

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall 259 and rollcall 260. The rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4310 denied the House the opportunity to consider a number of key issues of interest to members of the House and our constituents. In particular, the rule denied a vote on my amendment to restore important health and safety protections for workers and residents who live near nuclear weapons facilities that will be undermined by the underlying bill. The rule also did not allow for a vote on the amendment offered by Mr. MCGOVERN to accelerate the re-deployment of our troops from Afghanistan that was supported by Armed Services Committee Ranking Democrat ADAM SMITH, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER, Republican Representative WALTER JONES, and others.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 261. I support H. Res. 568’s goal of preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capacity and am on record on numerous occasions supporting legislation to this effect. Yet I do not believe that this resolution is a sensible way to pursue that goal. President Obama has effectively utilized aggressive sanctions and has united the international community diplomatically, which has substantially increased pressure on Iran to agree to a deal to prevent continued uranium enrichment and allow international inspectors to verify that Iran’s nuclear program is not being used for military purposes. Congress should encourage that progress to continue but I am concerned that H. Res. 568 could disrupt the progress that is being made through negotiations and could bring the U.S. closer to war unnecessarily.

In addition, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 262.

### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

SPEECH OF

**HON. PHIL GINGREY**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 17, 2012*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes:

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of amendment #45, offered by Mr. GOHMERT. This amendment clarifies that the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) do not deny the writ of habeas corpus—or any Constitutional rights—to those detained in the United States under the AUMF who are entitled to such rights.

Mr. Chair, this amendment is necessary because while the intent in the FY ‘12 NDAA was not to allow for the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens without access to legal representation, some have misconstrued it as such. Simply put, this misunderstanding must end today. I support this amendment because I believe that providing for the safety and security of United States citizens is the paramount responsibility of the federal government. As we

continue to fight the Global War on Terror, we must provide the President, the intelligence community, and our troops with all of the tools necessary to carry out this duty. Clearly, we must do this within the framework of our Constitution, and make certain that the Constitutional rights provided for our citizens are not violated.

Mr. Chair, in order to guarantee our citizens’ Constitutional rights, I am further pleased that the text of H.R. 4388, the Right to Habeas Corpus Act—which was authored by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia and of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor—was included in the FY ‘13 NDAA. Article 1, section 9 of the Constitution states ‘The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.’ This legislation affirms that and goes on to state that “Nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall be construed to deny the availability of the writ of habeas corpus in a court ordained or established by or under Article III of the Constitution for any person who is detained in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force.”

Mr. Chair, with the adoption of Mr. GOHMERT’s amendment and inclusion of Mr. RIGELL’s legislation, we are taking the steps necessary to ensure the protection of our citizens’ rights, while at the same time denying terrorists the same privileges.

Former Attorneys General Ed Meese and Mike Mukasey—as well as other high ranking national security officials from both the Reagan and Bush Administrations—requested in a May 9 letter to the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that “As the House begins consideration of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, we urge you to ensure that attempts to exploit misconceptions about the NDAA are not successful in harming U.S. national security.” Clearly they are referencing the misunderstanding stemming from the FY ‘12 NDAA. They further wrote that “the FY ‘12 NDAA included an affirmation of the detention authority provided by the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF). Given the President’s plan to withdraw U.S. combat forces from Afghanistan and the continuing threat posed by groups like al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, this affirmation was a critical step in reinforcing the military’s legal authorities to combat terror.”

As it relates to the other end of the spectrum—providing terrorists the same rights as would be conferred to U.S. citizens, as would be the case if the amendment authored by Mr. SMITH and Mr. AMASH were to be adopted—their letter states that “. . . rewarding terrorists with greater rights for making it to the United States would actually incentivize them to come to our shores, or to recruit from within the United States, where they pose the greatest risk to the American people. Such a result is perverse.”

Mr. Chair, I am glad that because of our actions today, we are making clear the distinction between the rights provided our citizens and those provided to terrorists, while stating unequivocally that U.S. citizens will not be stripped of their habeas privileges.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. GOHMERT’s amendment.

KYLE BEDFORD

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, May 18, 2012*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kyle Bedford for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Kyle Bedford is a 11th grader at Pomona High and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kyle Bedford is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kyle Bedford for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2012

SPEECH OF

**HON. LAURA RICHARDSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 16, 2012*

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 4970, “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2012.” I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation and appeal to the Republican leadership to bring to the floor the Senate version of this bill which passed with a substantial bipartisan majority. Every Democratic Senator and 15 Senate Republicans, including all of the Senate GOP women, voted for the bill.

H.R. 4970 reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) for five years. It provides federal resources authorized by VAWA directly to organizations and programs that help prevent violent crime and protect victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. It consolidates grant programs and requires more audits and direct grant applicants to disclose their sources of federal funding. It also includes new benchmarks for visa applicants who are the victims of violent crime.

Madam Speaker, VAWA has never been a partisan issue until this Congress. Twice over the last 20 years, Democrats and Republicans have worked together to reauthorize VAWA and make necessary improvements. But just like on the Highway Bill, House Republicans are abandoning the bipartisan consensus that has always existed on VAWA reauthorizations. The bill rolls back important protections for immigrant victims that put them in a more vulnerable position than under current law by eliminating longstanding confidentiality of VAWA petitions for protection by allowing immigration officials to contact a battered woman’s abusive spouse, tipping off the abuser to the victim’s efforts to leave.

H.R. 4970 also makes it more difficult for undocumented witnesses to work with law enforcement officials, and eliminates a pathway