beacon which is in a sea of despots, dictators, theocrats, and autocrats. The Palestinian leaders can choose to be a part of this light.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the ranking member.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 268 that affirms the United States' support for a negotiated solution to the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

Setting preconditions on negotiations is just an excuse to maintain the status quo. If President Abbas is serious about peace, then he should focus all of his energies and all the energies of his people on negotiations with Israel. An agreement won't be easy, but the outlines of an agreement are well-known. All that is really necessary now is leadership from both sides.

So this leadership sets firmly U.S. policy. We are a rock solid friend of Israel, and anyone else who seeks peace with them. But this also means that we stand against those who seek to circumvent the peace process by running to the U.N. General Assembly for a declaration that may score political points but is going to set back the peace process for years.

Now more than ever, Madam Speaker, with turmoil on every border of Israel, we need to stand with them as an ally. We want peace. Israel wants peace. Peace can only happen with negotiations. All we are missing is a true Palestinian partner.

□ 1800

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to yield 2 minutes to another Florida colleague (Mrs. ADAMS), a veteran of the U.S. Air Force.

Mrs. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268, which would reaffirm America's commitment to a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states: a democratic Jewish State of Israel and a democratic Palestinian state living in peace and mutual recognition.

For six decades, throughout 12 American Presidents and 12 Israeli Prime Ministers, Israel has stood as a beacon of democracy in an unstable region and has remained a loyal and committed friend to the United States. As Americans, we must continue to honor the promise of democracy and liberty around the world—we owe no less than that to our closest friend in the Middle East. This is why we'll continue to stand with Israel, continue to honor our friendship, and to continue my commitment to encouraging a negotiated peace that both the Israelis and the Palestinians have agreed to—not one that is imposed upon them.

The United States should not and cannot dictate how peace can be reached with the Palestinians, especially when they are willing to allow Hamas, a terrorist organization, to participate in any of their elections. This is why I strongly disagree with the President's strategy to force Israel into a peace they have not negotiated.

Again, I want to rise in support of H. Res. 268. I believe that the only peace will be a negotiated peace between Israel and the Palestinians without any influence of terrorists.

Mr. BERMAN. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend and partner in so many of these efforts, the gentlelady from New York, the ranking member of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, and I thank the ranking member for his leadership, and the chair.

Last week I traveled to Israel, where I saw the determination, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of that young nation. In a volatile region, Israel is a strong democracy. Despite many setbacks, the country still longs for peace. Yet unilateral actions by the Palestinian Authority diminish prospects for negotiations and threaten progress.

We must do everything within our power to stand by our ally Israel, to persuade the Palestinians to abandon their efforts in the U.N., break with the terrorist group Hamas, and return to the negotiating table with Israel without preconditions. This resolution is a strong statement in support of peace. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 268.

This resolution reaffirms congressional support for direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders in an effort to achieve peace in this over six-decade-long struggle.

While the Palestinian pursuit of a state is understandable, the attempt to bypass the peace process by going first to the United Nations is inappropriate. It is a disgrace and an offense to the U.N Charter and all acceptable norms of international law to create or recognize a state that itself will not first forsake terrorism, violence, ethnic hatred, and genocide.

If a vote for Palestinian statehood comes to the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. must veto and do so until a peace agreement is achieved and maintained between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Now is not the time for either party to remove themselves from the negotiating table. Peace will not be attained with only one side seeking it. I urge my colleagues to reassert American commitment to direct negotiations by supporting H. Res. 268.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, may I ask for the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentlelady from Florida has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BERMAN. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. DEUTCH.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the ranking member from California, and I thank the chair of the committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 268, reaffirming our Nation's unyielding support for our great ally Israel. Madam Speaker, the lack of progress in the peace process thus far stems from the Palestinians' refusal to negotiate despite historic Israeli concessions. They could choose dialogue, they could choose peace—instead they have chosen violence and hatred by partnering with Hamas.

Israel cannot be expected to negotiate with an organization that refuses to accept the internationally recognized Quartet principles, continues to murder innocent Israelis, and refuses to free Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit.

This resolution comes to us as the PA pursues plans to avoid direct negotiations altogether and unilaterally declare statehood at the United Nations.

Madam Speaker, just weeks ago here in this Chamber, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded us what we clearly already know—that peace cannot be imposed; peace must be negotiated. By passing this resolution, Congress will uphold this principle, will reaffirm our commitment to Israel's security, and will express our unyielding support for the Israeli people in their quest for a true and lasting peace. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of our committee, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I come from the premise that if you want to work out a disagreement, you sit face to face at the negotiating table and negotiate. That's what happened in Ireland, and it should happen in the Middle East.

But the Palestinians are playing their cute little games. They want to establish a lot of preconditions, they want to make excuses not to sit and talk with Israel, and they think they can impose this at the U.N. and impose statehood without face-to-face negotiations.

So I say ''no'' to excuses, ''no'' to 1967 lines, ''no'' to all kinds of preconditions before Palestinians will even sit down and talk.

The only way, if the Palestinians are truly wanting peace, they have a willing partner in Israel. As Prime Minister Netanyahu said, There is no Palestinian state not because we don't support one; it's because the Palestinians won't recognize the Jewish State.

So I believe in two states side by side: a Jewish State of Israel and an Arab-Palestinian state. And, again, that can only happen with face-to-face negotiations. No preconditions. Let the parties sit down and talk.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for allowing me to speak.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 268, a resolution reaffirming our Nation's commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As cochair of the Democratic Israel Working Group, I would like to thank my colleagues, both Republican Leader ERIC CANTOR and our Democratic Whip STENY HOYER, for bringing this important bipartisan resolution to the floor.

I have been to Israel and the West Bank on numerous occasions. I can personally vouch for the desire of the people of Israel and the Palestinian territories to come to a peaceful settlement that will end decades of discord and violence.

A negotiated two-state settlement between the Israelis and Palestinians is the keystone of the peace process. It is the official policy of the U.S. government, the Israeli government, and, until recently, the Palestinian Authority.

Only through direct negotiations can difficult compromises be reached on core issues like borders, water, refugees, the status of Jerusalem, and security. Attempts to bypass direct negotiations and seek recognition of a unilaterally declared Palestinian state by the U.N. General Assembly will not help the Palestinian people. Instead, such a declaration will undermine the peace process and endanger the security and well-being of the very people it claims to support.

□ 1810

A unilaterally declared Palestinian state will lead to a greater height in tensions, turn the region into a powder keg, and invite terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah to take advantage. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a member of the committee, the ranking member of the Oversight Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 268 and call upon my colleagues to strongly support this resolution.

It reaffirms the long-held U.S. commitment to Israel and the negotiated settlement by and between the Israelis and Palestinians. The future of Israel is inextricably linked to that of its neighbors in the Middle East and North Africa. With gas prices rising, conflicts in that region have a direct impact on Americans here at home.

I have long supported a two-state solution to the conflict, with Israel as the recognized home of the Jewish people and a strong Palestinian state to promote the well-being of the Palestinians as well.

The U.S. and our allies must support this process. We must allow the two parties to come together and negotiate a settlement. This is the best avenue to achieve a lasting peace. I want to say that I strongly oppose Palestinian attempts for unilateral recognition through the U.N. that would delegitimize this peace process.

A fellow Missourian, Harry Truman, recognized Israel within minutes of its declaration of independence. We must continue this kind of support for Israel and for our allies striving for peace together. I urge support of this resolution and look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this issue in the months ahead.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from California for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, the Middle East peace process is at risk of collapse, and I believe that only American leadership can save it. Both sides can and should do more to restart negotiations.

House Resolution 268, despite the fact that it has virtually unanimous support from this body and includes a laudable reaffirmation of the United States' commitment to a negotiated solution to the conflict, in fact falls short of the kind of leadership that I believe is needed. This resolution chastises the Palestinians for seeking to bridge the divide in their own community and for pursuing recognition of their state at the United Nations.

On the first point, I think we should give the Palestinian Authority, which has done an impressive job of developing institutions and its economy in the West Bank, some credit. They have tried to provide the leadership to pursue the goals that we have encouraged them to do; and they have, I think, done so in terms of developing democratic institutions in a way that we should be proud of because we had a role in that, a major role.

There is no indication they have any inclination to allow Hamas to jeopardize those gains that have been achieved in the West Bank. And thus far the reconciliation agreement between Hamas and Fatah has yet to yield any progress on a unity government. In fact, at this point it is unclear that it really will. So in many ways, the purpose for bringing forth this resolution is moot.

Should Hamas be invited to join a Palestinian unity government without accepting the conditions of The Quartet, the European Union, the United Nations, United States, Russia, those are the internationally designated bodies that have come forward with an agreement we have agreed to, if they invite Hamas to join a coalition government without accepting the conditions that we insist upon, it will have very serious implications for our relationship. And that should be the reason why we should cut off financial aid.

In 2006, Palestinian elections, which in fact were advanced by the Bush administration, are what brought Hamas into power. In reaction, the United States, as well as The International Quartet, suspended assistance to the Palestinian Authority. And the Obama administration is continuing that policy. There is no aid going to Gaza.

We need to recognize that Palestinian unity is crucial to a long-term peace. Gaza's separation from the West Bank, though, has made it impossible to advance meaningful negotiations with Israel.

Madam Speaker, there is insufficient time to lay out the other argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, there is insufficient time to lay out the other side to what has been presented. I don't particularly have strong disagreement with many of the points that have been made, but I do think there is another perspective to this. It ought to be advanced in this body.

I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. BERMAN. There are two important issues raised by this one resolution. One seems a little more distant than it did at the time it was introduced, and that was the possibility of a unity government that included an organization that is on our terrorist list, that subscribes to violence, to the elimination of the State of Israel, and refuses to recognize past agreements in a unity government. Hopefully, that agreement, the chances of it are diminishing.

The second point is a strategy which violates the Palestinians' own commitments that they made in Madrid, that they made part of the roadmap, that were made in the context of the Oslo agreements that they will negotiate directly with the Israelis to resolve this conflict. I think it is all appropriate to point out that should they pursue that course, the assistance that we have very generously given them, that they have put to good use, might well be terminated.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia in our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Israel's right to exist, Madam Speaker, should be guaranteed. And Israel has tried to work out over the years a peace agreement with the Palestinians so that there could be a two-state solution. In fact, twice, once during the term of Prime Minister Barak and again during the term of Prime Minister Olmert, Israel offered the Palestinians a very generous and fair final settlement. Both times those offers were flatly rejected and met with violence.

And what have the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinians done recently? They went and signed an agreement with Hamas. Hamas is a terrorist organization that has been lobbing bombs and missiles into Israel, trying to destroy the Israeli state. They are committed to the destruction of Israel. And the Palestinians have signed an agreement on May 4 of this year to work with them.

Israel went that extra step when they allowed Gaza to be turned open. And what happened right after that took place? Hamas came in there and took over and started attacking Israel day after day. Innocent women and children were running constantly from bombs being dropped on them because Gaza had been set in a position where they could open up to Hamas.

And so you have got a constant demand by the terrorists—Hamas, Hezbollah and others—to destroy the State of Israel. And Israel has been a great ally of the United States since its inception in 1948.

□ 1820

We need to send a very strong signal—I think we are doing it right now today—a very strong signal that this country, this Congress, and the Senate supports the State of Israel and does not want the Palestinians to go to the United Nations and try to have a unilateral settlement made by that body. This is something that has to be worked out at the conference table between Israel and the Palestinians and not at the United Nations.

So I would just like to conclude by saying that Israel is our best friend and ally in the Middle East. They are a stable element in the Middle East. We need to support them and make absolutely sure that Hamas, Hezbollah, and the other terrorist organizations do not have their way and destroy the State of Israel.

We are committed to that, this Congress is committed to that, and this whole debate has shown very clearly that almost unanimously the people of the United States stand with Israel.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 268, reaffirming the United States' commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

We all know that the only way to achieve a true and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians is through direct negotiations between the parties. But the Palestinians have been refusing to negotiate with Israel for over a year, using excuse after excuse to stay away from the bargaining table. The Israelis, meanwhile, have accepted the principle of a two-state solution and have pushed for immediate, direct negotiations with the Palestinians.

If I were the Palestinian leadership, which claims simply to want an independent state, I would be clamoring for immediate, direct negotiations. Nothing could stop me from sitting down at the negotiating table and finding a lasting settlement to these issues so that my people could finally achieve statehood.

But while Israel waits for a partner at the bargaining table, the Palestinians have turned away and instead asked that the United Nations prematurely recognize a Palestinian state, though its borders have not been determined, the status of Jerusalem has not been settled and the Palestinians still insist on an unprecedented ''right of return'' for refugees. Further, Israel still faces real threats to its security in the form of terror attacks: between April and July of this year alone, Israel was on the receiving end of hundreds of missiles fired from Gaza. The Palestinians' end-run around the negotiations is just another attempt by the Palestinians to gain the upper hand and embarrass Israel rather than finding a peaceful solution to this tragic conflict.

Complicating matters further is the agreement signed between Fatah and Hamas, a terrorist organization, to form a unity government within the Palestinian Authority. Israel cannot be expected to negotiate with terrorists, and no one should ask them to do so. And yet, PA president Mahmoud Abbas decided to cast his lot not with the moderates but with the extremists and terrorists who seek Israel's destruction, rather than a peaceful solution to the conflict.

The United Nations and the world community must reject Hamas as a legitimate representative of the Palestinians and must turn back any Palestinian attempts to avoid the negotiating table. We must insist on immediate, direct negotiations as the only path to peace. I therefore urge strong support for this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I do not intend to oppose this measure because I agree with its basic premise: that the United States Congress strongly supports a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposes any action that will make such an outcome harder to achieve.

However, I have serious reservations about several of the assertions this resolution makes—as well as those it doesn't make—about recent developments in, and U.S. policy toward, Israel and the Palestinian territories. These concerns are more than abstract: at a time of generational change in the Middle East, the positions that this Congress takes on an issue of such vital importance will have lasting implications for our nation's goals and interests in the region.

For two decades, irrespective of which party has controlled the White House or Congress,

the central aim of U.S. policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been to encourage a negotiated resolution based on the principle of a democratic, Jewish state of Israel living side by side in peace and security with a viable, democratic Palestinian state. Republican and Democratic presidents alike have affirmed that such an outcome will only be achieved through direct negotiations between the two parties, and have opposed any action by either side that undermines or diminishes the prospects for a negotiated peace.

To be sure, the Palestinian leadership's intent to pursue diplomatic recognition at the United Nations qualifies as such an action, and on this point I agree with the sponsors of this resolution. I also share their concerns about the prospect of a Palestinian unity government that does not recognize Israel's right to exist or renounce violence against innocent civilians. Either development would represent a major setback for the peace process as we know it, and Congress is right to warn Palestinian leaders about the consequences of their course of action.

But as usual, the resolution before us today tells only half the story. It says nothing about Israel's responsibility to act as a serious negotiating partner and abide by its previous commitments under the Road Map and other agreements. It says nothing about Israel's refusal to halt settlement construction in order to allow direct negotiations to resume—even when the Obama Administration offered a lavish package of aid and assurances for Israel to do something that was manifestly in its own interest to begin with. It condemns the Palestinian president for his unilateral actions while failing to comprehend that it has been Israel's intransigence that has led him to view the United Nations as his only recourse. And as usual, the resolution has been rushed to the floor without any serious debate or any opportunity for input from the many members of this body who care about this critical issue.

This resolution is also being considered at a pivotal moment in the history of the peace process, as well as the history of the broader Middle East. After years of false starts and broken promises, the prospects for a negotiated peace appear as dim today as at any time in recent memory, and may grow dimmer still as the political winds in the Arab world shift in unpredictable ways. Now, perhaps more than ever before, strong and decisive U.S. leadership is needed to persuade both sides of the urgency of the moment and bring them back to the negotiating table. It is only a matter of time before there is no table left around which to negotiate.

Yet instead of urging the President to redouble his commitment to the pursuit of peace, we are urging him to lead a diplomatic initiative to oppose Palestinian recognition. Instead of encouraging him to bring the full weight of American ideas, influence, and resources to bear on this critical issue, we are asking him to suspend U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority—the very assistance that has been so essential to laying the foundations for a future Palestinian state. Instead of congratulating him for his efforts to revive the stalled negotiations by outlining his ideas for the boundaries of a future Palestinian state, too many of my colleagues seem more interested in manufacturing a controversy for political gain. Unfortunately, the current Israeli prime minister seems all too willing to play along, despite the fact that the two previous U.S. presidents—not to mention at least two former Israeli prime ministers—have advocated positions nearly identical to that outlined by President Obama.

So while I will cast my vote in favor of H. Res. 28, I am reminded of the story of Nero playing the fiddle as Rome burns. The Middle East is transforming before our eyes, and the window of opportunity for the United States to achieve a just and lasting resolution to this age-old conflict may be closing rapidly. We should seize this moment of opportunity and recommit ourselves to the pursuit of peace before it is too late.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. While I certainly share the hope for peace in the Middle East and a solution to the ongoing conflict, I do not believe that peace will result if we continue to do the same things while hoping for different results. The U.S. has been involved in this process for decades, spending billions of dollars we do not have, yet we never seem to get much closer to a solution. I believe the best solution is to embrace non-interventionism, which allows those most directly involved to solve their own problems.

This resolution not only further entangles the U.S. in the Israeli/Palestinian dispute, but it sets out the kind of outcome the United States would accept in advance. While I prefer our disengagement from that conflict, I must wonder how the U.S. expects to be seen as an "honest broker" when it dictates the term of a solution in such a transparently one-sided manner. In the resolution before us, all demands are made of only one side in the conflict. Do supporters of this resolution really believe the actors in the Middle East and the rest of the world do not notice? We do no favors to the Israelis or to the Palestinians when we involve ourselves in such a manner and block any negotiations that may take place without U.S. participation. They have the incentives to find a way to live in peace and we must allow them to find that solution on their own. As always, congressional attitudes toward the peace process in the Middle East reveal hubris and self-importance. Only those who must live together in the Middle East can craft a lasting peace between Israel and Palestine.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 268.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BELARUS DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 515) to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; STATEMENT OF POLICY.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

''Congress finds the following:

''(1) The Government of Belarus has engaged in a pattern of clear and uncorrected violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

''(2) The Government of Belarus has engaged in a pattern of clear and uncorrected violations of basic principles of democratic governance, including through a series of fundamentally flawed presidential and parliamentary elections undermining the legitimacy of executive and legislative authority in that country.

''(3) The Government of Belarus has subjected thousands of pro-democratic political activists to harassment, beatings, and jailings, particularly as a result of their attempts to peacefully exercise their right to freedom of assembly and association.

''(4) The Government of Belarus has attempted to maintain a monopoly over the country's information space, targeting independent media, including independent journalists, for systematic reprisals and elimination, while suppressing the right to freedom of speech and expression of those dissenting from the dictatorship of Aleksandr Lukashenka, and adopted laws restricting the media, including the Internet, in a manner inconsistent with international human rights agreements.

''(5) The Government of Belarus continues a systematic campaign of harassment, repression, and closure of nongovernmental organizations, including independent trade unions and entrepreneurs, and this crackdown has created a climate of fear that inhibits the development of civil society and social solidarity.

''(6) The Government of Belarus has subjected leaders and members of select ethnic and religious minorities to harassment, including the imposition of heavy fines and denying permission to meet for religious services, sometimes by selective enforcement of the 2002 Belarus religion law.

''(7) The Government of Belarus has attempted to silence dissent by persecuting human rights and pro-democracy activists with threats, firings, expulsions, beatings and other forms of intimidation, and restrictions on freedom of movement and prohibition of international travel.

''(8) The dictator of Belarus, Aleksandr Lukashenka, established himself in power by orchestrating an illegal and unconstitutional referendum that enabled him to impose a new constitution, abolishing the duly elected parliament, the 13th Supreme Soviet, installing a largely powerless National Assembly, extending his term in office, and removing applicable term limits.

''(9) The Government of Belarus has failed to make a convincing effort to solve the cases of disappeared opposition figures Yuri Zakharenka, Viktor Gonchar, and Anatoly Krasovsky and journalist Dmitry Zavadsky, even though credible allegations and evidence links top officials of the Government to these disappearance.

''(10) The Government of Belarus has restricted freedom of expression on the Internet by requiring Internet Service Providers to maintain data on Internet users and the sites they view and to provide such data to officials upon request, and by creating a government body with the authority to require Internet Service Providers to block Web sites.

''(11) On December 19, 2010, the Government of Belarus conducted a presidential election that failed to meet the standards of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) for democratic elections.

''(12) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election the Government of Belarus responded to opposition protests by beating scores of protestors and detaining more than 600 peaceful protestors.

''(13) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election the Government of Belarus jailed seven of the nine opposition presidential candidates and abused the process of criminal prosecution to persecute them.

''(14) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the Government of Belarus disrupted independent broadcast and Internet media, and engaged in repressive actions against independent journalists.

''(15) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, Belarusian security services and police conducted raids targeting civil society groups, individual pro-democracy activists, and independent media.

''(16) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, Belarusian officials refused to extend the mandate of the OSCE Office in Minsk.

''(17) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, opposition candidates and activists have been persecuted and detainees have been physically mistreated, and denied access to family, defense counsel, medical treatment, and open legal proceedings.

''(18) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, lawyers representing those facing criminal charges related to the post-election protest have been subjected to the revocation of licenses, disbarment, and other forms of pressure.

''(19) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the Government of Belarus has convicted political detainees to harsh prison sentences.

''(20) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States and European Union imposed targeted travel and financial sanctions on an expanded list of officials of the Government of Belarus.

''(21) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States fully restored sanctions against Belarus's largest state-owned petroleum and chemical conglomerate and all of its subsidiaries.

''(22) After the December 19, 2010, presidential election, the United States has engaged in assistance efforts to provide legal and humanitarian assistance to those facing repression and preserving access to independent information, and has pledged resources to support human rights advocates, trade unions, youth and environmental groups, business associations, think-tanks, democratic political parties and movements, independent journalists, newspapers and electronic media operating both inside Belarus and broadcasting from its neighbors, and to support access of Belarusian students to independent higher education and expand exchange programs for business and civil society leaders.

''(23) The Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and other executive branch agencies have heretofore made effective use of this Act to promote the purposes of this Act, as stated in section 3 of this Act.

''SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

''It is the policy of the United States to—

''(1) condemn the conduct of the December 19, 2010, presidential election and crackdown on opposition candidates, political leaders, and activists, civil society representatives, and journalists;

''(2) continue to call for the immediate release without preconditions of all political prisoners in Belarus, including all those individuals detained in connection with the December 19, 2010, presidential election;

''(3) continue to support the aspirations of the people of Belarus for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

''(4) continue to support the aspirations of the people of Belarus to preserve the independence and sovereignty of their country;

''(5) continue to support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in Belarus, which empower the people of Belarus to end tyranny in their country;

''(6) continue to refuse to accept the results of the fundamentally flawed December 19, 2010, presidential election held in Belarus, and to support calls for new presidential and parliamentary elections, conducted in a manner that is free and fair according to OSCE standards;

''(7) continue to call for the fulfillment by the Belarusian government of Belarus's freely undertaken obligations as an OSCE participating state;

''(8) continue to call for a full accounting of the disappearances of opposition leaders and journalists in Belarus, including Victor Gonchar, Anatoly Krasovsky, Yuri Zakharenka, and Dmitry Zavadsky, and the prosecution of those individuals who are in any way responsible for the disappearance of those opposition leaders and journalists;

''(9) continue to work closely with the European Union and other countries and international organizations, to promote the conditions necessary for the integration of Belarus into the European family of democracies;

''(10) call on the International Ice Hockey Federation to suspend its plan to hold the 2014 International World Ice Hockey championship in Minsk until the Government of Belarus releases all political prisoners; and

''(11) remain open to reevaluating United States policy toward Belarus as warranted by demonstrable progress made by the Government of Belarus consistent with the aims of this Act as stated in this section.''.

SEC. 3. RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO BELARUS.

Section 5 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5. RADIO, TELEVISION, AND INTERNET BROADCASTING TO BELARUS.

''It is the sense of Congress that the President should continue to support radio, television, and Internet broadcasting to the people of Belarus in languages spoken in Belarus, by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, European Radio for Belarus, and Belsat.''.

SEC. 4. SANCTIONS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS.

Section 6 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or expression, including those individuals jailed based on political beliefs or expression in connection with repression that attended the presidential election of December 19, 2010'' before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', including politically motivated legal charges made in connection with repression that attended the presidential election of December 19, 2010'' before the period at the end;

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and violations of human rights, including violations of human rights committed in connection with the presidential election of December 19, 2010'' before the period at the end; and

(D) in paragraph (7), by striking ''internationally recognized observers'' and inserting ''OSCE observers'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(ii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) is a member of any branch of the security or law enforcement services of Belarus and has participated in the violent crackdown on opposition leaders, journalists, and peaceful protestors that occurred in connection with the presidential election of December 19, 2010; or

''(5) is a member of any branch of the security or law enforcement services of Belarus and has participated in the persecution or harassment of religious groups, human rights defenders, democratic opposition groups, or independent media or journalists.'';

(3) in subsection (e), by striking ''of each international financial institution to which'' and inserting ''at each international financial institution of which''; and

(4) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by striking ''(as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code)''.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Section 8(a) of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''sale or delivery of weapons or weapons-related technologies'' and inserting ''sale or delivery or provision of weapons or weapons-related technologies or weapons-related training'';

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking ''involved in the sale'' and inserting ''or weapons-related training involved in the sale or delivery or provision'';

(4) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or weapons-related training described in paragraph (1)'' before the period at the end; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The cooperation of the Government of Belarus with any foreign government or organization for purposes related to the censorship or surveillance of the Internet, or the purchase or receipt by the Government of Belarus of any technology or training from any foreign government or organization for purposes related to the censorship or surveillance of the Internet.''.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

Section 9 of the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Committee on International Relations'' and inserting ''Committee on Foreign Affairs''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''and prosecutors'' and inserting '', prosecutors, and heads of professional associations and educational institutions''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Lukashenka regime'' and inserting ''Government of Belarus''.

SEC. 7. FUNDING FOR REPORT.

The requirement to prepare and transmit the report required under section 8 of the

Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 (Public Law 109–480; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note), as amended by section 5 of this Act, shall be performed within current levels of authorized and appropriated funding.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 515.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman BACHUS for their cooperation in allowing this bill to proceed so swiftly to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011.

I would like to thank my distinguished colleague and friend, Mr. SMITH, for introducing this timely and important measure.

Belarus has been correctly deemed the last dictatorship of Europe. Under the iron hand of Lukashenko, the Belarusian people have endured the systemic denial and violation of their basic freedoms and human rights.

The authorities in Belarus have severely restricted free speech and independent media. Prodemocracy political activists are subject to beatings and imprisonment. The regime's heavy-handed tactics were fully utilized in last December's fraudulent election for president.

According to our own Department of State's Human Rights Report: ''Authorities denied citizens the right to change their government, manipulating the December 19 presidential election to ensure that the president would not be seriously challenged.

''Security forces beat detainees and protesters, used excessive force to disperse peaceful demonstrators, and reportedly used torture during investigations.

''A crackdown on post-election demonstrations led to the arrest of over 700 activists, including criminal charges against five presidential candidates and numerous activists and journalists.''

Unfortunately, the regime, despite its repeated promises of reform, continues this campaign of repression against its own people.

In response to the rumors that peaceful protesters were planning to gather on Belarusian Independence Day, July 3, just recently, to show their opposition to the regime by clapping their hands, the dictator stated, ''Stomping, clapping, bellowing and roaring on squares and streets cannot solve problems. The state has the resources and power to pacify those who violate the law and the constitution.''

We have now seen Lukashenko did indeed use the state's power to pacify the demonstrators. How? He ordered the authorities to start by firing tear gas at the protesters, followed by the violent beating and imprisonment of those who dared to clap their hands. Over 300 activist were arrested and today 140 were convicted on such dubious charges as being hooligans or participating in unsanctioned demonstrations.

This unrelenting persecution of the Belarusian people by the regime is simply unacceptable. The U.S. and other responsible nations must support the prodemocracy forces in Belarus and hold the authoritarian regime in Minsk accountable for its growing abuses.

That's why I am pleased to support this important measure which, among other things, condemns the conduct of the recent presidential elections and the crackdown on opposition candidates and activists, expresses a sense of Congress that the President should continue to support radio, television and Internet broadcasting to the people of Belarus and expand on existing sanctions, including the denial of visas to any member of the Belarusian Government who participated in the crackdown on opposition leaders, journalists, and peaceful protesters that occurred in connection with the December elections.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROS-LEHTINEN: I am writing in response to your letter concerning H.R. 515, the ''Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011,'' which the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 515 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to discharging our Committee from further consideration of this bill in order that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 515 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I appreciate your including our exchange of letters on this matter in your committee report, or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of H.R. 515.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROS-LEHTINEN: On April 14, 2011, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011, by a unanimous recorded vote of 34 to 0. As you know, the Committee on Financial Services was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over international financial and monetary organizations, banks and banking.

Upon review of H.R. 515, it is clear that the legislation will not alter the current statutory directives pertaining to the votes of the U.S. Executive Directors at the Multilateral Development Banks. Since no policy change is being made with respect to the narrow matter within the jurisdiction of the Financial Services Committee, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Financial Services Committee so that it may be considered expeditiously by the House. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 515. In addition, I do so with the understanding that this will not prejudice the Committee on Financial Services with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Further, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 515 or related legislation.

Lastly, I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), be allowed to manage the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I will be the only speaker to speak from our side on this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. On December 19 of last year, Belarus' President, Alexander Lukashenko, staged a fraudulent election. Immediately afterward, he had the opposition candidates arrested, and this May almost all of them were sentenced to prison.

The Lukashenko regime has continued to harass members of opposition political parties, human rights activists, civil society and to suppress Belarusians' access to free press and information. Over the past month, an increasing number of Belarusians have gathered to protest against Lukashenko and the deteriorating economic situation there.

The Obama administration has reacted strongly to the fraudulent elections and post-election crack down. On February 2, the U.S. significantly expanded the list of Belarusian officials subject to travel sanctions and to have their assets blocked and restored full

U.S. sanctions against Belarus's largest state-owned oil and gas concern.

On July 2, Secretary Clinton met with activists from Belarus during her visit to Lithuania for a meeting of the Community of Democracies and repeated her demand that Belarus release political prisoners and embark on the path of democratic reform. In coordination with the European Union, the administration has significantly expanded democracy assistance to Belarus for this year from $11 million to $15 million.

We must continue to call for the reopening of the OSCE office in Minsk and for the Government of Belarus to fully cooperate with an OSCE fact-finding mission requested by 14 participating states under the Moscow mechanism.

And we must continue to demand the release of many heroic individuals still languishing in Belarusian prisons without access to their families or legal counsel. Europe's last dictatorship should not be allowed to stand unchallenged.

I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, let me thank Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today, the majority leader and the Speaker for scheduling it, and to HOWARD BERMAN for his strong support of it as well and his very eloquent statement just a moment ago.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 515, the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act of 2011. The bill demonstrates our strong and sustained promotion of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Belarus through targeted sanctions against this brutal dictatorship of Alexander Lukashenko.

H.R. 515 reinforces earlier law, the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004 and the Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2006, both of which passed the House and Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support and were signed into law.

This legislation is timely and necessary. The fraudulent December 19 elections in 2010 in Belarus and the ongoing crackdown on democracy activists and independent journalists by the Lukashenko dictatorship underscore the need for democracy-promoting legislation. Immediately after the election, the government responded to peaceful protests against electoral fraud with savage mass beatings and large-scale detentions—over 700 people.

Later on, Madam Speaker, I will put in the RECORD the list of many of the activists, many of whom were already in jail, their sentences—and these are men and women whose only crime was asking that Belarus matriculate from dictatorship to a democracy.

Of those charged, 40 have been convicted, with some receiving very harsh sentences—up to 6 years. And, of course, after those 6 years are over, what Lukashenko and his cronies usually do is find some reason to extend those jail sentences. So these sentences are awful indeed.

As ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN pointed out a moment ago, the chairwoman of our committee, this also includes five of the nine Presidential candidates who ran against Lukashenko, their families, lawyers, journalists, and democratic activists who continue to be harassed and intimidated. It is the worst political crackdown in Europe in over a decade. And it's ongoing, Madam Speaker.

The repressive regime in Belarus was in full force earlier this week as police broke up protesters attempting to mark their country's independence day. Hundreds were detained, and 140 already received administrative sentences or fines, including independent journalists reporting on rallies held across the country.

The post-election has followed the pattern of repression that has characterized Lukashenko's 17-year rule. Through a series of rigged elections, large-scale intimidation and suppression of independent media and civil society, the dictator has long since consolidated his control over virtually all national institutions. This dictatorship, as has been said, is the worst of any in Europe today.

Perhaps most significantly about the legislation, the bill supports targeted sanctions. It expresses the sense of the Congress to deny the privilege of visiting our country to senior Belarus officials, their immediate families and others involved in human rights violations and anti-democracy actions, including those involved in the December 19 post-election crackdown. Likewise, it has provisions prohibiting U.S. Government financing, except for humanitarian goods and agricultural products or medical products and nonhumanitarian loans from international financial institutions to the Belarusan Government; and blocking assets owned by the Belarusan Government's senior leadership or their families and others involved in antidemocratic actions. These sanctions are aimed at the senior leadership of a dictatorship that displays utter contempt for the dignity and rights of the Belarusan people, and with these sanctions we stand with the Belarusan people against their oppressors.

H.R. 515 requires the State Department to issue a new report to Congress on the sale, delivery or provision of weapons or weapons-related technologies or training, Lukashenka's personal wealth and assets, and cooperation by the Belarusian government with any foreign government or organizations related to censorship or surveillance of the Internet.

H.R. 515 states a U.S. government policy of strong support for the Belarusian people in their struggle against the Lukashenka dictatorship, aspiring to live in a free and independent country where their human rights are respected, they can choose their government, and officials apply just laws that they themselves are subject to.

This bill encourages those struggling for decency and basic rights against the overwhelming pressures from the anti-democratic regime. It calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners in Belarus, including those detained in the post-election crackdown and refuses to recognize the results of the flawed elections. It calls for a full accounting of the 1999–2000 disappearances of opposition leaders and a journalist in Belarus and the prosecution of those responsible. At the same time it explicitly opens the door to the re-evaluation of U.S. policy towards the Belarusan government should it take significant steps toward democracy and respect for human rights.

H.R. 515 supports radio, television and Internet broadcasting to Belarus, specifically Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Voice of America, European Radio for Belarus and the satellite television station Belsat.

Madam Speaker, this bill comes to the floor as the Belarusan people are increasingly taking to the streets in protest against the dictatorship, and the EU Council is ramping up sanctions on Belarus. The Belarusan people deserve far better than the Lukashenka dictatorship—this bill is an act of support of their heroic struggle for human rights and democracy and is an act of profound respect and friendship for the people of Belarus.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to add to my earlier remarks in support of this legislation that, as part of a Helsinki Commission visit in to Minsk in June 2009, I had the opportunity to press Lukashenka directly on his dismal human rights record and denial of democratic freedoms.

While making clear our support for Belarus' independence, I and other members of the delegation reiterated the long-standing U.S. message that the only way to improve relations between our two countries was and is for him to take steps to increase political freedom and respect human rights. We told Lukashenka that the ball was in his court. There were even small, tentative steps in the right direction, but since December 19 any hopes for change have been crushed.

The December 19, 2010 fraudulent election, which the OSCE condemned as not having met international standards, and the continuing crackdown on democracy activists and independent journalists by the Lukashenka regime underscore the need for this legislation and our continued attention to the further deterioration of human rights and freedoms in Europe's remaining dictatorship. This ongoing repression is the harshest we have seen in Europe in more than a decade and a stark illustration that Belarus remains an anomaly—a pariah state—in today's Europe.

Peaceful protests against electoral fraud were met with mass beatings and detentions. Some of the jailed were abused and even tortured. Their families, lawyers, journalists and democratic activists have been harassed and intimidated. Students have been expelled from universities. Belarus now has more political prisoners than at any time under Lukashenka's rule, as the Belarusan tyrant has squelched dissent by convicting nearly 40 activists within the last few months on charges of mass rioting and disturbing the public order.

Some, including several opposition leaders who ran against Lukashenka in December and other political activists and civil society leaders, received severe, completely unjustified prison sentences of up to six years. Their trials were a politically motivated farce, in which policemen sometimes were not even able to identify the defendants, and which saw unexplained discrepancies between witness testimony favoring the defendants, and the judges return of guilty verdicts.

The now-6-month-long crackdown only magnifies the pattern of repression and gross and systematic human rights violations that has characterized Lukashenka's 17-year rule. He has systematically consolidated power over virtually all institutions through a series of rigged presidential and parliamentary elections, repeated violations of fundamental freedoms and the suppression of independent media and civil society, creating a climate of fear that pervades the country.

Thanks to this dictator's misrule, Belarus has the worst democracy and human rights record in Europe. Furthermore, Belarus's Soviet-style, structurally unreformed state-dominated economy is facing its worst crisis since Lukashenka came to power. Russian cut offs of energy subsidies and the explosion of the country's budget deficit following heavy state spending ahead of December's presidential elections in a populist bid to increase Lukashenka's waning popularity have contributed. Since then, Belarus has witnessed devaluation of its currency, a jump in inflation and increase in unemployment, and, in recent weeks, growing public protests.

Notwithstanding the almost universal condemnation and punitive measures by the U.S. and EU, Alexander Lukashenka continues to turn a deaf ear to the international community, and, more importantly, to the Belarusan people. The Belarusan autocrat has clearly manifested his profound mistrust of—and contempt for—the long-suffering Belarusan people at whose expense he has enriched himself for the past 17 years.

Clearly, the need for a sustained U.S. commitment to foster democracy and respect for human rights, and sanction Lukashenka and his cronies remains. I want to stress that both the Bush and Obama administrations have made good use of the previous Belarus Democracy Acts, of 2004 and 2006, reinforcing to the Belarusan goverment that the elected representatives of the American people—by overwhelming bipartisan majorities—support the policy of condemning and sanctioning the Belarusan government for its brutal human rights violations.

The visa bans and targeted financial and economic sanctions instituted by President Bush in response to the earlier legislation have been maintained, and in some ways expanded by President Obama since December 19th. Most recently, on May 27 President Obama issued a statement in which he condemned the conviction and sentencing of five opposition candidates, asserting that the United States considers these candidates, along with the other courageous activists arrested and charged in the crackdown, as political prisoners. The President also pledged to pursue new sanctions against select Belarusian state-owned enterprises, which H.R. 515 strongly encourages.

Unfortunately, two decades after the demise of the Soviet Union, Belarus remains in a time warp—unreconstructed politically and economically and isolated from its European roots, due to one man's dictatorial rule. His tactics are a chilling reminder of a darker time, more than two decades ago when the Soviet KGB hounded dissidents. It is a tragedy for the Belarusian people—who have suffered so much over the course of the last century—that Lukashenka is yet again choosing the path of self-isolation and squelching the desire for freedom. He is, yet again, making a mockery of Belarus' freely undertaken OSCE obligations.

The Belarusan people wish to live in a country where human rights are respected, democracy flourishes and the rule of law is the norm. I remain convinced that the time will soon come when Belarus will be integrated with the family of democratic nations. We must continue to resolutely stand at their side as they struggle to lift themselves from the yoke of this oppressive regime.

BELARUS—CANDIDATES OR ACTIVISTS UNDER CRIMINAL CHARGES RELATED TO THE DECEMBER 19–20 POST-ELECTION DEMONSTRATION

Persons charged with organizing and participating in mass disturbances (article 293 para 1 and 2 of the Criminal Code, penalties of up to 15 years in jail)

Detainees, In detention, Trial date, Conviction and charge:

1. Andrey Sannikau, European Belarus coalition coordinator, Charter97, presidential candidate, Yes, April 27–May 14, Five years in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

2. Mikalay Statkevich, Narodnaya Hramada Social Democratic party leader, presidential candidate, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Six years in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

3. Ales Mikhalevich, For Modernization NGO, presidential candidate, No (abroad).

4. Dzmitry Us, presidential candidate, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Five years and six months in a high security jail; organization of mass disturbances.

5. Alyaksandr Atroshchankau, Sannikau's spokesperson, Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

6. Natallya Radzina, Charter97 editor, No (abroad).

7. Anatol Lyabedzka, United Civic Party chair, No.

8. Alyaksandr Klaskouski, former police officer, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Five years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances, insult of an official, unauthorized assumption of rank or powers of an official.

9. Uladzimir Kobets, Sannikau's campaign team leader, No.

10. Alyaksandr Arastovich, Statkevich's aid, No.

11. Anatol Paulau, Ramanchuk's aid, No.

12. Aleh Korban, Ramanchuk's aid, No.

13. Ivan Haponau, a Russian citizen, No, February 22, March 10, 10,500,000-ruble fine ($3,450); participation in mass disturbances.

14. Artsyom Breus, a Russian citizen, No, February 22, March 10, 10,500,000-ruble fine ($3,450); participation in mass disturbances.

15. Mikita Likhavid, For Freedom movement activist, Yes, March 22–23, March 29, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

16. Dzmitry Novik, BPF member, Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

17. Aleh Fedarkevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years and six months in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

18. Uladzimir Khamichenka, a demonstration participant, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

19. Dzmitry Myadzvedz, a demonstration participant, No, March 01, March 10, Partial house arrest that requires regular reporting to police and restricts travel without prior permission from authorities; participation in mass disturbances.

20. Uladzimir Loban, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

21. Paval Vinahradau, ''Tell the truth'' activist, Yes, April 27–May 05, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

22. Andrey Paznyak, a demonstration participant, No, May 11–18, May 26, Three years of partial house arrest; participation in mass disturbances.

23. Alyaksandr Malchanau, a demonstration participant. Yes; appeal denied April 5, March 01–02, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances and desecration of state symbols.

24. Illya Vasilevich, a youth activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

25. Dzmitry Bulanau, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

26. Alyaksandr Kvyatkevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

27. Vasil Parfyankou, ''Tell the Truth'' activist, Yes; appeal denied March 25, February 17, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

28. Artsyom Hrybkou, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 11–18, May 26, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

29. Fyodar Mirzayanau, a demonstration participant, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

30. Ales Kirkevich, Malady Front activist, Yes, April 27–May 5, Four years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

31. Dzmitry Drozd, Sannikau's campaign team member, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

32. Syarhey Kazakou, European Belarus activist, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

33. Uladzimir Yaromenka, Malady Front activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

34. Dzmitry Daronin, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years and six months in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

35. Andrey Pratasenya, Ramanchuk's campaign team volunteer, Yes, April 27–May 5, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

36. Aleh Hnedchyk, Nyaklyaeu's campaign activist, Yes, April 27–May 14, Three years and six months in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

37. Vital Matsukevich, a demonstration participant, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in a high security jail; participation in mass disturbances.

38. Yauhen Sakret, Sannikau's campaign activist, Yes, May 5–12, Three years in jail; participation in mass disturbances.

Persons charged with organizing, arranging, and actively participating in activities that severely violate public order (article 342 para 1 of the Criminal Code, penalties up to three years in jail)

1. Uladzimir Nyaklyaeu, ''Tell the Truth'' campaign leader, presidential candidate, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.
2. Vital Rymasheuski, Belarusian Christian Democracy co-chair, presidential candidate, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.
3. Alyaksandr Fyaduta, Nyaklyaeu's aid, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.
4. Andrey Dzmitryeu, Nyaklyaeu's campaign team leader, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.
5. Syarhey Vaznyak, Nyaklyaeu's aid, No, May 5–20, Two years suspended sentence.
6. Nasta Palazhanka, Malady Front deputy chair, No, May 5–20, One year suspended sentence.
7. Paval Sevyarynets, Belarusian Christian Democracy co-chair, Rymasheuski's aid, No, May 11–16, Three years of ''khimiya,'' a form of internal exile.
8. Zmitser Bandarenka, European Belarus coalition coordinator, Charter97, Yes, April 26–27, Two years in jail.
9. Syarhey Martsaleu, Statkevich's aid, No, May 11–16, Two years suspended sentence.
10. Iryna Khalip, independent journalist, Sannikau's wife, No, May 11–16, Two years suspended sentence.

Persons suspected of organizing and participating in mass riots (article 293 para 1 and 2 of the Criminal Code, penalties of up to 15 years in jail)

1. Ryhor Kastuseu, BPF deputy, presidential candidate, No.
2. Anton Davydzenka, a demonstration participant, No.
3. Usevalad Kavalenka, a demonstration participant, No.
4. Syarhey Klyueu, ''Tell the truth'' activist, No.
5. Mikita Krasnou, a youth activist, No (abroad).
6. Dzmitry Apishau, a demonstration participant, No.
7. Leanid Navitski, Sannikau's aid, No (abroad).
8. Andrey Mikalayeu, a demonstration participant, No.
9. Alyaksandr Vasileuski, a demonstration participant, No.
10. Dzyanis Shydlouski, a demonstration participant, No.
11. Alyaksey Sharstou, a demonstration participant, No.
12. Dzmitry Huseltsau, a demonstration participant, No.
13. Vital Stazharau, a demonstration participant, No (abroad).

Persons convicted of severe hooliganism committed by a group of individuals inflicting bodily harm (article 339 para 2 and 3, penalties of up to ten years in jail); detained December 18

1. Zmitser Dashkevich, Malady Front leader, Yes, March 22–24, Two years in jail; severe hooliganism (para 2).
2. Eduard Lobau, Malady Front activist, Yes, March 22–24, Four years in a high security jail; severe hooliganism (para 3 involving armaments).

Students Expelled after December 19 (for political reasons).

Belarusian Committee for defense of the repressed ''Salidarnasc'' reports ten expelled students:

1. Yauheni Bely, Belarusian State University.
2. Uladzimir Syarheyeu, Belarusian State University.
3. Alyaksandr Lukashou, Belarusian State University.
4. Katsyaryna Davydzik, Belarusian State University.
5. Katsyaryna Klimko, Institute of Journalism, Belarusian State University.
6. Aleh Anufyenka, Institute of Journalism, Belarusian State University.
7. Viktorya Petrakouskaya, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.
8. Viktoryia Kruchkova, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.
9. Tatsiana Hrybouskaya, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.
10. Andrey Luhin, Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.
11. Artsyom Khvastsyuk, Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.
12. Uladzimir Yaromenak* Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.
13. Illya Zhakhavets, Belarusian Institute of Law.
14. Yauhen Tsarykau, Minsk State High Radiotechnical College.
15. Illyia Vasilevich* Minsk State Polytechnic College.
16. Boris Zakharchuk, Hrodna State University named after Kupala.
17. Yauhen Busko, Hrodna State University named after Kupala.
18. Arseni Asmanau, Homyel State University named after Skaryna.
19. Mikita Likhavid* Minsk Institute of Entrepreneurship.
20. Fyodar Mirzayanau* Belarusian State Economic University.

*Tried and Sentenced to terms in prison

Other sources report (unconfirmed):

1. Ales Krot (Member of Studentskaya Rada [independent Student Council], Belarusian National Technical University.
2. Anna Baraban, Belarusian State University.
3. Alina Litvinchuk, Brest State University.
4. Syarhey Sadouski, Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronics.

According to ''Salidarnasc'', one student was expelled before December 19 (for political reasons).

1. Mikhail Mikulich Maxim Tank Belarusian State Pedagogical University.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 515, the ''Belarus Democracy Reauthorization of 2011.'' In recent years the Belarusian government, lead by Alexander Lukashenko, has engaged in atrocious human rights violations against opposition leaders and journalists. I believe that it is time that the United States call for an end of these practices and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 515.

Seven years ago the ''Belarus Democracy Act of 2004'' was passed into law as a measure to help promote the values of democracy, human rights, and to end the violations of fundamental freedoms in the Republic of Belarus. Since this time, the Belarusian dictator, Alexander Lukashenko, has continued to harass and persecute pro-democracy political dissenters and regularly engages in human rights violations against his people. The ''Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011'' calls for Lukashenko to cease all persecution and urges the Belarusian government to work to promote the conditions required for integration of Belarus into the European family of democracies.

This legislation carries a larger significance as it is coming to a vote on the eve of a poignant time in Belarus's involvement within the global community. The International Ice Hockey Federation's (IIHF) 2014 World Ice Hockey Championship has recently been awarded to Belarus and will be hosted in Minsk resulting in fanfare and praise. It is my belief that the IIHF should suspend this great honor until the iron grip of Lukashenko's police state is lifted and all political prisoners are released. The United States Senate unanimously, passed a resolution in April of 2011 expressing the dire need for a moratorium on the 2014 World Ice Hockey Championships in Belarus until justice has been brought to Lukashenko's victims.

It is with sincere urgency that I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 515, ''Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011.'' We must continue the strong tradition of promoting democratic values around the world and let Alexander Lukashenko know that his behavior will not be condoned or tolerated by the United States of America.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the ''Belarus Democracy Act'' reauthorization. This title of this bill would have amused George Orwell, as it is in fact a U.S. regime-change bill. Where does the United States Congress derive the moral or legal authority to determine which political parties or organizations in Belarus—or anywhere else—are to be U.S.-funded and which are to be destabilized? How can anyone argue that U.S. support for regime-change in Belarus is somehow ''promoting democracy''? We pick the parties who are to be supported and funded and somehow this is supposed to reflect the will of the Belarusian people? How would Americans feel if the tables were turned and a powerful foreign country demanded that only a political party it selected and funded could legitimately reflect the will of the American people?

I would like to know how many millions of taxpayer dollars the U.S. government has wasted trying to overthrow the government in Belarus. I would like to know how much money has been squandered by U.S. government-funded front-organizations like the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Republic Institute, Freedom House, and others meddling like the old Soviet Union in the internal politics of a country that has neither threatened nor attacked the United States. It is the arrogance of our foreign policy and we call it ''democracy.'' We wonder why we are no longer loved and admired overseas.

Finally, I strongly object to the sanctions that this legislation imposes on Belarus. We must keep in mind that sanctions and blockades of foreign countries are considered acts of war. Do we need to continue war-like actions yet another country? Can we afford it.

I wish to emphasize that I take this position not because I am in support of the regime in Belarus, or anywhere else. I take this position because it is dangerous folly to be the Nation that arrogates to itself the right to determine the leadership of the rest of the world. As we teeter closer to bankruptcy, it should be more obvious that we need to change our foreign policy to one of constructive engagement rather than hostile interventionism. And though it scarcely should need to be said, I must remind my colleagues today that we are the U.S. House of Representatives, and not some sort of world congress. We have no constitutional authority to intervene in the wholly domestic affairs of Belarus or any other sovereign nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 515, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2354, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–135) on the resolution (H. Res. 337) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 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. 2219.

□ 1836

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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 31, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 122, line 9.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH of Ohio.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 22 Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 241, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

AYES—175

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Cantor
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Hinchey
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Roe (TN)
Speier
Towns
Watt
Young (AK)

□ 1900

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, HOLDEN, and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting 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 Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 328, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

AYES—87

Adams
Amash
Bachmann
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Chabot
Clarke (NY)
Coble
Conyers
DeFazio
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson (IL)
Labrador
Lance
Lee (CA)
Lummis
Manzullo
McClintock
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nugent
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Tierney
Tonko
Upton
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Westmoreland
Woodall

NOES—328

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Buchanan
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Hinchey
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Roe (TN)
Towns
Watt
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1906

Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. GUTIERREZ changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 496 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 266, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

AYES—152

Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Hinchey
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Roe (TN)
Towns
Watt
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1909

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, on July 6, 2011, I missed 3 recorded votes because my return flight from Tennessee to Washington was significantly delayed.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on recorded vote numbers 495, 496, and 497.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 167, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—253

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—167

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Hall
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Whitfield

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Towns
Watt
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1914

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS NO. 21 AND 22 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment Nos. 21 and 22, to the end that they stand disposed of by the voice votes thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate each amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Without objection, the requests for a recorded vote are withdrawn and amendment Nos. 21 and 22 stand as not adopted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 322, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—98

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harris
Higgins
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—322

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Towns
Watt
Young (AK)

□ 1920

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

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

AYES—212

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper

Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—208

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Culberson
Giffords
Guinta
Keating
Mack
McIntyre
Towns
Watt
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1925

Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TURNER and NUGENT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—217

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—204

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel

Reyes	Scott (VA)	Tierney
Richardson	Scott, David	Tonko
Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Rogers (AL)	Sewell	Turner
Ross (AR)	Sherman	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Shimkus	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Sires	Walz (MN)
Rush	Slaughter	Wasserman Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Welch
Sarbanes	Stark	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Sullivan	Wolf
Schiff	Sutton	Woolsey
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
	Tiberi	

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Guinta	Watt
Bono Mack	Keating	Young (AK)
Culberson	Mack	
Giffords	Towns	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1930

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8128. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the approximately $100,000,000,000 in efficiency savings identified by the military departments in the defense budget covering fiscal years 2012 through 2016 that are to be reinvested in the priorities of the military departments. Such report shall include an analysis of—

(1) each savings identified by the military departments, including—

(A) the budget account from which such savings will be derived;

(B) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such savings;

(C) the estimated reductions in the number and funding of contractor personnel caused by such savings; and

(D) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such savings, including the locations of such activities or services; and

(2) each reinvestment planned to be funded with such savings, including—

(A) with respect to such reinvestment in procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts, the budget account to which such savings will be reinvested, including, by line item, the number of items to be procured, as shown in annual P–1 and R–1 documents;

(B) with respect to such reinvestment in military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts, the budget account and the subactivity (as shown in annual—1 and O–1 budget documents) to which such savings will be reinvested;

(C) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such reinvestment;

(D) the estimated number and funding of contractor personnel affected by such reinvestment; and

(E) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such reinvestment, including the locations of such activities or services.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendments to this title that cut funds, reduce our military footprint, and move to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. And I rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

I want to commend the ranking member of the committee, Congressman NORM DICKS from Washington, for his leadership in calling for a fresh look at how we carry out military operations in Afghanistan and the need for a strategy that brings our troops home sooner rather than later.

Mr. Chairman, I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan. I cannot describe how impressed I am with the commitment, the dedication, and the work carried out every single day by our men and women in uniform, and those in the civilian services. I met and spoke with them in Kabul, Marja, at large bases like Bagram Air Force Base, and in small villages. Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, they are incredible.

But over and over and over again I heard the same message: This is not sustainable. The strategy that we are pursuing in Afghanistan is not sustainable. And it is costing us too much in human lives and financial resources to continue. It can't continue for another 18 months, as called for by the President, let alone even longer.

I stand here tonight more convinced than ever that it is time to forge a new path, a new strategy, built upon past and present accomplishments, but more aggressively focused on more rapidly reducing the U.S. military footprint in Afghanistan than the plan described last month by the President, accelerating the transition of combat operations to Afghanistan authorities, and an intense international and regional effort to secure a political solution to the Afghan conflict and define a genuine regional coordinated effort that safeguards the region and the world from terrorist threats.

While I was in Afghanistan, General Petraeus invited me and two Members I was traveling with, Congressman ALLEN WEST and DUNCAN HUNTER, Jr., to attend a ramp ceremony. We may not always agree on policy, but we were united in how respectful, emotional, and moving we found the ceremony honoring the fallen soldiers who were being transported by the C–130 on their final journey home.

Mr. Chairman, 1,650 American service men and women have sacrificed their lives in the Afghanistan war. While I was in Afghanistan, six more were killed. It was a reminder of the enormous sacrifice that our soldiers are paying. 2010 was the deadliest year of conflict to date in the Afghanistan war for U.S. and coalition forces, and for Afghan civilians. This year, 2011, is on pace to be the deadliest year of the war. We need to end the war, not sustain it, Mr. Chairman.

We are borrowing $8 billion to $10 billion each month for military operations alone. Borrowing, Mr. Chairman, borrowing. We know we can't sustain that. And we know that the Afghan Government and security forces don't have the resources or the political will to sustain that level of resources once we leave. We need to find a new strategy and purpose to help bring this conflict to an end.

The President and congressional leaders are in negotiations, grappling with how to deal with the national debt. It can't be done if we don't find the means and the political will to end this war sooner rather than later. According to CBO, we could save $1.3 trillion by ending these wars. That's trillion with a ''t,'' Mr. Chairman. We have spent approximately $3.7 trillion since 9/11 in Iraq and Afghanistan. We cannot afford another decade like the last one. It is simply not sustainable.

We need to also understand that jobs and economic security and economic strength are central parts of our national security. While we serve as an ATM machine for a corrupt government in Kabul, we tell our own people that we have no money for roads, and bridges, and schools, and teachers, and police, and firefighters, and jobs here at home. Enough. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support amendments that reduce our spending and military footprint in Afghanistan, help bring our troops home sooner rather than later, and call for a new strategy and a new direction in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I will be submitting for the RECORD two articles, one from the Washington Post entitled ''CBO: Ending the Wars Could Save $1.4 Trillion,'' and an article that appeared in Scientific American entitled ''Legacy of Mental Health Problems From Iraq and Afghanistan Wars Will Be Long-lived.''

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to come together and find a different strategy in Afghanistan, one that will bring our troops home sooner rather than later. It is time to end this war.

[From The Washington Post, June 23, 2011]

CBO: ENDING THE WARS COULD SAVE $1.4 TRILLION

(By Ezra Klein)

It's increasingly clear that a deal on the budget deficit will have to include a lot of spending cuts that Democrats can deny are spending cuts and at least some tax increases that Republicans can deny are tax increases. I'll get to the tax increases in a future post. But if you're looking for the spending cuts, look no further than the wars.

Last night, President Obama *announced* that ''the tide of war is receding,'' and that he will soon bring the Iraq and Afghanistan wars ''to a responsible end.'' Left unsaid is the effect that could have on our projected deficits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we're talking big money: $1.4 trillion, to be exact.

That has less to do with the likely cost of the wars than the way CBO officials estimate future spending. In the case of discretionary spending—which is the pot of money that

goes to the wars—they simply take current spending and assume it grows at the rate of inflation. So though it's clear our wars are winding down, they won't count the savings from them in their projections until there's explicit government policy that winds them down.

But if they can be convinced, they've made clear that they're willing to count big savings. ''In 2010, the number of U.S. troops (active-duty, reserves, and National Guard personnel) deployed for war-related activities averaged about 215,000,'' CBO said its *January budget outlook* (pdf). ''In the alternative scenario presented here, the number of military personnel deployed for war-related purposes would decline over a five-year period to an average of 180,000 in 2011, 130,000 in 2012, 100,000 in 2013, 65,000 in 2014, and 45,000 in 2015 and thereafter. Under this scenario, total discretionary outlays over the 2012–2021 period would be $1.1 trillion less than the amount in the baseline. Debt-service costs would bring the cumulative savings relative to the baseline to about $1.4 trillion over the coming decade.''

I'm told that a big chunk of these savings were included in the debt-ceiling deal that, *until today*, Eric Cantor and Jon Kyl were negotiating with the Democrats. But eventually, we're going to have some kind of deal on the debt ceiling, and I'd bet quite a bit f this money will be in there. The best type of deficit reduction, after all, is the kind you were going to do anyway.

[From the Scientific American, June 27, 2011]

LEGACY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS FROM IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN WARS WILL BE LONG-LIVED

(By John Matson)

As Operation Enduring Freedom, the war on terror in Afghanistan, winds down and some 33,000 U.S. servicemen and servicewomen return from overseas in the next year, a plan announced by President Obama on June 22, the psychological issues that veterans face back home are likely to increase.

Some of the key psychological issues affecting the approximately two million American troops deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 have been traumatic brain injury (TBI), depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (FTSD)—and the diagnoses often overlap. A 2008 report by the RAND Corp. think tank estimated that more than 26 percent of troops may return from the wars on terror with mental health issues.

It is reasonable to expect a continuation of these brain and mental health trends, only multiplied by the anticipated dramatic uptick in returning troops. On top of that, such issues also tend to crop up several months or even years after service members settle in, rather than directly after homecoming, as researchers learned following America's wars in the late 20th century. A false honeymoon can deceive health care workers and family into a perception that all is well among members of the military reentering society stateside.

After the withdrawal of U.S. soldiers from Vietnam in 1973 ''the only thing that happened is that rates of problems went up,'' says George Mason University assistant professor of clinical psychology Keith Renshaw. ''The longer people are back, the more people come forward as potentially struggling.'' A study in the April issue of the Journal of Affective Disorders showed that among service members injured in Iraq or Afghanistan, health care usage—and psychiatric problems—increased over time.

The influx of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan into the military mental health system has yet to peak, but it is already well underway. There is some concern, however, that the health care system is unprepared to handle the care of returning troops. A 2010 report from the Institute of Medicine identified a ''critical shortage of health care professionals—especially those specializing in mental health—to meet the demands of those returning from theater in Iraq and Afghanistan and their family members.''

TBI is especially common: roughly 30,000 servicemembers were diagnosed annually in 2008, 2009 and 2010, according to U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) figures. Most of those diagnoses were for concussions or other relatively mild forms of brain injury. PTSD is also worryingly prevalent—in a RAND survey, 13.8 percent of veterans and returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan met the criteria for PTSD, meaning that some 275,000 U.S. service members may be affected in total.

The RAND report predicted that the mental health needs of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans will increase over time. ''There are a lot of concerns that what we see now are underestimates, if anything,'' Renshaw says.

Many of the afflicted veterans will not seek help, and others will not do so for some time. ''There's a lag time between when people serve and when they actually come in,'' says Shira Maguen, an assistant professor at the University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine and a psychologist at the San Francisco Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center. ''For many of those people there are a lot of barriers at this point, the biggest of which is probably stigma.'' Renshaw notes that some soldiers who remain active in the armed forces resist seeking help because they do not want to endanger their military careers by acknowledging psychological issues. Others seek help in civilian practice rather than in the military health system.

The DoD and the VA have taken steps to prepare for the forecast rise in PTSD cases, highlighting two approaches to treatment—cognitive processing therapy and prolonged exposure therapy—that studies have shown to be effective. And June 27 has been designated National PTSD Awareness Day. ''They're rolling out a massive dissemination effort,'' Renshaw says. ''But I don't think we're at the point that we're ready yet.''

New veterans suffering from PTSD may well fare better than their predecessors who served in Vietnam, as the disorder was only recognized by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980. ''I think we've learned a tremendous amount from Vietnam and from prior conflicts,'' Maguen says. ''I think we're in a unique position now to deal with it.''

Even with lessons learned from Vietnam and the Persian Gulf wars, however, veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom present a special treatment challenge. In some ways the new crop of veterans have had similar combat experiences to Vietnam veterans. Both groups fought in wars without clearly delineated front lines, where ambush and insurgency are a constant threat. But the types of combat exposure have changed, as have the potential triggers for negative psychological reactions later in life. For instance, Renshaw says, the urban component of the wars on terror and the threat of improvised explosive devices have made driving and traffic jams problematic triggers for some veterans. ''Our methodology is still evolving to catch up with the nature of these conflicts,'' he says. ''I think this is something we're going to be working on and dealing with for a long time.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1940

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I join in this effort.

I tell you, without any pride but with humility, that this past weekend I signed 31 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

At this time I have signed over 10,374 letters because of my mistake in voting to send our kids to Iraq, which was an unnecessary war with misinformation led by the previous administration. So I join my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle, and I thank those who offered this amendment.

This past weekend I decided to email my adviser, who is a former commandant of the Marine Corps, and said, What do you think about President Obama's plans?

I will read just two short points to you: ''I think the time is too long. I think he needs to increase the number of troops coming out of the country more and quicker.''

And his last point: ''Get real with training and army and police force. All we are doing is training eventual new members of the Taliban. Trainers are doing a wonderful job, but we don't have the time to make an army. Every day someone dies. Every day an American dies or gets his or her legs blown off.''

Mr. Chairman, to the left of me is a poster that was in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper. Too many times, as we debate and there are eloquent speakers on the floor of the House, but we don't see any faces. We don't see any broken arms or legs.

Here is a young lady holding a little baby in her arms, and the little baby is looking at the officer who is presenting her with a draped flag. How often does this happen throughout America? We never see it.

It is time to bring our troops home. They have done everything they were asked to do by President Bush, to get al Qaeda, who was responsible for 9/11, to get bin Laden. We have done all of that. We have done everything we can do.

And as my friend from Massachusetts said, $10 billion a month and we can't fix the schools, we can't fix the roads here in North Carolina and throughout America.

I'm from North Carolina. I know what's happening to my State. I know what's happening to the other States.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to bring them home. We don't need any more babies coming to their moms and dads and saying, when is daddy coming home? When is mother coming home? And they are being told they are not coming home. They are gone.

They have given their lives for America. We have done enough for Afghanistan. It has a corrupt leader and a corrupt government, and we need to come home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, there will be a number of amendments offered in the next little while by Mr. GARAMENDI, by Ms. LEE, myself and Mr. JONES and by others all in various ways seeking to speed our exit from Afghanistan. I support them all.

Two weeks ago, the President proposed that we continue fighting in Afghanistan for at least 3½ more years. In those 3½ years, more of our soldiers will die, more of our Treasury will be spent and, in the end, we will not be any closer to creating a stable Afghanistan or to enhancing our safety.

The whole premise of this war is wrong. Fighting in Afghanistan does not enhance the security of the United States. Ten years ago we were attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda. Al Qaeda had bases in Afghanistan, and at that time it made sense to go in and destroy those bases, and we did.

But the CIA tells us that there are now fewer than 100 al Qaeda personnel in all of Afghanistan. So why are we still fighting there? Why will we still have 70,000 troops in Afghanistan at the end of 2012, troops who will continue to risk their lives every day in a war that has already claimed too many American lives?

And we will continue pouring billions of dollars into an intractable mess when we should be devoting taxpayer funds to our own economy, to our own jobs, our own housing, our own social programs and our own education.

Afghanistan is in the middle of what is so far a 35-year civil war. If we continue on this course, in 3 years there will be several thousand more American soldiers dead, several hundred billion more dollars wasted, and two or three more provinces labeled pacified.

But as soon as we leave, now, or in 2014, or 2016 or whenever, those provinces will become unpacified. The Taliban and the warlords will step up the fighting, and the Afghan civil war will resume its natural course.

Our troops are fighting valiantly, Mr. Chairman, but they are in the wrong mission. We should recognize that rebuilding Afghanistan is both beyond our ability and beyond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States.

To delay withdrawal of our forces and continue this terrible policy at so high a cost is quite simply unconscionable. It is unjustifiable to sacrifice more lives and more money on this futile endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, we should withdraw our troops now, all of them, as rapidly as physically possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, on March 16, 2011, I joined my cochairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus Task Force on Peace and Security and 76 other Members of Congress in sending a letter to the President asking him to move swiftly to end America's longest war, the war in Afghanistan.

Since then, the cochairs have continued to call on the administration to move towards a significant, swift and sizeable reduction in our troops in Afghanistan, meeting or exceeding the number of troops on the ground before the escalation.

Similarly, the Democratic National Committee, of which I am vice chair, called for a ''sizeable and significant'' drawdown beginning in July. Even the U.S. Conference of Mayors called for an end to the Afghanistan war. In poll after poll, the majority of Americans are consistently calling for an end to this war.

A significant redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan, beginning of this month, would have sent a clear message that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan.

This move would recognize that we cannot afford the war in Afghanistan, costing nearly $10 billion per month, while American families struggle to stay afloat amid the slow recovery of our Nation's economy.

The cochairs of the CPC Task Force on Peace and Security believe that a significant, swift, and sizeable troop reduction in Afghanistan is necessary, especially given the fact that the CBO reported recently that ending the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq will save this country $1.7 trillion, and especially given the fact that a recent Brown University study shows that the United States has spent $3.7 trillion in these wars since 2001.

Anything less hurts our Nation's future and is unacceptable. It is time to focus on securing a future of economic opportunity and prosperity for the American people, and the President must move swiftly and boldly to end the war in Afghanistan and bring our troops home now.

The President's announcement last month does not reflect a significant policy change in Afghanistan. This strategy does not represent a drawdown in Afghanistan, but rather aims at maintaining the status quo through the end of 2012.

Simply removing the 30,000 surge troops from Afghanistan means that by the end of the summer of 2012 we will be exactly where we were in late 2009. Tens of thousands of American soldiers will continue to fight a battle that their commanders insist will only end with a political solution.

Peace in Afghanistan will depend ultimately on an Afghan solution, not on American soldiers. Everyone seems tired of this war, from Republicans and Democrats in Washington, to Afghans in Kabul, to Americans in Kansas. Administration officials acknowledged that due to America's mounting debt and deficits, war costs at nearly $120 billion annually for Afghanistan alone are no longer sustainable.

□ 1950

Republicans gave similar ground with Appropriations Chair HAROLD ROGERS and Defense Subcommittee Member JACK KINGSTON expressing concern about the costs, the mission, and the lack of progress—bolstering Republican Senator DICK LUGAR's call for troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. Nearly half the House weighed in during the recent Defense authorization debate with a call for an accelerated plan to draw down troops and transition to Afghan control.

Moving beyond what Washington wants, consider the Afghans, who are at the receiving end of all of this. After a series of serious civilian casualties resulting from multiple indiscriminate NATO bombings, Afghan President Hamid Karzai had declared opposition to any and all air strikes on Afghan homes. This adds to Karzai's insistence that foreign forces must end night raids, stop unilateral operations, and stay off roads and out of Afghan villages.

The Afghan people are no more pleased than Karzai with America's continued presence, hardly a surprise given that General Petraeus has increased bombing throughout the country by 80 percent in the last year alone. According to a recent poll, nearly six out of 10 Afghans said Western troops must leave on or before the original July 2011 withdrawal date. Only 17 percent say that the deployment should be maintained longer.

After spending hundreds of billions of American tax dollars, the security and day-to-day life in many regions of Afghanistan aren't improving. Crime, economic opportunity, and freedom of movement are getting worse, not better. Availability of electricity, food, medical care, and schools has shown little or no improvement in recent years.

So, for all these reasons and more, the case is clear: We need to end this war in Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and will seek an amendment shortly.

Memorial Day was a time when four of my colleagues and I traveled throughout Afghanistan. We learned a great deal, and what we did learn we brought home.

1,650 American men and women have died in Afghanistan, and yet the incredible dedication of American soldiers was easy to see. They risk their lives every day. And it is with the utmost respect that we honor them on Memorial Day and beyond. I have great respect for the President and recognize

the difficult situation, the decisions that he must make; but, frankly, I think he made the wrong decision.

The killing of bin Laden gave us the opportunity to pivot, to go in the direction that we must ultimately go, which is to focus like a laser on al Qaeda, wherever it is in this world, including our own country. We must do that. And yet the decision to maintain in Afghanistan a troop level that really reflects what existed in 2009 is not sustainable. It's costing us a fortune, a fortune that we can ill afford.

This entire town is caught up in a debate over the deficit and the pending default crisis, and yet we seem to want to continue to pour money into Afghanistan, into a five-way civil war for which there is no military solution. Negotiations are essential. Yet is this country pushing forward the negotiations? If so, it's in secret, and I certainly hope it is there, because therein lies the solution.

I think we don't need 100,000, 50,000, 60,000, troops in Afghanistan. We really only need a handful to focus on al Qaeda, wherever they may be in that region. And so if we were to draw down our troops in the next 18 months to 25,000 in Afghanistan and then 10,000 in 2013, we would begin to get to a level over an appropriate course of time. And it is this House's responsibility to put forth an appropriation bill that provides money for only that, and no more, to limit the funding.

It's pretty clear the President has the power to initiate a war. It's equally clear that we have the only power, the only power to fund the war. And if we say no, then this war will cease. If we say only this amount of money for only this purpose, then this war will rapidly diminish. There will be amendments on the floor shortly to achieve that goal. And we ought to proceed in that way.

We need to rebuild America. We need to bring the money and the troops home and rebuild this Nation. We can do so when this war is over. Until then, this is a sump in which we are pouring the lives of American men and women and even more Afghan men and women and our treasure to the detriment of this Nation's economic strength.

I oppose this war, along with my colleagues, and I would ask this House, Democrat and Republican alike, to use the power of the purse to bring this war to a rapid and appropriate close and fund the negotiations, fund the war on al Qaeda, not the war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue of cost, but I want my colleagues to understand what we are actually paying for military operations in Afghanistan.

We are borrowing $10 billion per month, $2.3 billion per week, $328.3 million per day, $13.7 million per hour, $228,000 per minute. And we are having a debate right now over how we get the debt under control. And these borrowed moneys are not even a subject of discussion. If you want to get the debt down, you've got to deal with these war costs. And I can't believe that for those who are advocating the status quo that they don't want to pay for it, it's going on our credit card, and I think that is unacceptable. This is an enormous cost to us here in our own country.

I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Ms. CHU. I am opposed to the underlying bill because it does not do enough to withdraw our troops from Afghanistan.

Earlier this month, the President made an important announcement. He plans to withdraw 10,000 troops from Afghanistan in the next 6 months and another 20,000 by next summer. This is a step in the right direction, and I commend the President for following through with the drawdown plan.

But the American people are crying for a significant and sizable drawdown, and we are still too far from that. Even after these troops come home, which won't be for another year and a half, we will still be exactly where we were in 2009. Seventy thousand American soldiers will still be serving in Afghanistan, and I can't help but wonder why.

The ongoing financial and human costs of this war are now indefensible. We spend $2 billion a week on the war effort in Afghanistan. And what's worse is that our own money is working against us.

Last year, I was outraged to learn that taxpayers are spending $2.16 billion on private contractors in Afghanistan. These contractors use part of the money to pay off local warlords, which then ends up in the Taliban's hand. So, in effect, we are funding both sides of the same war.

This corruption and waste of hard-earned American dollars is the direct result of unreliable counsel and a lack of perspective, and it's costing us a whopping $100 billion a year. That's five times more than we spend on Pell grants every year, financial aid to put American kids through college. That's double what we spend on Medicaid that keeps all Americans healthy regardless of income. And $100 billion would completely pay for the Homeland Security Department, Commerce Department, Department of Science and the entire judicial branch combined. When money is tight and Congress is trying to slash Medicare and Social Security to keep this Nation afloat, it is irresponsible to keep writing blank checks for this war.

But, sadly, that's not the largest toll of this war. Since 9/11, we've lost over 1,600 American lives. Over 11,000 troops have been wounded, and an untold number of Afghan civilians have lost their lives after a decade of war.

□ 2000

And it is not getting any better. In fact, last year was the most deadly year on record for U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

Al Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan but scattered around the world. It did not take 100,000 troops to find Osama bin Laden, and it does not take a military occupation of Afghanistan to protect us from terrorist threats. By failing to significantly draw down the number of troops in Afghanistan, we continue to focus efforts away from the terrorists and needlessly put American soldiers in the line of fire.

But this story is about more than just numbers and figures; it is about real people who sacrifice everything to keep us safe. On Sunday, April 3, of this year, a 21-year-old young marine named Harry Lew died while serving the country in Afghanistan. He was the son of Sandy and Allen Lew, the brother of Carmen Lew, and he was my nephew.

Harry died while serving on watch duty in Helmand Province. His unit's goal was to provide security to locals and to promote development in the region. But 3 short months before he was set to return home, he was gone.

Ending this war will save American lives. Ending it will let us focus on fighting terrorism around the globe. Ending the war will save money at a time when we need it the most. It is time to end the war in Afghanistan, bring our troops home, and begin seriously addressing our real security needs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate the time, Mr. Chairman, and I rise only because I can't help but be moved by the Progressive Caucus' interest in getting us out of Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

I know of those who are very concerned about America being involved in wars anywhere. It was not my intention to speak about this subject until I heard my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who has an amendment later that would strike the funding for approximately 2½ months of the proposed cost of this effort in Afghanistan.

And as I thought about that, I would want to caution my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, and others, about the role in Afghanistan. Indeed, it is important for us to note, those of us who may have read ''Charlie Wilson's War,'' and I am sure my colleague has read it thoroughly, but Charlie Wilson was a colleague of mine on the Subcommittee on Defense who first raised the prospect of challenges in Afghanistan.

At that point in time, the Soviet Union was attempting to move into Afghanistan to take over that entire country, giving them access to the entire region, a warm water port, and

otherwise. If it had not been for, in my judgment, the effort as a result of Charlie Wilson's war and the efforts of Pope John Paul, who was then the bishop from Poland, perhaps it is very possible that the Soviet Union never would have fallen. But, indeed, Charlie Wilson's war created a circumstance where the Soviets did withdraw from Afghanistan. And so we were right on the edge of opportunity and peace and freedom in Afghanistan.

And what I would caution my colleague from California about is, following that, what did America do? America did what we often do in the world where there is strife and struggle, where we are asked to play a role in leadership, providing for opportunity and change for peace. The vacuum that was left in Afghanistan as a result of our walking away after the war, after the Soviets left, was that vacuum. And within the vacuum, there came terrorists who would have America and freedom in mind. Indeed, as a result of that vacuum, al Qaeda, Taliban, and others got strength and found a terrorist center. And now we are involved in a war that involves the future of the world, not just peace for the world but American peace as well.

Indeed, I would be very cautious as we go about suggesting that we ought to automatically walk away from the commander in chief's plan. Indeed, if we are not careful, the vacuum will catch up with us, and America will find itself in a much broader and a much more intense struggle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIMM). The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to my colleague from California to respond, I would like to mention, and I appreciate Mr. LEWIS' history, but I would suggest to you that al Qaeda could have found a base in Yemen, they could have found a base in the Sudan, they could have found a base in other places. There was nothing particularly unique about Afghanistan that allowed them to have that base there. The fact is that we went into a country to fight al Qaeda, which was all in the mountains in Pakistan, and even in the cities in Pakistan, probably with the knowledge of the Pakistani government, and we have wasted a lot of money and lives in an area where we didn't need to be because that war will continue.

There are only 100 al Qaeda, give or take, left in Afghanistan, but there are al Qaeda in other spots in the Middle East, and al Qaeda's people have plotted terrorist activities from Germany and from other places in Europe. They don't need Osama bin Laden's base to have activity. There is nothing unique with Afghanistan.

As far as the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union went down for goodly reasons, because of all of the money they spent in Afghanistan. True, we were there fighting them; but their attempt at gaining empire, which has been the cause of the loss of many empires, stretching too far and going beyond their supply lines, killed them. They spent money there. And they'd like us to stay there. They are being real nice to us. They're helping us with bases to bring in armaments and troops and supplies.

Come on, America, spend your money. Break your government. Come like we are, broken.

It was a mistake.

I believe that we need to get out of Afghanistan because we are losing lives and money, and doing it for a reason that is not going to make our country any better.

Mr. LEWIS talked about strife in places in Afghanistan. I will tell you about strife—in the United States of America, in my city, in Detroit, in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Chicago. You go to the inner cities of America, and you will see people without hope and without opportunity. That is where infrastructure needs to be built. That is where education needs to be affirmed, not in projects in Afghanistan, but in the United States of America. And that is what the Conference of Mayors said, that we cannot afford this; while our cities go to decay and our people lose their opportunity and our middle class is destroyed, we fight a war in Afghanistan which was the war of another generation, which we should have learned from history and the Soviets' experience and what happened to them. If you don't learn from history, you are doomed to make the same mistakes. I see that happening.

Admiral Mike Mullen said national debt is our biggest security threat. Admiral Mullen: National debt is our biggest security threat.

He said at a breakfast just last month in a tribute to our troops that that is the biggest problem we have. And when you have a problem like that that is a security interest, you go to your biggest spot where you can save money, which is the defense budget, and this war that is draining and has cost us so much—Afghanistan and Iraq.

I have some amendments coming which I am going to offer that would reduce the amount of money that we spend with the forces, and also the amount of money that we spend with the infrastructure and the development there in Afghanistan.

The fact is, just like in Iraq, we put in equipment and buildings and then we leave, and they don't have the ability to maintain those buildings or maintain that equipment, and it goes to waste. We don't need to be wasting our resources, leaving them there where they will just go to waste. We need to spend those resources in America and create jobs in America, and hope and opportunity for America.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I just want to respond to something that Mr. LEWIS said, who is a good friend of mine and whom I respect very much. He talked about the need for us to be cautious. Well, I wish we were more cautious where we committed our young men and women in the field of battle.

It is politicians that put our service men and women in harm's way, and it is politicians that keep this war going. The fact of the matter is that we have an unreliable partner in Afghanistan. President Karzai is corrupt. He fixed the last election. I mean, he is denigrating our service men and women. When I was over there, one of our soldiers from Massachusetts said to me, What bothers me most is we are risking our lives to try to help improve the quality of life of people in this country, and the President of this country, Mr. Karzai, denigrates us, diminishes what we do, calls us names, accused the United States of using nuclear weapons in Afghanistan.

The Massachusetts soldier said to me, Do you know what that feels like?

□ 2010

Look, we need to rethink our policy in Afghanistan. Nobody is talking about walking away. What we're saying is that the current policy of counterinsurgency is going broke.

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

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

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

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from California.

Previously, my good friend with whom I've worked for more than 35 years in various levels of government challenged me on the position I take with regard to winding down quickly the war in Afghanistan. His recitation of history, while accurate, is woefully incomplete.

Much of what we are now fighting was actually begun by Charlie Wilson, morphed over this period of time perhaps by Pakistan. But we're caught in the middle of a civil war, not just a civil war, but a five-way civil war, one that has gone on for at least the last 35 years. We are, as my friend Mr. MCGOVERN just stated, backing a government that is, on the face of it, corrupt by any standard.

So what are we doing here? What is this all about?

In fact, we went into Afghanistan to get al Qaeda, and we did. There is only a handful there. There are probably far more al Qaeda sympathizers—and maybe active members—in the United States than in Afghanistan.

So why do we have over 100,000 American troops and another 40,000 NATO troops in Afghanistan?

I did not suggest that we leave in a vacuum. Instead, I said we leave a

small force behind that goes after al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. Bring our troops back home. Go back to the original mission in Afghanistan. Go after al Qaeda.

You're quite correct, my colleagues. They're in Somalia; they're in Yemen; and they're in other parts of this world. The more troops we have in Iraq and Afghanistan, the more reason we give to those who want to recruit yet more al Qaeda members. This makes no sense going forward. Yes, we will have a continuing obligation, but if you take a look at the strategy that is now in place, one that calls upon America to maintain its troops, then you can count on a larger deficit. That makes no sense to me. Let's bring our troops home rapidly. The amendments that will be on the floor will cause that to happen.

We have the power of the purse here. This Nation can no longer sustain $120 billion a year in Afghanistan when our bridges are crumbling, when our children are not educated, when we cannot afford in the budget you're putting forth to feed our children or to care for our elderly. This war must end, and it must end soon.

I have great respect for the President, but he has got the wrong strategy. He is continuing on the strategy that by the proof on the ground does not work. Pivot. Go back to what we once said was our goal. Get al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. We know we can do it. We have done it.

Anybody who wants to play the al Qaeda game on their side, know that this Nation has the capability to take you out.

My good friend, Mr. LEWIS, the next time you want to recite the history of Afghanistan, recite the full history of Afghanistan, including this Nation's 10-year effort and all of the mistakes that we have made. Let us not compound those mistakes by continuing on the same course for another 3, 4, 5 years and beyond. It's time to end this war. It's time to focus on the true enemy here—al Qaeda.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 122, line 10, strike ''Not'' and insert ''(a) Not''.

Page 124, after line 7, insert the following:

(b) It is the sense of Congress that suicide prevention programs should be a priority of the military departments with respect to reinvesting the efficiency savings described in subsection (a).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. This is a very simple amendment. It clarifies that the Defense suicide prevention programs are a priority and should always remain a priority.

I am not alone in my concern for the rates of suicide among our servicemembers in the active duty, Guard, and Reserve components. I, like some of the rest of you, have had that experience with my own constituency back in the Iowa Reserve.

The Department of Defense has identified large potential savings from improved efficiencies, totaling as much as $100 billion over the next 5 years. Section 8128 directs the Secretary to report to Congress on how it will redirect those savings into priorities of the military departments. However, there is no direction that ensures that the Secretary include existing suicide programs as ''priorities'' for reinvestment from these savings.

This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will remain a priority. We must do everything in our power to reduce the suicide rates of our men and women in uniform, and this amendment fulfills that obligation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill; therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

This amendment proposes to state a legislative position, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, as you might expect, respectfully I rise in opposition to the point of order.

In accordance with clause 2 of rule XXI, this amendment does not make a new appropriation; it does not re-appropriate unused funds; it does not restrict the availability of funds; and it does not change existing law.

In fact, Defense suicide prevention programs have already been authorized by law, for example, the Yellow Ribbon Program, which helps support National Guard and Reserve servicemembers and families. This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will always remain a priority. So I humbly suggest that no one in good conscience could suggest otherwise.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language expressing the sense of Congress.

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

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

□ 2020

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8129. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability.

SEC. 8130. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $6,822,635,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,438,789,000)''.

Page 125, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $445,117,000)''.

Page 125, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $337,774,000)''.

Page 125, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $665,978,000)''.

Page 126, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $103,610,000)''.

Page 126, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $20,878,000)''.

Page 126, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $12,714,000)''.

Page 126, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $13,411,000)''.

Page 127, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $315,703,000)''.

Page 127, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,719,000)''.

Page 127, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $11,012,116,000)''.

Page 127, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,021,929,000)''.

Page 128, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,160,729,000)''.

Page 128, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,010,749,000)''.

Page 128, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,948,995,000)''.

Page 130, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $70,707,000)''.

Page 130, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 130, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $11,731,000)''.

Page 131, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $119,794,000)''.

Page 131, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $10,159,000)''.

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,625,451,000)''.

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $154,418,000)''.

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,161,156,000)''.

Page 138, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $21,099,000)''.

Page 139, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,546,000)''.

Page 139, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $34,740,000)''.

Page 139, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $223,174,000)''.

Page 140, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $6,847,000)''.

Page 140, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $52,352,000)''.

Page 140, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $40,179,000)''.

Page 141, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $210,224,000)''.

Page 141, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,738,000)''.

Page 142, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $15,423,000)''.

Page 142, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $483,835,000)''.

Page 142, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $61,480,000)''.

Page 143, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $941,192,000)''.

Page 144, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,419,000)''.

Page 144, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $8,253,000)''.

Page 145, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $22,523,000)''.

Page 145, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $30,609,000)''.

Page 145, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $133,194,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, relating to the spending reduction account, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $33,000,124,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Let me just first thank Chairman ROGERS, our ranking member, Mr. DICKS, and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in putting together this bill.

I rise today to offer the Lee-Jones amendment, joined by Representatives NADLER; WOOLSEY; OLVER; STARK; JESSE JACKSON, JR.; HONDA; CONYERS; GRIJALVA; PAUL; and AMASH. And I want to thank each of my colleagues for joining Representative JONES and me on this important amendment.

This amendment would end the war in Afghanistan by ending the funding for combat operations but would provide funds to bring our troops home in a safe and orderly manner. And while I would have preferred to offer the Lee amendment, which I have offered in the past—to fence off and to limit funding to the safe, orderly withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan—I was unable to do so today given that we are debating on an appropriations bill. So I want to emphasize again this important point: that while this amendment cuts war funding, it cuts combat operations funding, but it does leave enough funding to provide for the safe and orderly return of all U.S. forces from Afghanistan.

I speak today as the daughter of a lieutenant colonel who fought in several wars, one who knows the trauma and devastation of wars on families. I want to be clear that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and commitment in Afghanistan. They are doing everything we asked them to do. But the truth is that they have been put in an impossible position. They are fighting in a way with no military solution and no end in sight. Only a political and diplomatic solution and a regional stabilization strategy will end this war.

In fact, this concern of ''war without end'' is why I opposed the resolution authorizing military force on September 14, 2001. It began a series of blank checks that we have been writing for nearly a decade now.

There are few things that we know with certainty regarding the situation in Afghanistan:

We know that corruption persists unabated, and in many cases has been fueled by the U.S. occupation and influx of foreign cash. President Karzai has proven himself time and time again unwilling—or, at the very least, unable—to meaningfully root out corruption within his own administration;

We know that the United States troop presence has increased from 4,000 troops in 2002 to almost 100,000 in 2011. At the same time, military and civilian casualties have increased at record rates, and violence is on the rise;

We also know that al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan has been all but eliminated, and Osama bin Laden is dead. It's not feasible or in our national security interest to address this threat through a military-first, boots-on-the-ground strategy in Afghanistan;

And we know, as military and foreign policy experts from across the political spectrum have told us repeatedly, that the situation in Afghanistan will not be resolved by a military solution.

We need to bring our troops home safely and swiftly, and that is why I am offering this amendment.

This war is costing us too much. With over 1,600 troops killed and tens of thousands more seriously wounded in Afghanistan, the human toll continues to mount every day. And we have already spent over $400 billion fighting in Afghanistan. It is past time to admit that we can no longer afford to send more blank checks for a war without end.

The United States has squandered more than $1.1 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Economists estimate that the total direct and indirect costs of these two wars by their end may total as much as $6 trillion.

With no military solution, we need to redirect these funds to job creation and supporting those efforts for the most vulnerable, including those who have been unemployed for over 2 years and have no more unemployment benefits. While we spend $2 billion a week—mind you, $2 billion a week—on this decade-long war, critical programs like Medicare are on the chopping block as we seek to get our Nation's finances in order.

The American people are sick and tired of this war and the massive unending spending that it requires.

Just last month, the United States Conference of Mayors passed a resolution to end the wars and to use the savings to build bridges and schools and infrastructure here at home where it is needed. The resolution specifically calls on the President and the United States Congress to end the wars as soon as strategically possible and bring these war dollars home to meet vital human needs, promote job creation, rebuild our infrastructure, aid municipal and State governments, and develop a new economy based on renewable, sustainable energy and reduce the Federal debt.

We need to bring our troops back and use the savings to address our Nation's fiscal challenges. The American people recognize this. It's time to say that enough is enough. It's time to begin with safe and orderly withdrawal of United States troops from Afghanistan. This amendment does just that by ending the funding of combat operations in

Afghanistan while maintaining funds for a safe and orderly withdrawal.

This is not a cut-and-run amendment. This is a responsible amendment to bring our troops home now. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, helping to bring our servicemen and -women home safely and ending the war in Afghanistan.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has an amendment to reduce the overseas contingency operation—aka the war on terror—by $33 billion. She intends for this amendment to support, as she says, an orderly withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan. However, such a reduction would, in fact, severely disrupt and suspend a redeployment from Afghanistan. The magnitude of her funding reduction would also threaten the ability to support troop pay and safety.

The committee has provided funds to begin the redeployment of troops in Afghanistan. If the redeployment from Afghanistan were to be accelerated, there would be significant increases in personnel, equipment, and transportation costs in fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my dear friend Congresswoman LEE and the rest of the authors.

Congresswoman LEE is a courageous voice for peace in Afghanistan and around the world, and what she says—this is the bottom line of this amendment—is clear: We should not spend one more dime waging war in Afghanistan. The only money we appropriate must be used to wind down the war with the safe, orderly, complete, and long overdue military redeployment out of Afghanistan.

□ 2030

The White House announced about 2 weeks ago that we would have a troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. I believe that announcement was tragically inadequate. Actually, I was hoping to hear that at least 50,000 troops would be coming home by the end of 2011. Instead, the President announced his intention to wait another year, the summer of 2012, before removing the 33,000 troops that were added with the surge. Too slow, too cautious, too modest.

I don't know how much clearer the writing on the wall has to be, Mr. Chairman. Afghanistan remains in terrible disarray, with a terribly corrupt central government and a security force actually incapable of enforcing security. Our military footprint isn't doing enough in Afghanistan. It is actually causing more harm than good. Meanwhile, the human cost here at home is nothing short of devastating. Casualties have spiked. Americans are dying in Afghanistan at an unacceptable rate, more than 200 troops so far this year and over 1,600 troops since the war began nearly a decade ago.

And, Mr. Chairman, making it home alive doesn't mean making it home whole. Thousands upon thousands of servicemembers will spend the rest of their lives coping with the wounds and the scars they acquired in this unnecessary war. Many have left limbs behind in Afghanistan. Others will never regain their mental health or their peace of mind, suffering the devastating effects of PTSD.

Why would we continue to throw another dollar at a war that has done so much to hurt our people and Afghan civilians and done so little to help Afghanistan in general? This week, as a matter of fact, all of Washington is abuzz about the debt ceiling negotiations. Commentators are asking us, where will we find consensus that preserves the full faith and credit of the United States of America? Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus in the United States, a consensus among the American people, and that is that the $10 billion a month that we're spending in Afghanistan is roughly $10 billion too much. But war spending is not on the table in these talks. Instead, Medicare cuts are on the table, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are clinging tight to loopholes and subsidies for oil companies, corporate jets, and the horse racing industry. Their spending priorities are just totally warped.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to bring all this in line with the priorities of the American people. It's time to end this war. It's time to stop investing money that we need right here at home, and it is time to invest only in bringing our troops home safely.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I won't take 5 minutes.

I rise to speak in support of the Lee amendment, which I have the honor of cosponsoring. My views on Afghanistan, I expressed a little while ago, but I just want to make a couple of comments.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) said we have to be careful, that we have to be wary of a vacuum should we pull out. He analogized it to what happened with the Soviets when the Soviets lost and there was a vacuum because we turned our backs on it. And he was right. We should not have turned our backs on helping, on helping with schooling and other things in Afghanistan at that time. But the fact of the matter is the world's history is full of empires that threw away their substance on silly military adventures. This is a silly military adventure. It's a total waste, because it is a classic, where we are fighting when we have forgotten why we are fighting.

We went into Afghanistan to get rid of the al Qaeda bases. That took a week. For good measure we spent another week and got rid of the Taliban government. And now what are we fighting for for the last 8 years? To put a government in our image? It's not going to happen. To install and see that there is a government that can rule from Kabul? There hasn't been a government in Kabul who has run the entire country since Alexander the Great. That's not going to happen.

We can't settle their civil war, which has now gone on for 35 years, nor will settling their civil war aid our security, which we can't do anyway, and we don't have to. Our security is fighting the terrorists, but the terrorists are all over the place. And maybe we have to, if they develop a base in Pakistan, maybe we have to bomb it or send in special forces. Ditto for Somalia, Yemen, or God knows where.

Every sovereign country as a condition of its sovereignty must make sure that its territory is not used to attack someone else, and if territory of some country is being used to attack us, or to plot mayhem against us, we have the right and the duty, if necessary, to deal with that. But that's not the question in Afghanistan. The CIA, as I said before, tells us there are fewer than 100 people there. Why do we need 70,000 troops? Those troops could be better occupied back home in the United States training, helping fight disasters. Our money could be better occupied dealing with our serious fiscal problems, building up our infrastructure, building up our schools, building up our social services, and even building up our military for real threats.

There are real threats in the world. Pakistan is dangerous because they have nuclear weapons. We have to pay attention to it. But I fail to see any purpose whatsoever for having tens of thousands of troops, tens of billions of dollars in Afghanistan where we vanquished the enemy 10 years ago. We ought to declare victory, we should have pulled out, and we should do so right now.

I thank the gentlelady for her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,695,031,000)''.
Page 125, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $348,845,000)''.
Page 125, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $264,718,000)''.
Page 125, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $521,937,000)''.
Page 126, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $81,201,000)''.
Page 126, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $16,362,000)''.
Page 126, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,964,000)''.
Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,511,000)''.
Page 127, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $247,421,000)''.
Page 127, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,698,000)''.
Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,662,596,000)''.
Page 127, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,584,616,000)''.
Page 128, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $909,681,000)''.
Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,359,569,000)''.
Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,527,457,000)''.
Page 130, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,414,000)''.
Page 130, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,674,000)''.
Page 130, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,193,000)''.
Page 131, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $93,884,000)''.
Page 131, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,962,000)''.
Page 138, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,748,000)''.
Page 139, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,697,000)''.
Page 139, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $113,688,000)''.
Page 140, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,488,000)''.
Page 140, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $26,669,000)''.
Page 140, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,468,000)''.
Page 141, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $107,091,000)''.
Page 141, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,414,000)''.
Page 142, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,857,000)''.
Page 142, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $246,473,000)''.
Page 142, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,319,000)''.
Page 143, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $737,626,000)''.
Page 144, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $723,000)''.
Page 144, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,204,000)''.
Page 145, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,474,000)''.
Page 145, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,593,000)''.
Page 145, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $104,386,000)''.
Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,887,651,000)''.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with reading the rest of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2040

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank my colleagues for bringing that recitation to an end, but I also urge my colleagues to pay careful attention to what we're trying to accomplish here. I'll try to explain it without reading each and every one of those lines.

The Afghan Study Group, Richard Haas and many others who are very familiar with the Afghanistan war and the way in which it is being conducted have suggested that by the end of 2012, America should have no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan and then further, wind down the war in 2013 to 10,000 troops focused on terrorists, focused on al Qaeda.

As I spoke a few moments ago on this issue, this amendment is to accomplish that goal, to wind down the war in a responsible way over the next 18 months so that at the end of the 18 months—that would be December 31, 2012—that there'd be no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan.

Now, unfortunately, I can't add the rest of it, but I will at least give the reason for this. And that is to pivot on the success of getting bin Laden. We went to Afghanistan to get al Qaeda. We succeeded. And now we are involved in a civil war, a great civil war, a five-sided civil war, maybe a six- or seven-sided civil war; and we are supporting a government in that war that is at best corrupt and quite possibly even more inept. So what are we doing there besides spending $120 billion a year?

Well, we are kind of fighting it out. We're losing a lot of Americans, and even more Afghans are dying. We're not going to be able to solve this with troops on the ground. This war needs to be negotiated. As much effort as we are spending on the troops, we should spend on negotiations. Unfortunately, little or no negotiations are going on that are at least talked about publicly; and I would hope they're going on privately, secretly, but I don't think that to be the case.

So we need a negotiated settlement; we need to pivot on the success of bin Laden. We need to focus like a laser on al Qaeda wherever they happen to be in the world. And we know that they are in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, other places in the world—including the United States. So our focus must be on that, not on this civil war. We cannot solve it with our troops in Afghanistan.

This amendment would cause us, as Members of Congress, to exert the authority given to us by the Constitution, that is, the power of the purse, and by denying funding for more than 25,000 troops at the end of 2012, we will accomplish the goal of rapidly, appropriately winding down the war. Not my words, but the words of the Afghan Study Group and Richard Haas—people who know these issues.

We must do this for our own good, for the good of this Nation. We're sitting here in the midst of a great debate upon a default crisis, a back-and-forth about how do we deal with the deficit. Well, one way we can deal with the deficit is to end this war; $120 billion a year adds up to a third of a trillion dollars in just 3 years. We're not suggesting we can get that. We know we're going to have to maintain some sort of a presence there.

But surely we don't need to spend $120 billion in Afghanistan when in our own country we are denying our children an education for lack of money. We are denying our elderly the health care that they need, for example, terminating Medicare for lack of money. We are not feeding our children; ''60 Minutes'' recently did a heart-wrenching story on homeless children living in cars and hotels in America because their parents have lost their jobs.

We have an unemployment rate that demands our attention, demands our investment in America, rebuilding America's bridges, roads, rebuilding our manufacturing sector, making it in America once again, rebuilding the real strength of this Nation, its economy, and the middle class so that they can have jobs that will allow them to stay in their homes, provide for their children, live the good American life.

We must end this war. We must first wind it down. Were this more than an appropriation bill, I would have gone to step two, which is 10,000 at the end of 2013 with a mission that is the original mission, that is, going after the terrorists, not nation-building. We must, as the President said, rebuild our Nation. And unlike the President, this amendment offers us the opportunity to use our money to rebuild this Nation.

By the way, for you deficit hawks, it's all borrowed money. You're borrowing money for Afghanistan, or you're borrowing money to rebuild this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We oppose this amendment for the same reason we opposed the gentlewoman's amendment from California on the last. It would be highly disruptive to our troops and, I think, put them at great risk for their personal safety. So we oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $919,034,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $675,360,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $1,436,353,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $207,162,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $44,530,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $25,421,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $26,815,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $646,879,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $9,435,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $39,175,755,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 149, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

Mr. WELCH (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, one of the central questions that Congress must address is whether to continue the policy and nation-building in Afghanistan. As previous speakers have indicated, it's expensive. It's also very questionable as to whether it's anything but a failure.

□ 2050

The cornerstone of the nation building program is the Commander's Emergency Response Program. That gives the commanders flexibility, at their own discretion, to authorize significant infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, the goal being to win hearts and minds of the Afghan citizens. When you lay it out by its intentions, it's a very reasonable tool to provide to our commanders. The problem is the evidence is in, and it has been a failure.

The $400 million Commander's Emergency Response Program, CERP, is a central component of what I believe is a failed nation building strategy. And the fundamental question here is this: Does the Defense appropriations bill double down on the nation building approach which has been drawn into such question?

Now, of the CERP development dollars, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, about half of the CERP projects reviewed were unsustainable and fell into disrepair immediately following their transfer into Afghan hands. That failure of sustainment is real, and it is not subject to something that we can control here.

So the question that we have to ask on behalf of our military strategy is, is the money being used in a way that's effective? From the perspective of the Afghans, is it being used on projects that are sustainable? And the evidence, on the basis of our SIGAR report, is the answer is ''no.'' And it's not surprising. You know, we've got to get a bit real about this, whatever your position is on Afghanistan. If you have a government that has no infrastructure of civil service, that doesn't even have the capacity to do the sustainment, they don't have a civil service that can go out and maintain and repair the roads and other projects, is it realistic to expect that they will?

When you have a government that is corrupt, for whatever reason, but where the money that gets injected by the U.S. taxpayer into these projects, with the best of intentions, gets siphoned off into paying off people who have positions of authority, is that a wise use of our taxpayer dollar? Is it going to help our military ultimately be successful? So the question that we have a responsibility to answer is whether this tool of nation building makes sense.

One of the other questions that I think is fair to ask: Many of us have been to Afghanistan, and we've met with some of our USAID people, our State Department people who are out there, our military people of course, trying to implement these projects, Mr. Speaker. The amount of security that is required in order to allow people to do the simplest of projects in the middle of a shooting war is an enormous expense. And the question that comes to mind for me, and I think many Americans, is this: Does it make sense to do these infrastructure projects, these hearts and minds projects in the middle of a shooting war, or are those things that have to be done before or after? That's really the question.

So the intention of this program makes sense. The flexibility for our commanders they see as desirable. It is a tool that they can use. But we have had 10 years now of history. We have had a fully blown report by SIGAR that has said it just doesn't work. It just doesn't work.

So is it time for this Congress to call the question about the wisdom and the efficacy of this nation building tool, the CERP programs that fall into disrepair immediately upon their completion?

Our amendment calls the question, Mr. Speaker. And it would cut in half, which is about the amount that's documented to be wasted, the amount that is spent by U.S. taxpayers on these nation building activities in Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under section 3(j) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, because the amendment does not merely propose to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill, but also proposes language other than the amounts.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on this point of order? The Chair will rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations from an object or objects in the bill to a spending reduction account. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont proposes other changes to the bill, namely changing the level of a limitation, it may not avail itself of section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5 to address the spending reduction account. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000) (increased by $15,000,000)''.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment tonight that will save both blood and an immense amount of money. The amendment I am introducing along with Congressman BLUMENAUER designates already authorized funds in the amount of $15 million to be used to insulate the shelters at forward operating bases in Afghanistan. Properly insulating military shelters can significantly reduce energy consumption, which in turn can decrease the number of vulnerable fuel convoys needed to support our troops.

These fuel convoys cost us dearly. They are an absolutely vital supply link to our troops in the field, but they are exposed to constant and devastating attack. Despite the Pentagon spending $24 billion a year to protect fuel convoys in Afghanistan, more than 3,000 troops and civilian contractors have been killed or wounded while riding on convoy. What's more, fully two-thirds of the fuel used in Afghanistan goes to provide electricity for air-conditioning and heat at military installations. If we can reduce the energy required to heat and cool shelters in the field, then we can reduce the number of vulnerable fuel trucks needed to support the operations. Simply put, insulating the structures in the field will save lives of people who will not be on convoys to be attacked.

We will also save money. Properly insulated shelters use up to 92 percent less energy for their heating and cooling. With more than 200,000 gallons of diesel fuel used every day to power our forward operating bases in Afghanistan, insulating our field shelters has the potential to significantly reduce fuel consumption. A similar insulation effort in Iraq has led to almost $1 billion a year in savings and has taken more than 11,000 fuel trucks off the road. This in turn has helped to prevent an estimated 458 casualties in Iraq.

A little arithmetic will show you that this $15 million invested in insulating the shelters in the forward bases in Afghanistan should save several billion dollars in costs, as well as thousands of lives.

I want to thank Congressmen BLUMENAUER, HINCHEY, and WELCH for their support of this amendment. Together, the amendment provides a commonsense way to reduce fuel consumption across the war zone. This would save about two-thirds of the 200,000 gallons used a day. With the total cost of fuel sometimes exceeding $400 a gallon in Afghanistan, including the transport costs, and thousands of casualties suffered by fuel convoys, a small investment of $15 million in energy efficient insulation can go a long way in saving thousands of lives and upwards of billions of dollars in resources.

I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

□ 2100

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very, very similar to one that the House rejected earlier today.

The project that would be funded by this amendment, by the shifting of this money, is not an authorized program to begin with. But even if it were, the Army's O&M account in the OCO portion of the bill is funded at over $39.1 billion.

And should this project remain in the final authorization bill and the Department concurs that it is a high enough priority, then there simply are ample funds to cover it with the $39.1 billion.

So I see no reason for this amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GARDNER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $6,749,489,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $3,571,210,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $10,739,587,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $9,312,876,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading:

(1) Not to exceed $12,500,000 for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund, to be used in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) Not to exceed $1,750,000,000, to remain available until expended, for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access provided to United States military operations in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the requirement to provide notification shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000,000)''.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the money that we give Pakistan. It specifically deals with the reimbursement account that the United States pays for the war on terror to reimburse Pakistan for the spending that they do and the money that they request back from the United States, specifically takes $1 billion out of the reimbursement account and applies it to the reimbursement or, excuse me, the Spending Reduction Act.

Since May 2, when Osama bin Laden was taken out and we learned more about the role that Pakistan is playing—or, shall I say, not playing—in the war on terror, they have become more and more an unfaithful ally. President Bush said, when the war on terror began, to the countries throughout the world, either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.

Pakistan has yet to prove which side they are really on, so much so that when Osama bin Laden was taken out by the American military, we did not trust Pakistan enough to even tell them that we were going to come into their country. Our distrust against that country has been proven over and over again since that date.

On May 16, the Wall Street Journal reported that over 40 percent of the money that Pakistan requests for reimbursement for military aid is denied by the Federal Government because those claims are unfounded by the Federal Government. In one case last year, the United States paid millions of dollars to refurbish four helicopters to help Pakistan's Army transport troops into battle against the Taliban, but it turned out that Pakistan diverted three of those aircraft to peacekeeping duties in Sudan operations for which Pakistan receives compensation from the United Nations.

Other claims include a $26 million charge for barbed wire and pickets and $70 million for radar maintenance, although there is no enemy air threat related to the war on terror.

And on May 22, 15 to 20 militants stormed three hangars at the naval aviation base in Karachi. It took the Pakistan military over 15 hours to end that siege.

Two U.S. P–3Cs were destroyed. The P–3C is an anti-submarine and marine surveillance aircraft. Some reports now indicate it was an inside job, as the terrorists had military uniforms and knew exactly where the planes were located.

Then on June 14, reports confirmed that Pakistan now has arrested CIA informants that helped us locate Osama bin Laden, where he had been living under the eyes of the Pakistan military for years.

As reported in The New York Times on June 14, ISI arrested 30 Pakistani informants who helped the United States capture bin Laden. One was a Pakistani Army major who officials said copied the license plates of cars visiting bin Laden's compound at Abbottabad.

Then further, in June, when CIA Director Leon Panetta went to Pakistan to inform them that there was a factory that was making bombs or IEDs that could be used against Americans, by the time the Pakistani troops showed up, the militants had disappeared.

Not to be outdone, we told them again about a second place where IEDs were being made, more bomb-making facilities only days later, and once again the terrorists picked up and disappeared. Sounds like they had inside information.

And lastly, on June 29, Pakistan asked the United States to shut down a drone base that it had in Islamabad and ended U.S. operations at the Shamsi Air Base. Although the United States denies that occurred, Pakistan's defense minister said that it has ended those operations. And, of course, drones carry out strikes against the Taliban and al Qaeda militants on Pakistan's border with Afghanistan.

And lastly, Transparency International has rated 178 countries on corruption, and Pakistan, our so-called ally, is rated the 143rd most corrupt, beating out, of course, Bangladesh and Nigeria, who have less corruption in their governments.

So we are dealing with a corrupt government. We don't know where our money is going. It may end up in the hands of people who hate us. It's being wasted. The Pakistan military, the Pakistan Government is trying to play at least two sides: our side, their side. They may be on a third side, who knows. But a billion dollars that we send them for so-called reimbursement of the war on terror, we can stop that. They are an unfaithful ally.

Only 17 percent of the Pakistani citizens say they even like the United States. That puts 83 percent that do not like the United States. We don't need to pay the Pakistan people to hate us. They will do it on their own.

So we no longer need to fund them. We need to take a billion dollars out of this account and put it into the deficit reduction spending account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The bill includes approximately $2.4 billion to support the Pakistani military. Of this amount, 1.1 billion is for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund and approximately 1.3 billion is provided through Coalition Support Funds.

The Pakistani Counterinsurgency Fund provides for the training and equipping of Pakistani forces specifically to aid U.S. counterterrorism objectives. Coalition Support Funds are used to reimburse the Pakistani military for operations which generally support U.S. counterterrorism objectives.

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's killing by U.S. Special Forces, serious questions have arisen about Pakistan's reliability as a strategic partner. And I must say that I agree with much of what the gentleman from Texas has just said.

The relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult, but maintaining the relationship is essential. This relationship helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism, and the Pakistanis have allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to this mission.

A complete withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts with their military and their government generally. Aggravating this divide would be counterproductive to U.S. objectives in the region, and we must remember that they are also a nuclear power.

In addition to the counterterrorism activity, the fact of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capabilities provides ample reason for the U.S. to continue to try and engage Pakistan.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2110

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The ranking member, Mr. DICKS, has eloquently pointed out why we are opposing this amendment. But like Mr. DICKS and like Mr. POE, the author of the amendment, I couldn't agree more. If this language included the word Pakistan, I would probably have to have a different attitude on this amendment because I share those concerns and I share them strongly. However, I understand the importance of our coalition and the coalition support fund that we have agreed to and the importance of maintaining that agreement.

But I would say that someone at a higher level who deals diplomatically with other countries, including Pakistan, has dropped the ball somewhere. I agree with Mr. POE, but I just don't think that we can be in a position where we can renege on our agreements and arrangements with our coalition partners, because they are very important to us and to the missions that we face.

So as reluctant as I might be because I share Mr. POE's thoughts, I also will oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $217,500,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $74,148,000:

Provided, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $36,084,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $142,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $387,544,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $34,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated $5,000,000,000 for the ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'' for expenses directly relating to overseas contingency operations by United States military forces, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds made available in this section, the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, and working capital fund accounts: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, that the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to such transfer: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE. I want to once again thank Mr. ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this bill. Let me also thank my colleagues who are joining Representative JONES and me on this bipartisan amendment: Representatives WOOLSEY, OLVER, HONDA, GRIJALVA and PAUL.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer the Lee-Jones amendment to redirect the $5 billion of the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund into a deficit reduction account. This amendment does nothing to undermine the efforts that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and with extreme commitment in Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world. They have done everything asked of them. And as the daughter of a military veteran, I take any matters that affect our troops very, very seriously.

But supporting our troops does not mean giving a blank check to the Pentagon. I have consistently said that we cannot afford to give any more blank checks to the Defense Department.

This amendment is about eliminating a giant $5 billion check with a blank memo to fight the global war on terror anywhere, at any time, without any accountability. The Department of Defense just has to notify Congress that these funds are being transferred.

This $5 billion giveaway, which is what it is, it's like a slush fund, it's like a war slush fund, another giveaway to the Pentagon. It's a $5 billion check to use as it pleases with little or no congressional oversight. There's no accountability in how these funds are spent. While we understand that the Pentagon needs flexibility to address terrorist threats to this Nation and around the world, we need not create a separate slush fund, mind you, to do it. The flexibility has been given elsewhere in this bill, including $119 billion in flexibility in this appropriations bill, a tremendous amount, at a time when we are cutting aid to American families who need assistance with buying food or receiving health care and also during a time when there are many calling for cuts in Medicare.

We already have a process in place for the Pentagon to get additional funds, as needed, outside of this appropriations bill; and the Congress has consistently responded well to the needs of the military. But Congress does not need to create a $5 billion war slush fund. The Pentagon can incorporate its work to fight terrorism globally into its budget while taking steps to rein in waste, fraud, and abuse in an already bloated budget.

Sixty cents of every dollar of discretionary funds is already handed over to the Pentagon. There's no doubt that this war slush fund would give rise to opportunities for waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon, such as the more than $300 billion in major weapons system cost overruns identified by GAO.

It's time to address the culture of unlimited spending and no accountability at the Pentagon. Being strong on defense does not mean we have to give a free pass for irresponsible spending.

During such austere times, does the Pentagon really need another slush fund? Why can't the Pentagon budget for its wars, budget for preventing terrorist attacks? It's time to hold the Defense Department accountable for its bloated budget and rein in waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon by ending this war slush fund before it ever gets started.

I think the American people would be shocked to know what's taking place in this budget, especially this $5 billion in war funding that's just put aside for the Pentagon to use as it pleases.

And so I hope my colleagues will vote ''yes'' to end this slush fund, and let's begin to start reining in these blank checks for the Pentagon. We're asking people who are vulnerable, we're asking our senior citizens, we're asking low-income individuals, we're asking everyone in this country to pay for this deficit and this debt. And we know how we got there.

But we need to really start beginning to look at deficit reduction in a real way, and in a way that is balanced, as the President said. And I don't think allowing a $5 billion slush fund really moves us in the correct direction. It really is, I think, a sad day to think that we would allow for the Pentagon to have a $5 billion slush fund when we cut funding for women and children and people who are hungry, when we won't extend unemployment for people who have exhausted their 99 weeks of unemployment compensation.

I can remember asking the Speaker to allow us to vote for unemployment compensation that would provide for 14 additional weeks of unemployment, but we were told there's no money and that was somewhere between 16, you know, to 20 billion that should have been designated as an emergency. Now we're dealing with a $5 billion slush fund. So I ask for an ''aye'' vote to use this money for deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't call this a slush fund. This is not an additional fund that was added by the subcommittee at the request of the Pentagon or the Department of Defense.

When the subcommittee analyzed the request at our hearings and in the subsequent material provided us to justify the budget of the Defense Department for the overseas contingency operations, we had a strong disagreement. We did not think that their figures were well thought out. So rather than appropriate that $5 billion that they requested, we moved it to what we call this transfer fund. It is not any additional money; it is just taken out of one account and put into another account. This transfer fund is to give the Defense Department some flexibility when they do get their facts and figures together on what the actual costs are.

□ 2120

Now, the $5 billion, again, is not a slush fund. They can't spend this money without reporting back to Congress. Any money spent from this transfer fund must be reported to Congress, and Congress has 15 days in which to respond to that request.

This was done to try to make sure that we had what they needed, that the Defense Department had what they needed for the overseas contingency operations, but that they had to justify exactly how they were going to use the money. And to the contrary, rather than being the potential slush fund, this is definitely not a slush fund, and so I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, war is not predictable. We have men and women today engaged in combat. And I am a combat veteran with the United States Marine Corps. I served in the first gulf war, and I served in the Iraq war. I wish that war was predictable. I wish we knew what the enemy was going to do and when they were going to do it, but we don't know that. This is a dedicated fund to the global war on terror. It provides flexibility that is necessary for our commanders in the field at this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and would hope that it would be voted down.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund''. For the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'', $475,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such sums shall be available for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, requiring funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, water, power, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: *Provided further*, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That any projects funded by this appropriation shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for purposes of undertaking projects, which funds 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: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 635(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committees of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of the section the ''appropriate committees of Congress'' are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the Defense appropriations bill is one of our primary funding bills to help protect our country against threats. However, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, correctly said that our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

With that said, finding dollars that can be diverted from lower priorities to apply to deficit reduction will indeed make America safer. This amendment will reduce funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by $200 million and return those funds to help reduce the deficit. That is $200 million to help reduce the deficit.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was established to provide funds for infrastructure projects, and some reports also indicate funds could be used for other purposes; but, predominantly, they are for infrastructure purposes. My amendment does not completely eliminate funding. It keeps over $200 million in the infrastructure fund, but it reduces it so we can take a serious look at how we can achieve savings to reduce the deficit in funds spent overseas that are not being used properly and effectively.

With the death of Osama bin Laden, there is not a need for a large U.S. presence in Afghanistan. In fact, the killing of Osama bin Laden was the biggest deficit reduction action this country has known if we take advantage of that action and act on it to make it into a deficit reduction action. We need to rethink our goals and strategy in Afghanistan.

According to the World Bank, 97 percent of Afghanistan's gross domestic product is derived from military funding and foreign assistance—97 percent. If we build a vast infrastructure in Afghanistan, they will not be able to sustain it after we leave. The American people should not have to fund that infrastructure while sitting in traffic in our own Nation, in gridlock, seeing schools in disrepair, hospitals that can't provide services, and watching our own infrastructure crumble—infrastructure that can create and does create jobs carrying goods to market and providing jobs in America.

If House rules permitted, I would direct some of these funds toward building our own infrastructure. That's what we need to do. But that's not the case. The Afghan Government cannot spend all that we are giving to it, and our funding is only fueling corruption and profiteering.

Mr. POE mentioned Pakistan being third from the bottom ahead of Nigeria and another nation. Afghanistan is right there with them. They are fighting for the third to last place. Afghanistan is historically a corrupt nation, and what fosters corruption is money and the moneys that we give them; and 97 percent comes from us. It is going into the pockets of people who aren't

using it to build that infrastructure to help their own people. We are fostering corruption. Afghans could build their own infrastructure for far less than we are investing.

We need to pull back some of this funding to focus on our domestic priorities, but we need to be concerned about our deficit. Let's keep America safe and strong on all fronts.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join with me in a bipartisan effort, stretching from Florida to Tennessee, the width of the Southeastern Conference, and Conference U.S.A., I may say as well for central Florida. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the AIF, Infrastructure Fund for Afghanistan was created by this Congress in the FY 2011 House-passed authorization bill. It was again fully authorized in the FY 2012 House-passed authorization bill. We support the objectives of Operation Enduring Freedom, including the Afghan Security Forces Fund. This is a counterinsurgency tool that General Petraeus placed the highest priority on when he recommended that we create the AIF in place of the CERP, the Commanders Emergency Response Program. So we did that. We took money from the CERP, put the money into the AIF as part of General Petraeus's counterinsurgency program.

So we think this is not a good amendment, and we are opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against my colleague from Tennessee's amendment.

General Petraeus testified before the House Armed Services Committee and stated that the current counterinsurgency strategy employed by U.S. forces and NATO in Afghanistan is seeing success.

I was there in mid-April; and having been there since 2005 through that time frame, the narrative there today is better than it has been since I started going over there in 2005. What we are doing there is working. The Afghan Infrastructure Fund is key to General Petraeus' counterinsurgency campaign as improvements to Afghanistan's infrastructure is necessary to obtain support from the local populace. General Petraeus' successful counterinsurgency strategy is dependent on the local populace and the intelligence they provide.

Visible development projects increases the Afghan Government's legitimacy in relation to the Taliban, especially since these projects are conducted in areas vulnerable to Taliban influence. Furthermore, economic development increases security in Afghanistan by providing jobs for former insurgents and building markets for alternative crops to opium, thus reducing corruption.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The House Armed Services Committee has fully authorized this program. The House Appropriations Committee has gone through this bill with a fine-tooth comb. They believe that these funds will be properly used and properly supervised in the building of Afghan infrastructure as we continue to put in place the system we need so that when we leave, and we will leave, the Afghan people can sustain what we are doing.

One of the messages I got when I was there in April, unlike some of the previous efforts, we will build things to Afghan standards. That is not meant to be a pejorative; it is meant to face reality. When you build a road to U.S. standards, they cannot maintain that road to U.S. standards. But when you build a road to Afghan standards, they can in fact maintain that infrastructure. That is the new paradigm that they are working off of. Good enough for Afghanistan is not a pejorative; it is simply facing a reality that this country is different from the United States, and infrastructure projects there will be built to those Afghan standards.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2130

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $475,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $475,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Afghanistan policy that is funded in the fiscal year 2012 Defense appropriations bill. I join the efforts of my colleagues in a variety of amendments designed to accelerate the end of the war in Afghanistan.

For more than 9 years now, our troops have been executing the American mission in Afghanistan with bravery, dedication and extraordinary competence; but what started out as a ''quick war'' in 2001 to bring Osama bin Laden to justice and to dismantle al Qaeda in Afghanistan has turned into the longest war in United States history. The original mission has now been largely accomplished, and with bin Laden's death in Pakistan, this provides an opportunity to reexamine our ongoing mission in Afghanistan, which some estimates indicate is costing us in excess of $8 billion per month.

We should no longer be sending billions of American taxpayer dollars to the Afghan people for their schools, their hospitals, their roads, bridges, and police at the expense of making those same investments in our own country, especially when the Afghanistan Government, under the leadership of President Karzai, has proven itself incredibly corrupt.

In fact, Transparency International ranked Afghanistan the third most corrupt country in the world; and The New York Times recently reported about a road construction project, just one example in Afghanistan, funded by American taxpayers. It's a 64-mile-long project and is expected to cost $176 million to build, which comes to $2.8 million a mile. Undisclosed amounts of money have gone to pay off local strongmen to buy security while the project is ongoing, and it was reported that the people collecting these bribes staged attacks on the construction crews in order to make the bribes necessary in the first place.

With this kind of corruption and many other examples, we simply cannot afford to finance the infrastructure projects associated with this war. Don't forget, Mr. Chairman, that on top of everything else we're not even paying for this war. It's actually being financed on the national credit card. These are difficult economic and budgetary times. It is time to reassess U.S. involvement in Afghanistan so that we can focus on rebuilding our own economy, putting Americans back to work, and making sure our Nation can compete in the 21st century.

That is why I'm offering this amendment today, which will strike $475 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Vital investments to our country's economic stability, the education of our children, the health of our seniors, and the employment of our workforce have time and again been put on the chopping block in this Congress. We're told that we can't afford to adequately repair our crumbling infrastructure here in America; we're told that Pell Grants and student loans are too expensive; and we're told that we need to change the safety nets for our Nation's seniors and most vulnerable populations—and in the same

breath, we're told we should continue to borrow billions and billions of dollars for nation-building in Afghanistan. What we really should be doing is nation-building right here at home. Instead of building roads and bridges and hospitals and schools halfway around the world in Afghanistan, we should be investing resources on the urgent needs of our own country.

Budgets are a reflection of our priorities.

Are we going to pay down our Nation's debt? Are we going to make the much needed investments in our own roads and bridges and ports? Are we going to protect our seniors? Are we going to ensure that access to college remains affordable? If we continue to spend billions and billions of dollars in Afghanistan, then we cannot have a balanced discussion of these priorities and these choices.

As we debate the merits of raising the debt ceiling and as we consider our domestic priorities, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which strikes $475 million from nation-building in Afghanistan in order to keep those dollars right here at home—to invest in our future and to reduce our debt.

There was a recent report, Mr. Chairman, done by the Eisenhower Research Project at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies just this past week. This group's cost of war project has released new figures for a range of costs associated with U.S. military responses to September 11, including our activities in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. They project that the wars will cost Americans between $3.2- and $4 trillion and cost 225,000 lives.

It is time to end this spending. It is time to make these investments in infrastructure in our own country, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This is pretty much the same debate we just had. The difference is that this particular amendment just eliminates the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund altogether, and the other amendment didn't do that.

This account, this Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, was created by Congress in the fiscal 11 authorization bill and again in the fiscal 12 authorization bill—which we just passed a few weeks ago—at the request of General Petraeus, who made this one of the most important parts of his counterinsurgency strategy. Now, if you don't believe that General Petraeus knows what he's talking about, then maybe you should vote for this amendment; but those of us who have watched General Petraeus skillfully function as the leader in Iraq and there again at Central Command and there again in Afghanistan, we believe that this is not a good amendment and that it should be defeated, the same as the other amendment that we just defeated, so I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. This amendment is very similar to the one we just debated except as to the amounts, and it does strike the entire infrastructure account. I would like to make a couple of points that I didn't make earlier with respect to the previous amendment.

None of the conversation that I was ever aware of prior to bin Laden's death remotely said that the war was over or that the fight was over if we killed bin Laden. Had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle been making that argument from start one, then it might have some validity to it; but quite frankly, that was just a marker in this long fight against Islamic jihadists and these terrorists.

The other issue of invoking past costs, or sunk costs, is informative as to how we got to this point in time and as to looking at where we go from here to when we have all American troops out of there; but how we make the intelligent decisions and intelligent investments in Afghanistan between now and then is the bigger question. Whatever it costs to fight in Afghanistan, whatever it has cost to fight in Iraq over the past 8 years or whatever, I understand those are big numbers; but we are looking forward as to how we push the Afghan security system to a point where they can take care of themselves and, in fact, begin to run their country as they should.

Most of my good colleagues' arguments were better suited for the conversation we had in April with reference to the overall budget. That budget passed. This amount that we are now going to spend on the Department of Defense fits under the discretionary spending cap that we put in place by the majority vote of this House back in April. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations had done their work, allocated their amount of moneys across a lot of priorities, said "no" to a lot of things, and said "yes" to this issue. So I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $236,000,000 to the Secretary of Transportation for the National Infrastructure Investments program".

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading requirement.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment would shift $236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund and would return that money back to the taxpayers of the United States—the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments program.

□ 2140

Look, I understand that we're trying to fight terrorism by spending all this money in Afghanistan, but the best way to protect the American people from terrorist attacks is to repair our roads and bridges, secure our ports, help fund secure rapid transit systems so we don't have to spend as much money buying foreign oil—and you know that some of that money that goes to these foreign countries when we buy oil ends up in the hands of terrorists. Let's redirect a share of the money that is going to rebuild roads in Afghanistan to build and invest in transit in America. Not only is this good for Americans, we're going to pave over all these potholes that are damaging our cars. And with rapid transit programs, we're going to help provide people who can't afford a car—or in my area, in metro Detroit, people can't afford auto insurance even though they have good driving records because they're red-lined. At least if we transfer some of that money to transit, they will have a way to go to work and to other events for leisure.

But the bottom line is this: If we invest this money in the United States as opposed to spending it all in Afghanistan, we're going to create jobs here in the United States. That is the best way

to secure our country—to make sure we put as many people as possible here back to work.

I urge your support on this amendment.

This amendment would shift $236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, AIF, to the Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments Program.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund provides funding for infrastructure projects such as water, power and transportation and related maintenance and sustainment cost.

My amendment would cut the amount dedicated to this fund in half. While we can agree that this funding is helpful to the Afghan people, I believe that we need to invest in nation-building at home at least as much as we invest abroad.

My amendment would restore about half of the funding historically given to the National Infrastructure Investments Program, which is zeroed out in this bill.

The National Infrastructure Investments Program awards grants to state, local, and transit agencies on a competitive basis for highway, bridge, port and rail projects that stand to make a significant national or regional impact.

The Department of Transportation estimates that, for every $1 billion invested in Federal highways, more than $6.2 billion in economic activity is generated. Spending tax dollars in Afghanistan fails to create the same economic multiplier.

The U.S. has invested approximately $51 billion in reconstruction and development for Afghanistan since 2002.

Our nation faces an ''infrastructure deficit'' as well as a fiscal deficit: federal investment in infrastructure has declined as a share of GDP over the past fifty years while the cost of building new infrastructure has risen.

A report from the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that the nation needs $2.2 trillion dollars of infrastructure expenditure over the next 5 years, but less than half that amount has been budgeted.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's infrastructure needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for the highway, bridge, and port projects that create jobs and further commerce here at home. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to address the point of order?

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I understand the honorable Representative's point of order here.

You know, if there is anything that is not in order, it's the nature of these rules. There are people out here in this country who are taxpayers, they don't want to see their money spent or borrowed in Afghanistan rebuilding their roads when we have all these potholes right here. We should be able to, in this Congress——

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's comments must be confined to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not debating the point of order, and so I insist on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to transfer funds. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $12,800,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That up to $15,000,000 of these funds may be available for coalition police trainer life support costs: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000,000)''.

Mr. COHEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I do realize the result of this amendment probably. There is another Latin phrase besides ''nunc pro tunc,'' which is ''morituri te salutant,'' which is basically ''we who are about to die salute you.''

I understand the votes today, and I see them, but I find it hard to fathom, with the American public—and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are indeed concerned about the deficit, not going at the place where you can really get to the deficit, which is in spending in the defense budget. That's Moby-Dick. You don't throw your harpoons at a minnow; you throw your harpoon at the whale. This is the whale. And Captain Ahab had a good point; you go out there and you see the big one, you go for it.

This would reduce the funds we are giving to the Afghanistan security forces by $4 billion. It wouldn't take all of it. It would keep two-thirds—they would still have two-thirds. It would reduce it by $4 billion and return those funds to help the deficit. The $12.8 billion that is currently allocated to this fund is nearly equivalent to the entire GPD of Afghanistan. Their GPD is $14 billion to $16 billion. Let's understand this, Mr. Chairman: We are giving the Afghanistan people their entire GDP, and we're borrowing it from China and other places. This makes no sense. We need to go after the big whale.

Six times the total annual revenue of the Afghan Government—which is approximately $1.5 billion—is what we're giving them. I understand these funds are to be used to provide assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan, including training and providing equipment, supplies, and services. Well, I have seen soldiers killed over there, my constituents that were killed by Afghanistan soldiers that we trained. We don't know which ones are Taliban and which ones are going to turn on us, and we're training them and giving them weapons.

Roughly $6 billion of the $12.8 billion is for salaries and benefits. In light of the President's announcement of withdrawing troops from Afghanistan, we need to make reductions all around, and that includes reduction for these security forces. This country could not, should not fund the structure that the Afghanistan Government cannot fund and at a time when we need to take a look at our deficit.

Now I have heard General Petraeus' name over there. I'm a fan of General Petraeus too, but he's sometimes wrong. He's sometimes wrong. And I think he was for us supporting the President in Libya. And some of the folks over there that are so supportive of General Petraeus weren't so supportive of General Petraeus then. So they understand he's not always right, and he's not right on these funds either. These troops are not going to be trained in a way that they're going to be able to sustain the forces. They're not going to use the weapons, they're not going to be able to supply them. It's going to be a waste.

General Mike Mullen talked about our debt being our biggest security threat, and accordingly we need to readjust our priorities and find realistic ways to reduce our deficit. This is a way we can do it and save $4 billion—still give them $8.8 billion. It's plenty. I'd like to see it all cut, but I realize that's not realistic. But we are pulling out. We're not going to be able to train those troops to where they're going to be able to maintain the funds to pay those troops in the future. Most of it is salaries, and when we're gone they're not going to have the salaries.

I've been to Afghanistan, you've been to Afghanistan. It is beyond Third World—it's Fourth World, and we're giving them the last of our dollars. If you really, really, really, really care about reducing the deficit, you've got to go for the whale, you've got to go for the defense budget. And just giving this money to Afghanistan is I think a dereliction of duty.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as we speak, our marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen are fighting for freedom in some of the toughest places imaginable. A vote for this resolution is a vote to pull the support out from under our troops and to leave a legacy of failure in Afghanistan. I urge against supporting this amendment.

Although I applaud the bravery and skill of the personnel who brought Osama bin Laden to justice, it is important to remember that this is not justification to abandon our efforts to increase the security in Afghanistan. The men and women of our military are working tirelessly to increase the proficiency of Afghan security forces, but to transition lead responsibility for security to them is irresponsible at this time. The Afghan security forces did not suddenly become more proficient because of the death of Osama bin Laden. I am strongly supportive of transitioning responsibility to the Afghan security forces, but only when they are fully prepared to assume that responsibility.

□ 2150

I agree that nation-building should not be a principal tool for achieving America's national security objectives. Such campaigns are too expensive in both blood and treasure, particularly given the circumstances our Nation currently faces. However, this is not an excuse to negate the sacrifices our troops have made or the progress they have won in Afghanistan.

I believe that establishing an arbitrary time line for withdrawal will actually hobble any efforts for a political reconciliation with the Taliban. If they are certain that our forces are leaving before the currently planned transition time line of 2014, they lose all incentive to work with us and the Afghan Government on a political solution.

What this amendment, in fact, does, though, is cuts off funding for the development of Afghan security forces. Our entire exit strategy is based on developing Afghan security forces so that they are strong enough to allow us to pull our forces out to complete a transition whereby they assume operational control by 2014.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Half of the money we give them is for salaries. When we pull out, we don't pay the salaries. Their budget is only like 15 percent of everything we give them. They can't pay the salaries. They can't borrow from China. So what's going to happen then?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. We have three security objectives in Afghanistan. The first is to make sure the Taliban don't take over the entire country. The second is to keep al Qaeda out of the country. And the third is to have a permissive environment from which we can strike targets in Pakistan at will, as we did with Osama bin Laden.

Cutting the legs under the current strategy of giving them the capability of standing up their own security forces completely undermines where we are right now and undermines the President's goals of being able to do that transfer of operational control by 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Colorado for having made a very, very eloquent statement that really is factual and gets right to the point. But the reason I rise also is earlier in the day, just in case there are Members here tonight that weren't there early today, I did suggest that I might say this again and again and again during this debate. This subcommittee that recommends this bill in a very nonpolitical way, in a very careful way, reviewed and analyzed all of the requests that we had from the administration in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012 appropriations for national defense.

The original recommendation, we reduced by $9 billion, and I think that is larger than the gentleman's whale, but it is a substantial cut and it was made without any regard to politics. We were extremely careful not to affect the war fighter. We were extremely careful not to affect our Nation's readiness. This is not a good amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $35,000,000)''.

Page 146, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It reduces the Afghan Security Forces account by about 1 part in 500, one five-hundredth, in order to increase the Defense Health Program account by $20 million to save soldiers' lives. It will give the Pentagon a much-needed infusion of funds to address a serious gap in our military's suicide prevention.

I learned about this gap through the tragedy of a young constituent from New Jersey who fell through the cracks. He took his own life in September of 2008. But it is not just one soldier. We have a broad problem here. In each of the past 2 years, more American soldiers have died at their own hands than have been killed in war fighting.

Coleman Bean of East Brunswick, New Jersey, attended East Brunswick public schools, he enlisted in the Army

in 2001, and he attended Airborne school at Fort Benning. His first assignment with the 173rd Airborne was in Italy. In 2003, he and the rest of the 173rd conducted a combat jump into Iraq.

Like many of his buddies, he saw the horrors of war firsthand, and, like some, he sought treatment from the VA for his diagnosed post-traumatic stress disorder when he returned home in 2004. He was honorably discharged from active duty in 2005, and, like other Army members, Coleman Bean still had 4 years of reserve duty commitment through what is known as the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) program. He was recalled to duty in Iraq in 2007 through the IRR and was assigned to serve in northern Iraq. When he returned to New Jersey the following year, he was still suffering from the symptoms of PTSD but managed to conceal his condition from even those closest to him. No one reached out to him. Tragically, he took his own life in September 2008. Ironically, tragically, a few weeks after Coleman took his life, the VA called to say that his appointment was ready.

Two Federal agencies charged with helping prevent suicides among our returning soldiers utterly failed this soldier and his family. Indeed, earlier this year, the Ninth Circuit Court, siding with two veterans groups that sued the Department of Veterans Affairs for failing to provide timely care for veterans at risk of suicide, noted that an average of 18 veterans per day take their own lives. We must stop this epidemic. This amendment will help. We can't allow another family to lose a son or a daughter, a father or a mother, a husband or a wife because of buck-passing.

When I investigated Coleman Bean's tragedy, the VA confirmed that they don't offer dedicated suicide prevention programs for members of the IRR. They consider that a DOD responsibility. The DOD officials at TRICARE said that treating IRR members is the VA's problem. Simply stated, if you are a member of the Individual Ready Reserve suffering from PTSD, you're on your own.

The same problem applies to other categories of reservists, such as the Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), and the members of the Inactive National Guard (ING). According to the Defense Department, there are at least 123,000 IRR, IMA, and ING members who have done at least one tour in Iraq or Afghanistan.

My amendment would give the Secretary of Defense the funding needed to expand the suicide prevention outreach program to ensure that members of these reserve units who have served a tour in Iraq or Afghanistan will receive a call from a properly trained counselor not less than once every 90 days so long as the servicemember remains in the IRR, the IMA or the ING. In these calls, the trained counselor would be required to determine the emotional, psychological, mental, medical and career needs and concerns of the reservist. Covered reservists identified as being at risk would be immediately referred to the nearest military treatment facility.

I have discussed this program with the Pentagon. The Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Dr. Stanley, assures me that the Department has more than adequate legal authority to carry this out. What he needs is funding, and my amendment would provide that funding.

When we get the word out about these counseling services, we save lives. This amendment is budget neutral, it is vitally needed, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 2200

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of the amendment, and urge that we accept it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We will accept the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 23, insert before the period at the end the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer $2,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Homeland Security to increase funds available for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605)''.

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

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment redirects $2 billion from Afghanistan Security Forces to the State Homeland Security Grants Program (SHSP).

My amendment makes sure that the Afghanistan Security Forces aren't funded at the expense of our country's Homeland Security efforts.

The State Homeland Security Grants Program ensures that states have strategies in place to protect, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.

State Homeland Security Grants Program was cut dramatically in the FY '12 Homeland Security Appropriations bill and was underfunded in the FY '11 bill. This amendment would restore grant funding to the FY '10 level to make sure our first responders have the resources they need to keep our communities safe.

My amendment does not jeopardize the training and equipping of the Afghanistan Security Forces. Even with my amendment, the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund is funded above the FY '10 level of $9.1 billion.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's homeland security needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for protecting ourselves from terrorism and catastrophic events. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I would like to speak on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is pending.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I would like to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This bill, this amendment which transfers money from the Afghanistan Security Forces to Homeland Security, it better supports existing law, better supports this defense budget because it better protects the American people, less money by funding police and fire as opposed to blowing all that money in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again the gentleman is discussing the amendment and not the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will hear Members on the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, just to clarify.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. In order to explain my position on the point of

order, I had to explain the merits of this amendment. This Defense budget is about protecting the American people. I'm saying redirect the money to Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I made this announcement earlier in the day that I would allow the Member to have the 5 minutes to speak on the amendment even though it was subject to a point of order, if that courtesy was not abused. In recent points of order, that courtesy has been abused.

I will continue to show that courtesy to Members who do not abuse their 5 minutes and who do not abuse the point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. As a new Member in this body, I have the utmost respect for this institution and to the chair. And to the extent that I appeared to be out of bounds, I do apologize.

It's the fact that this country is in crisis. We have a huge debt. We have so many people that need jobs. And since the budget resolution was passed, April 15, Osama bin Laden was captured and killed, and that provided us with an opportunity to reassess our mission in Afghanistan.

I want us to take a little share of our money that we're spending in Afghanistan and return it here to protect the American people, and also take the remainder of the savings to pay down our debt.

And I do understand what the rules provide. It is just, Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe these rules are old and out of date. We need to, in this House, respond more quickly and nimbly and more effectively on behalf of the American people.

And my closing point is this. We've spent over $50 billion in economic aid to Afghanistan. Let's take a share of that money, redirect it back home, create jobs here by repairing our roads and bridges. I understand that we don't want to have safe havens for terrorists around the world like Afghanistan. The best way to protect the American people is invest in homeland security, help fund our police and firefighters. They don't have the equipment that they need. The communication and radios with which they can talk to each other, they can share information.

And also, too, I believe it's the duty of this Congress to find a way to provide more equipment in funding for police and fire because this Congress in the past had failed to effectively address the foreclosure crisis which really dropped property values so our local units of government don't have the revenue to hire more police and fire.

So saying that, I want to say to the chairman that I respect your position; I respect this institution. I'm here trying to fight for my people I represent in metro Detroit and return American tax dollars back to Americans to create jobs here and to protect Americans here at home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund'', $1,100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance to Pakistan's security forces; including program management and the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and funds; and facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction to build the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistan's military and Frontier Corps: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this provision is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; defense working capital funds; and to the Department of State, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That funds so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation account, notify the Committees on Appropriations in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000,000)''.

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief.

I had my argument on the other $1 billion that I asked to be deducted from the reimbursement account to be sent to the spending reduction account.

This is a separate fund that also gives money to Pakistan, over a billion dollars. I'm asking that a billion dollars of that fund that goes into counterinsurgency also be sent to the spending reduction account.

There are several reasons for that, but the main one is the Pakistan Government is correct: we don't know where the money is going. We found out that after we took out Osama bin Laden, in that compound we found documents that revealed discussions of promises of no al Qaeda attacks in Pakistan in exchange for sheltering Osama bin Laden.

That's the type of things that we wonder about whether Pakistan is on our side or on the side of our enemies. We don't know whose side they're on. So I'd ask the adoption of our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the final word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California for any comments he may have.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the goals of this amendment which are to demand accountability from a nation that until recently has been one of our good friends.

Pakistan has faced serious problems throughout its history, and the United States has played a leading role in helping stabilize that troubled nation. We have spent billions and billion of dollars in military support and billions and billions more in economic assistance. We have worked as close as we can with Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies in order to stabilize the border region near Afghanistan where al Qaeda and the Taliban are trying to overthrow both Afghanistan and the Pakistan governments.

It is therefore hard to express the anger and frustration of all Americans when we discovered that Osama bin Laden, the man who had engineered the death of thousands on American soil, was living in comfort just a short drive from Islamabad. And we have asked in vain how this could occur. Rather than help us get to the bottom of how this international criminal could live for years within blocks of their military school, we received protests from Pakistani officials that our brave Special Forces captured and killed bin Laden under their noses.

□ 2210

But, Mr. Chairman, what has really outraged me and many of my colleagues is that the Pakistanis have had

the audacity to arrest and detain the informants who helped us bring this ultimate terrorist to justice. It is almost too much to take, and it is time that we made it clear to the Pakistanis that our friendship is at the breaking point. For this reason, I am convinced that we must carefully scrutinize every dollar that we are spending in Pakistan in this bill, and especially in the Foreign Operations bill.

And, Mr. Chairman, while I want to support Chairman YOUNG and the work of Mr. DICKS, as well as the rest of my colleagues on this committee, I do want to serve notice that as we go forward and I am able to gather more information, I could very well be presenting a very similar amendment in the Foreign Operations bill. It is high time that we get the answers that we seek here and know really which friends are truly our friends.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to be opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the Pakistanis are a troubled ally. They are an unstable Islamic country with extremist tendencies and a country that has nuclear weapons. The funding that we are talking about right now is that which is for training them in counterinsurgency operations.

We have troops in combat at this time in Afghanistan. The Taliban, the Afghan Taliban who are fighting our forces in the field oftentimes have sanctuary in Pakistan. We are trying to stand up a Pakistani military that is not simply exclusively engaged or exclusively focused on a conventional war with India but is able to launch counterinsurgency operations, particularly in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas. I think this funding is critical so long as we have troops in the field in Afghanistan that we seek to maintain, or certainly increase the capability of the Pakistani military counterinsurgency operations.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $387,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $118,412,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $37,117,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $208,381,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $1,398,195,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $492,060,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $41,070,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $317,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $249,514,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $1,183,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $440,265,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $46,920,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $139,510,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $3,213,010,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $406,668,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, of which $490,000,000 shall be available only for the Army National Guard: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund, $3,195,170,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to procure, sustain, transport, and field Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall transfer such funds only to appropriations made available in this or any other Act for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That such funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, not fewer than 10 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees

in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $8,513,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $53,884,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $182,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $192,361,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $435,013,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $1,228,288,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities'', $469,458,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $2,577,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Inspector General'', $11,055,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for 2012.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to $3,000,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' or the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U. S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of $75,000 per vehicle and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of $250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9005. Not to exceed $400,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9006. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

SEC. 9009. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal quarter a report on the proposed use of all funds appropriated by this or any prior Act under each of the headings Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, and Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund on a project-by-project basis, for which the obligation of funds is anticipated during the 3-month period from such date, including estimates for the accounts referred to in this section of the costs required to complete each such project.

(b) The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(1) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) were obligated prior to the submission of the report, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(2) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds were appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) in prior appropriations Acts, or for which funds were made available by transfer, reprogramming, or allocation from other headings in prior appropriations Acts, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(3) An estimated total cost to train and equip the Afghanistan and Pakistan security forces, disaggregated by major program and sub-elements by force, arrayed by fiscal year.

SEC. 9010. (a) FUNDING FOR OUTREACH AND REINTEGRATION SERVICES UNDER YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title IX, up to $20,000,000 may be available for outreach and reintegration services under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program under section 582(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 125; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note).

(b) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount made available by subsection (a) for the services described in that subsection is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for such services.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than $250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $500,000.

SEC. 9012. (a) The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan may, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, carry out projects in fiscal year 2012 to assist the commander of the United States Central Command in developing a link between United States military operations in Afghanistan under Operation Enduring Freedom and the economic elements of United States national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through strategic business and economic opportunities.

(b) The projects carried out under paragraph (a) may include projects that facilitate private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, and energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan.

(c) The Secretary may use up to $150,000,000 of the funds available for overseas contingency operations in ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' for additional activities to carry out projects under paragraph (a).

SEC. 9013. From funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, up to $524,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support the United States Government transition activities in Iraq by undertaking facilities renovation and construction associated with establishing Office of Security Cooperation locations, at no more than ten sites, in Iraq: *Provided*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for each proposed site and the source of funds.

SEC. 9014. (a) Not more than 85 percent of the funds provided in this title for operation and maintenance may be available for obligation or expenditure until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report under subsection (b).

(b) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on contractor employees in the United States Central Command, including—

(1) the number of employees of a contractor awarded a contract by the Department of Defense (including subcontractor employees) who are employed at the time of the report in the area of operations of the United States Central Command, including a list of the number of such employees in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(2) for each fiscal year quarter beginning on the date of the report and ending on September 30, 2012—

(A) the number of such employees planned by the Secretary to be employed during each such period in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(B) an explanation of how the number of such employees listed under subparagraph (A) relates to the planned number of military personnel in such locations.

SEC. 9015. Of the amounts appropriated or transferred to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Fund') for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2011—

(1) not more than 25 percent of such amounts may be obligated or expended until such time as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State—

(A) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the Fund and the metrics used to determine progress with respect to the Fund; and

(B) notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the intent of the Secretary to obligate or expend amounts that are in excess of such 25 percent and a period of 30 days has elapsed following such notification.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts described in the matter preceding paragraph (1) shall be available for reprogramming.

(3) Such report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A discussion of United States strategic objectives in Pakistan.

(B) A listing of the terrorist or extremist organizations in Pakistan opposing United States goals in the region and against which the United States encourages Pakistan to take action.

(C) A discussion of the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units that hamper the ability of the Government of Pakistan to take action against the organizations listed in subparagraph (B).

(D) A discussion of how assistance provided utilizing the Fund will address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

(E) A discussion of other efforts undertaken by other United States Government departments and agencies to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C) or complementary activities of the Department of Defense and how those efforts are coordinated with the activities undertaken to utilize the Fund.

(F) Metrics that will be used to track progress in achieving the United States strategic objectives in Pakistan, to track progress of the Government of Pakistan in combating the organizations listed in subparagraph (B), and to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

SEC. 9016. (a) Not to exceed $176,575,000 from amounts made available to the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2012 may be obligated for information operations or military information support operations: *Provided*, That such amount is to be derived from the amounts provided in title IX of this Act for the following accounts in this title as follows:

''Operations and Maintenance, Army'', $104,675,000;

''Operations and Maintenance, Navy'', $1,200,000;

''Operations and Maintenance, Air Force'', $20,400,000; and

''Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide'', $50,300,000.

(b) Such amounts are to be allocated only in accordance with the direction and for the purposes specified in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9017. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following account in the specified amount:

''Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund'', 2011/2013, $595,000,000.

□ 2220

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 161, line 4, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10001. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $124,800,000.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It cuts $124.8 million from the overall bill. For my colleagues who say they are committed to deficit reduction, this is your chance to prove it.

This amendment reduces government spending while protecting the Pentagon's national security mission by reducing the funding for military bands to the authorized level. Currently this bill and the Pentagon's budget includes a total of $324.8 million for 154 military bands and more than 5,000 full-time professional military musicians.

This amendment would reduce the total funding for military bands to $200 million. The limit set for spending on military bands included a voice vote in the 2012 defense authorization bill, H.R. 1540.

Let me be clear: This amendment brings the defense appropriations bill in line with the spending on military bands established in the defense authorization bill. Again, the House is already on record voting to limit spending on military bands to $200 million.

Earlier, in debate on this bill, Representative CARTER of Texas had an amendment that struck the language that I had inserted in the defense appropriations bill that would limit the military bands to $200 million. This amendment was agreed to on voice vote.

I do not believe that the majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House want to be on record adding, adding over $124 million in spending for military bands.

This amendment gives all of my colleagues the opportunity to reduce the cost to government by cutting $124 million from this bill, while allowing the Pentagon to continue to spend $200 million for choirs, jazz bands, ensembles, and other musical missions.

There is no doubt that bands are important. We all enjoy listening to military bands and cherish the traditions of military music. But at a time of fiscal crisis, $200 million must be enough for ceremonial music, concerts, choir performance, and country music jam sessions.

Maybe you believe that spending $325 million in 2012 is in our national security interests, a national priority that cannot even be cut or reduced.

Well, I couldn't disagree more. There are really Members in this House who in good conscience vote to cut nutrition for programs for poor, hungry women and infants, but vote to protect a military bands budgets? Is this House really capable of gutting investments on women's health care, but allow $5 million increases in funding for military bands?

Republicans are forcing cuts in law enforcement, firefighters, homeless veterans, but they take a stand opposing limiting funding for military bands to $200 million as a national security priority. Is this Congress really going to raise the debt ceiling so it can pay $325 million for military bands next year with money borrowed from China? These are truly misplaced priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress faces record deficits, and it's time for both smart investments and tough choices. In this $650 billion defense appropriations bill, this amendment proposes an extremely modest test of this House's willingness to cut spending for nonessential military functions.

Last year the Army Materiel commander had a $4.4 million state of the art building especially constructed for the Army Materiel Command Band. While schools, health care centers and food banks are getting cut, $4.4 million is an example that seems to indicate to me that no one told the Pentagon that this is a fiscal crisis.

The Pentagon does not need any more band aid.

Mr. CARTER argued against reducing spending on military bands, saying the language didn't save 1 cent, and he was correct. This amendment saves U.S. taxpayers $124.8 million, and that makes a lot of sense to the Minnesotans I represent. And it should make a lot of sense to my tea party Republican colleagues who march to their own drummers.

This amendment gives all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, a chance to show our constituents a deficit reduction. I urge my colleagues to support this reduction to unnecessary defense spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment would essentially cap funding for military bands at $200 million and reverse a decision of the body earlier this evening.

The band's main mission is music, with a secondary wartime mission for security. Band members train for security, and given the shortage of guards, security is often the band members' go-to-war mission. Every soldier is taught their basic combat skills and can secure the perimeter.

The Department of Defense strongly believes that military bands are vital to recruiting, retaining, and community relations, and that they provide patriotic, inspirational music to instill in soldiers, sailors, and airmen the will to fight and win, and foster the support of our citizens and promote national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments left, and this one will deal with the subject of NASCAR.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A–129).

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

□ 2230

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Department of Defense to limit what they spend on motorsports sponsorships for NASCAR, the National Hot Rod Association, the Indy Car Series, or AMA Super Bike Racing to no more than $20 million in fiscal year 2012. With our Nation in a fiscal crisis, I can't imagine anyone wanting to spend more than $20 million for taxpayer-funded racing teams.

As Members of Congress, we must make choices with what to do with America's taxpayer money. Congress needs to set priorities that will reduce the deficit and grow our economy.

This year, the Department of Defense will spend at least $63 million in taxpayer funds to sponsor motorsports for so-called recruitment purposes. In the last decade, hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent to sponsor motorsports racing.

And what do the American people get for their investment? Those millions of tax dollars buy decals—big stickers—on race cars. They pay for multimillion dollar race contracts for millionaire race car drivers and racing team owners. For example, the National Guard is currently spending $20 million in taxpayers' funds to sponsor one race car driver, $20 million, one race car driver.

At a time when our Nation is fighting two wars and facing a fiscal crisis, why are we borrowing money from China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia to pay for sponsorships and millionaire car drivers? How does that advance national security?

Now, many of my colleagues insist that these sponsorships are critical to the survival of an all-volunteer military. I disagree. But I respect their passion despite the fact there is no evidence to demonstrate that this motorsports program is effective in recruiting. And that is why my amendment maintains a significant and sufficient investment in motorsports sponsorships, $20 million, to allow the Pentagon to demonstrate to us and to the taxpayers it does work.

Now as Members of Congress, we must do a better job of exercising our oversight over the Pentagon's recruiting budget. Right now, 75 percent of Americans ages 17 to 24 years old are not qualified—let me repeat—75 percent of young Americans ages 17–24 years old are not qualified to serve in the Armed Forces.

Motorsports sponsorships are not the answer to making America's youth more physically fit or more academically prepared to serve. And according to a 2010 report by a retired military leader entitled ''Too Fat to Fight,'' the U.S. military faces serious long-term recruiting challenges.

Let me quote the report directly. When weight problems are combined with educational deficits, criminal records, and other disqualifiers such as asthma or drug abuse, 75 percent of Americans 17–24 years old are unable to join the military for one or more of those reasons. The military will have to have more fit young men and women if they are going to find enough recruits with the excellent qualifications needed for a modern military.

But we're not talking about $63 million to sponsor academic decathlons, soccer leagues, or baseball teams.

With these alarming trends facing America's young people, the Pentagon needs to be leading a national effort to ensure young people around this country from coast to coast are educationally prepared, physically fit, morally sound, and dedicated to serving our country. Those young men and women aren't just found at racetracks. Yet that is where our branches of military are spending disproportionate amounts of recruiting budgets on an increasingly small number of recruiting targets.

Here is an example of a motorsport's recruiting power. In 2010, the National Guard spent $645,000 to sponsor one single NASCAR race, the Air Guard 400. According to the Air National Guard, that $650,000 sponsorship generated 439 recruits. Only six of those leads were qualified leads or recruited eligible.

How many enlistments for $650,000? Zero. Zero enlistments, zero contracts signed. Other branches of the Armed Forces have found these sponsorships to be a waste. The Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Navy have all canceled their motorsports sponsorships years ago, shifting their valuable recruitment dollars to more effective programs.

I respect the patriotism and passion of motorsports fans. I do. And I encourage the U.S. military to continue its longstanding relationship with motorsports like NASCAR. This amendment does nothing to the additional $8 million the Army spends on outreach to NASCAR racing events or the millions spent on military recruitment at races. But we are wasting taxpayers' dollars on race cars and millionaire drivers with little or nothing to show from it.

I've heard from supporters of racing sponsorships talk about the passion points and media impressions these sponsorship dollars produce among television viewers. Really? Americans don't know that there is an Army or an Air Force, or the American people don't know that we are at war in Iraq and Afghanistan? They don't need a racing car to tell them that we have a volunteer military and our country is at war.

Already this year, the Republican Congress has voted to cut nutrition programs for poor, hungry women and infants. And this majority is cutting investments in energy efficiency at a time of high gas prices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to limit the sponsorship of motor racing to $20 million.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I compliment the gentlelady for her determination. She has really worked this amendment hard on more than one occasion. The House has already spoken on this issue. When we considered earlier H.R. 1, this amendment was defeated by more than 100 votes, 448–281.

But this is a recruiting tool. I don't think any of us want to go back to a draft. I think we like the fact that we have an all-volunteer service. But if you feel an all-volunteer service means you have got to recruit, then you use more than just NASCAR or sporting events or advertising in newspapers to gain recruits so that we can have an all-volunteer military, as opposed to a conscripted, drafted military.

The Army National Guard estimated that it engaged more than 83,000 prospects in the year 2010. The Air Force reports that their NASCAR sponsorship is the second-highest source of accessions of all event sports sponsorships. The Army expects that they will, this year, engage 28,700 prospects and gain access to 182 schools through its sponsorship of NASCAR.

Now, the gentlelady, as I said, is persistent. She uses the occasion to mention the fact that the Marine Corps does not use sporting, does not use NASCAR for recruiting. Which is true. But that is not a reason why we should discontinue the program. The Navy and the Marine Corps do not sponsor motorsports, NASCAR. But they both use the sponsorship of sporting events as part of their recruiting programs. The Navy is a sponsor of the X Games, while the Marine Corps sponsors a variety of events, including the Ultimate Fighting Championship.

The fact of the matter is we spend a lot of money for recruiting, and the recruiting for our programs that are successful ought to be continued and should not be denied for whatever the reason that someone objects to using the money for sponsoring race car vehicles.

The National car took seventh place, by the way, in Daytona this past weekend. And not only do we get the sponsorship, the excitement of the crowds and many of whom go to the recruiting stations, but we get newspaper coverage for free, we get television coverage for free, coverage that we don't have to pay for because of these events that we do sponsor.

So, as we did in the Appropriations Committee, and as we did on H.R. 1 earlier in this year, I just hope that we will, once again, defeat this amendment, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2240

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, Section 9012 of this Defense appropriations bill contains language authorizing the Pentagon, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, to operate a task force for business and stability operations in Afghanistan.

The bill provides $150 million to the Secretary of Defense to operate this business task force. Our brave military men and women have been in Afghanistan for 10 long years confronting the Taliban, killing terrorists, and helping secure a better future for the Afghan people.

When in the course of this long war did it become the Department of Defense's role to facilitate business opportunities for Afghan and foreign companies?

Is it really within the Pentagon's expertise or mission to excel at business development, farming, or mineral exploration?

This bill gives the Department of Defense authorization to carry out ''projects that include private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan.''

Afghanistan is an active war zone.

American servicemembers are under attack and our Department of Defense should be solely focused on their security. The Pentagon's focus should not be on starting up businesses or facilitating business development tours for corporate CEOs. Economic development is an important part of America's overall strategy in Afghanistan, but that is the role of civilian agencies like USAID, the Department of State, or the Department of Commerce.

Congress needs to invest in America's civilian capacity to carry out this function. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in this House does not believe international development activities are a component of national security. If they did, they would not cut vital foreign assistance capacity and programs.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Pentagon is supporting the development of the Afghan carpet industry while U.S. soldiers are under attack. Afghan carpets should not be a strategic priority for the Department of Defense.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Department of Defense is helping Kate Spade, an exclusive New York handbag designer, to source raw materials in Afghanistan? Since when did the Pentagon invest taxpayer dollars in promoting women's fashion?

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense described his role in heading up the task force in The Washington Post: ''We do capitalism. We're about helping companies make money.''

Colleagues, helping companies make money is not the role of the Department of Defense. This is the worst example of mission creep. It is up to Congress to perform its oversight duty and rein in the Pentagon.

Getting people to work in Afghanistan is important. Afghans who are working on farms, in factories, in functioning government ministries, and in the police and military are likely not shooting at our troops. But this report that accompanied the Defense authorization bill that passed in May said it best, and I quote from the Defense authorization bill: ''The function of private sector business development falls outside of the core competency of the Department of Defense.''

The House Armed Services Committee's report went on to further state: ''The mission of TFBSO should eventually fall under the jurisdiction of a different agency, likely USAID or possibly the Department of Commerce.''

The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan and its $150 million budget should not be funded and not authorized in the Defense authorizations bill. This function and this money belongs in the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

This task force is another example of the militarization of foreign assistance that diverts the Pentagon from its core mission of security and war fighting. It also dangerously blurs the line between military-affiliated personnel in a war zone and civilian personnel carrying out development activities.

America needs the Department of Defense to take care of its top priority: ensuring the national security of our country. We all know there will be fewer and fewer military personnel in Afghanistan in the coming months. Troops stationed in Afghanistan will be in increasing danger. We must allow those troops to focus on their security mission.

If the Secretary of Defense truly believes business development and the work of the task force is vital to national security, then the Pentagon can contract with professionals at USAID to carry out this function.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and get the business development and cooperative investment support out of the Pentagon.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, the Americans and our allies pretty much stabilized Afghanistan and neutralized the Taliban. But then before the job was completed, we all walked away. The Taliban resurged, came back, and created the situation that we face today and yesteryear and the year before. Let's not let that happen again.

Now this Task Force for Business and Stability is part of that operation to try to maintain stability once we clear out and neutralize the Taliban once again. The mission of the task force is to assist the commander of U.S. Central Command in developing a link between U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and economic elements of U.S. national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and to restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through business and economic opportunities such as agricultural diversification and energy development.

The Secretary may use up to $150 million of available operations for overseas contingency operations. This amendment would prohibit that. This amendment would not permit us to do the things that we need to do after winning on the battlefield. After eliminating the combat areas, we have got to maintain an Afghanistan that is not any longer under the jurisdiction and the influence of the Taliban.

As I said, we did that once before at great cost. We neutralized the Taliban. We basically stabilized Afghanistan, and then we walked away. We didn't do the things that this Business and Stability Operations Task Force would do.

So let's do them this time so we don't have to go back and refight the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan. It is not a good amendment. It is not a good amendment, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the gentleman on this particular amendment. I think we should vote it down.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close the defense commissary store at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, over 19,000 people in New Jersey depend on the goods and services provided by the commissary at Fort Monmouth. The looming closure of Fort Monmouth has cast a cloud over the future of this facility, causing considerable consternation among the active duty, Guard and Reserve, and military retirees who count on the commissary to help them save money and live their quality lives that we have promised them.

In February 2011, the Secretary of the Army recognized the importance of this facility and recommended to the Pentagon leadership that the facility remain open. Department regulations give the Pentagon the ability to decide whether to keep the commissary open after a base closes.

□ 2250

I should point out that the active personnel at Naval Weapons Station Earle, which does not have a commissary, depend on this commissary as well. We in New Jersey, in the New Jersey delegation, strongly agree with Secretary McHugh's recommendation, which is currently under consideration in the Pentagon.

The amendment I am offering, but will withdraw pursuant to a discussion, a colloquy with my colleagues, would bar the use of fiscal 12 funds to close the commissary.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I can completely understand the gentleman's concern here. I want the gentleman to know that I am prepared to work with him on this to see if we can talk to the powers that be over in the Pentagon. Hopefully, they can accept Secretary McHugh's recommendation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that I agree with Mr. DICKS. We are more than happy to work with you in order to work out this problem.

Mr. HOLT. I thank both gentlemen. This means a great deal to the people of New Jersey, to whom we owe a great deal for their military work.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2011.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: Thank you for your August 17, 2010 letter concerning the closure of the commissary and post exchange on Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

As we have discussed, the post exchange stores at Fort Monmouth must close in preparation for the closure of Fort Monmouth. However, I have directed the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy and Environment to send an official request to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [USD(P&R)] to keep the Fort Monmouth commissary open for a transitional 2-year period following installation closure.

If USD(P&R) approves this request, the continued operation of the commissary for this 2-year period will be conditional on a volume of sales that supports operational costs. Defense Commissary Agency's (DeCA) projections indicate annual sales of $9.2M in the year following closure. DeCA will continue to review sales and cost data and will advise the Army if sales decline significantly.

Thank you for your inquiry into this matter and for your continued support of our Soldiers and their Families.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MCHUGH.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. GARDNER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 7, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2260. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cooperative Inspection Programs: Interstate Shipment of Meat and Poultry Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2008-0039] (RIN: 0538-AD37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2261. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diethylene Glycol MonoEthyl Ether (DEGEE); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0474; FRL-8877-1] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2262. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C9 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons, C10-11 Rich Aromantic Hydrocarbons, and C11-12 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0517; FRL-8876-2] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2263. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2264. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Bangladesh, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2265. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report for calendar year 2010 on the country of origin and the sellers or uranium and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2266. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Information Required in Prior Notice of Imported Food [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0179] (RIN: 0910-AG65) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2267. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Administrative Simplification: Adoption of Operating Rules for Eligibility for a Health Care Claim Status Transactions [CMS-0032-1FC] (RIN: 0938-AQ12) received June 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2268. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards No. 108; Lamp, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment [Docket No. NHTSA-2004-18794] (RIN: 2127-AK85) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2269. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Plating and Polishing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0084; FRL-9320-6] (RIN: 2060-AM37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2270. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition and Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0295, FRL-9319-5] (RIN: 2060-AP67) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2271. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0076; FRL-9320-2] (RIN: 2060-AH37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2272. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2011 [NRC-2011-0016] (RIN: 3150-AI93) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2273. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning Planning [NRC-2008-0030] (RIN: 3150-AI55) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2274. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-16, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2275. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2276. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-049, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2277. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-040, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2278. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-061, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2279. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-037, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2280. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-026, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2281. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-053, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2282. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-048, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-052, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2284. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-055, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2285. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-050, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2286. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-039, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2287. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2288. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Inspector General Semiannual Report, October 1, 2010 — March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2289. A letter from the Executive Director, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2290. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2291. A letter from the Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Board for the period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2292. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Implementation of Information Technology Security Provision [GSAR Amendment 2011-02; GSAR Case 2011-G503; (Change 50) Docket 2011-0012, Sequence 1] (RIN: 30900-AJ15) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2293. A letter from the Delegated Authority of the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Connecticut Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2294. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Performance of Functions; Claims for Compensation Under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; Compensation for Disability and Death of Noncitizen Federal Employees Outside the United States (RIN: 1240-AA03) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2295. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with Rotax aircraft Engines 912 A Series Engine [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0504; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-16702; AD 2011-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2296. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F; Model MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1044; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-16704; AD 2011-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2297. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE SYSTEMS (OPERATIONS) LIMITED Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0673; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-208-AD; Amendment 39-16705; AD 2011-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2298. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulation of Fractional Aircraft Ownership Programs and On-Demand Operations; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FAA-2001-10047; Amdt. No. 91-322] (RIN: 2120-AH06) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2299. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond aircraft Industries GmbH Model DA 42 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0231; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-16706; AD 2011-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2300. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Transitional Relief under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j) for Small Organizations [Notice 2011-43] received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2301. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application for Reinstatement and Retroactive Reinstatement for Reasonable Cause under Internal Revenue Code Section 6033(j) [Notice 2011-44] received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 337. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112–135). 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. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2406. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2407. A bill to protect the safety of America's roads by limiting the operation of motor carriers domiciled in Mexico beyond municipalities and commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border to a pilot program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily increase the investment tax credit for geothermal energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2409. A bill to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 2410. A bill to establish a temporary private education loan debt consolidation program to assist eligible borrowers in refinancing all or a portion of their private education debt as Federal Direct Consolidation Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 2411. A bill to provide for an employee election on Form W-4 to have amounts deducted and withheld from wages to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 2413. A bill to establish a sustainable Federal Secondary Market Facility for Residential Mortgages that is financed by private capital, to terminate the conservatorships of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and repeal the charter Acts of such enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2414. A bill to exempt certain farm vehicles from certain operating requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2415. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Dock Street in Pittston, Pennsylvania, as the ''Trooper Joshua D. Miller Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2416. A bill to extend temporarily the treatment of Monroe County, Pennsylvania, as a HUBZone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2417. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 2418. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Future Farmers of America Organization and the 85th anniversary of the founding of the National Future Farmers of America Organization; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of ''combat with the enemy'' for purposes of service-connection of disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2420. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2421. A bill to provide for the treatment and temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HANNA, Ms. BUERKLE, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2422. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45 Bay Street, Suite 2, in Staten Island, New York, as the ''Sergeant Angel Mendez Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2423. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to increase the American-made content requirement for the Buy American Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that certain Federal contracts are set aside for small businesses, to enhance services to small businesses that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2425. A bill to prohibit Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Ginnie Mae from owning or guaranteeing any mortgage that is assigned to the Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems or for which MERS is the mortgagee of record; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to limit claims in connection with decisions to issue permits, licenses, and approvals for highway and public transportation capital projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify a maintenance exemption regarding the removal of sediment, debris, and vegetation from certain structures; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2428. A bill to protect the taxpayers of the United States by limiting the Federal payment of legal fees for current and former officers and affiliated parties of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2429. A bill to exempt certain class A CDL drivers from the requirement to obtain a hazardous material endorsement while operating a service vehicle with a fuel tank containing 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the percentage of funds appropriated under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 required to be reserved for outlying areas and the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HOCHUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession, transfer, or use of fraudulent travel documents, to amend title 49, United States Code, to require recurring training for transportation security officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. VISCLOSKY (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2432. A bill to provide for a feasibility study before carrying out any Federal action relating to the Chicago Area Water System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 338. A resolution welcoming His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama to Washington, DC, and recognizing his commitment to world peace, nonviolence, human rights, religious freedom, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 2 of the Constitution grants Congress the power ''to borrow Money on the Credit of the United States.''

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''Commerce Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''[1]

[1] Please note, pursuant to Article I, section 8, Congress has the power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to ''lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts. . .''.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which states The Congress shall have the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, which states that Congress, among other things:

''Shall have Power To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; To provide and maintain a Navy''

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Legislation to name a Post Office after an individual is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7, which gives Congress the power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

''The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8. Clause 3. and Article I. Section 8. Clause 18

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I

Article I Section 8 Clause 9

Article III Section 2

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 1), which grants Congress the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8, Section 3, of Article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 21: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 56: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 58: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 85: Ms. BASS of California.

H.R. 157: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 178: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 181: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 186: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 198: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 218: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 303: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 308: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 358: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 365: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 376: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 402: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 421: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 432: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 436: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 452: Mr. YODER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 456: Mr. RUSH, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 459: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 494: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 515: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 589: Mr. REYES and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 605: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 607: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 613: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 634: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 645: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 687: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 692: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 704: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 711: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 721: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 733: Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 735: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 743: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 750: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 765: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
H.R. 773: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 774: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 795: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 798: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 808: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 816: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 820: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 822: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 825: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 835: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 853: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 876: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 883: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 912: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 923: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 931: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 942: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 959: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 972: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 1002: Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HECK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1005: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1041: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1057: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1058: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1070: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1103: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1106: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1113: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1127: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1164: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1166: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1173: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1193: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1206: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1219: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1259: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1269: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1278: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1283: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1287: Mr. BERG.
H.R. 1297: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1312: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1322: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1331: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1350: Mr. RUSH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1351: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 1358: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1370: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1380: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1385: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1386: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1390: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. LANDRY.
H.R. 1394: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1416: Mr. BACA, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1418: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1439: Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1449: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1462: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1463: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1465: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 1479: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1489: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1505: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1506: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1524: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1527: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1547: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1558: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1574: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 1580: Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1588: Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1591: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1636: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1639: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1672: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1699: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1706: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1720: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1744: Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1755: Mr. BARROW and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1756: Mr. CRITZ and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1774: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1781: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1796: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1798: Mr. POSEY and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1802: Mr. TURNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. WEST.
H.R. 1803: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1815: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Ms. CHU, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1819: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1831: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1834: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1842: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1846: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1852: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1856: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1860: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1897: Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1905: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1932: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1933: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1946: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1955: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1969: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1970: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1976: Mr. JONES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1978: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1981: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1995: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2005: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2008: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2018: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2026: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2033: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2041: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2046: Mr. STARK and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 2054: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2068: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 2069: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2074: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 2077: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2085: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2091: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WU, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2093: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2098: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2099: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2100: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2101: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2108: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2123: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2145: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2146: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2159: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 2161: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2164: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2169: Mr. POLIS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2182: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2187: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2198: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2216: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2228: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2233: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2236: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2247: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2250: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2258: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2268: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2277: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2299: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 2321: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2337: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2355: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 2359: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2360: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2365: Mr. FILNER and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2375: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2393: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 2401: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 2405: Mr. BURGESS.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. FARR.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 13: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 25: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H. Res. 60: Mr. HANNA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H. Res. 111: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. CARNEY.

H. Res. 130: Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 137: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 177: Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H. Res. 231: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 247: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. RIVERA.

H. Res. 262: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 268: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PITTS, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BERG, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 282: Mr. WU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 295: Mr. KIND, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 309: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 315: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 333: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 71: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104(g) or (h)).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 72: Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 73: Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 74: Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 75: Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SHULER

AMENDMENT NO. 76: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to restrict cooperation between employees of the Department of Defense and employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 77: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the curriculum of the Chaplain Corps Tier 1 DADT repeal training dated April 11, 2011.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 78: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Operation Odyssey Dawn, Operation Unified Protector, or other military operations in Libya in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NUGENT

AMENDMENT NO. 79: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Operation Odyssey Dawn, Operation Unified Protector, or other military operations in Libya.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 80: Strike section 8101.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 81: Page 22, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 82: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $119,800,000.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 83: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A–129).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. MCCOLLUM

AMENDMENT NO. 84: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT NO. 85: Page 31, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $297,023,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $297,023,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. SESSIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 86: Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 33, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 87: Page 160, after line 3, add the following:

(G) A discussion of whether and how Pakistan discriminates against religious minorities by requiring denunciations of particular religious minorities or sects on passport applications and other instruments of state.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CICILLINE

AMENDMENT NO. 88: Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $475,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $475,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUGEBAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 89: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of B–1 aircraft of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. WELCH

AMENDMENT NO. 90: Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 149, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. LIPINSKI

AMENDMENT NO. 91: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to replace an information technology system that stores classified information in the United States with an information technology system that stores such classified information outside the United States.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 92: Page 125, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,695,031,000)''.

Page 125, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $348,845,000)''.

Page 125, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $264,718,000)''.

Page 125, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $521,937,000)''.

Page 126, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $81,201,000)''.

Page 126, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $16,362,000)''.

Page 126, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,964,000)''.

Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,511,000)''.

Page 127, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $247,421,000)''.

Page 127, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,698,000)''.

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,662,596,000)''.

Page 127, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,584,616,000)''.

Page 128, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $909,681,000)''.

Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,359,569,000)''.

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,527,457,000)''.

Page 130, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $55,414,000)''.

Page 130, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,674,000)''.

Page 130, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,193,000)''.

Page 131, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $93,884,000)''.

Page 131, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,962,000)''.

Page 138, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,748,000)''.

Page 139, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,697,000)''.

Page 139, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $113,688,000)''.

Page 140, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,488,000)''.

Page 140, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $26,669,000)''.

Page 140, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $20,468,000)''.

Page 141, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $107,091,000)''.

Page 141, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,414,000)''.

Page 142, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,857,000)''.

Page 142, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $246,473,000)''.

Page 142, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,319,000)''.

Page 143, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $737,626,000)''.

Page 144, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $723,000)''.

Page 144, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,204,000)''.

Page 145, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,474,000)''.

Page 145, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,593,000)''.

Page 145, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $104,386,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $20,887,651,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 93: Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 94: Page 125, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,438,789,000)''.

Page 125, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $445,117,000)''.

Page 125, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $337,774,000)''.

Page 125, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $665,978,000)''.

Page 126, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $103,610,000)''.

Page 126, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $20,878,000)''.

Page 126, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $12,714,000)''.

Page 126, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $13,411,000)''.

Page 127, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $315,703,000)''.

Page 127, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,719,000)''.

Page 127, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $11,012,116,000)''.

Page 127, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,021,929,000)''.

Page 128, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,160,729,000)''.

Page 128, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,010,749,000)''.

Page 128, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,948,995,000)''.

Page 130, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $70,707,000)''.

Page 130, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 130, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $11,731,000)''.

Page 131, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $119,794,000)''.

Page 131, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $10,159,000)''.

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,625,451,000)''.

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $154,418,000)''.

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,161,156,000)''.

Page 138, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $21,099,000)''.

Page 139, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,546,000)''.

Page 139, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $34,740,000)''.

Page 139, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $223,174,000)''.

Page 140, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $6,847,000)''.

Page 140, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $52,352,000)''.

Page 140, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $40,179,000)''.

Page 141, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $210,224,000)''.

Page 141, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $4,738,000)''.

Page 142, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $15,423,000)''.

Page 142, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $483,835,000)''.

Page 142, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $61,480,000)''.

Page 143, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $941,192,000)''.

Page 144, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,419,000)''.

Page 144, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $8,253,000)''.

Page 145, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $22,523,000)''.

Page 145, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $30,609,000)''.

Page 145, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $133,194,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, relating to the spending reduction account, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $33,000,124,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 95: Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 96: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section

376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 97: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $8,500,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available—

(1) by title I (''Military Personnel'');

(2) under the heading ''Defense Health Program'' in title VI (''Other Department of Defense Programs''); or

(3) by title IX (''Overseas Contingency Operations'').

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT NO. 98: Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $200,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. COHEN

AMENDMENT NO. 99: Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000,000)''.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,000,000,000)''.

H.R. 2219

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT NO. 100: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. After the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has completed the final space shuttle mission, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) to the maximum extent practicable, use the unique capabilities of the NASA Shuttle Logistics Depot of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(2) preserve the unique capabilities and the highly skilled, highly certified workforce of such facility.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 62, after line 2, inset the following new section:

SEC. 609. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Vehicle Technologies Program of the Department of Energy.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. POMPEO

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $254,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $254,000,000)''.

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. HARRIS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 62, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 609.

''None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund any portion of the International program at the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy other than the U.S.-Israel energy cooperative.''

H.R. 2354

OFFERED BY: MR. HARRIS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.