Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Engel
Hinchey

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Boren
Filner
Gonzalez
Gosar
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Lewis (GA)
Polis
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Sewell
Stivers

□ 1354

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 471, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 471, I was delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5856, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 717 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5856.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1356

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. MARCHANT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is the Defense appropriations bill for 2013. It has been done with the cooperation of the Republicans and the Democrats on the subcommittee, the Democrats led by NORM DICKS. I would say that NORM and I have worked together for so many years in making sure that these Defense appropriations bills were strictly nonpolitical—no politics in Defense appropriations. And there should not be.

Our investment in our national defense should be based on what is the real threat to the United States and what does it take to protect against that threat and what does it take to protect the men and women who provide for that national defense.

I want to compliment Mr. DICKS for having worked together with each other so well, regardless of who was in the majority, for 35 years, Mr. DICKS. And I just want to recognize that this will be the last Defense appropriations bill that Mr. DICKS will preside over on the floor because he is seeking retirement at the end of the term.

This committee will miss Mr. DICKS, the House will miss Mr. DICKS, the Congress will miss Mr. DICKS, and I will say the country will miss his service to the United States of America for so many years. So Mr. DICKS, I extend to you my very, very best and my appreciation and thanks for your friendship and your spirit of cooperation over the many years.

The subcommittee held many hearings and many briefings on so many subjects that it took most of the year leading up to this date in order to do that. I will compliment the members of the subcommittee because they were very attentive. The subcommittee hearings and meetings were all very, very well attended. The members were very loyal and faithful to their assignments and to their responsibilities.

During these hearings, we heard one word that bothered me a lot, that was the word ''risk.'' As we got into the issue of the budget requests, we were told that this might bring about a certain risk, or a prudent risk, or an acceptable risk. We pursued the issue of what is an acceptable risk when it comes to national defense or what is a prudent risk. Let me explain briefly some of the things that we heard.

One, we were told that the United States is going to show much more presence in the Pacific area. I certainly agree with that. That is a very, very

important part of the world, and we have got to be present.

□ 1400

The other point was that, as we did our hearings, we were told that in the Mid East, in the Persian Gulf area, we need a buildup of naval forces in order to do the job that has to be done, especially as we watch what Iran is doing, what Iran is threatening to do, and the choke point of the Strait of Hormuz where much of the world's oil transports.

Well, these risks, we think, have been met. But on the Navy buildup, the budget request actually would reduce the naval capability, the number of assets that we have. So we differed with the budget request on that, and we added funding. And by the way, with the support of the Secretary of the Navy, we added funding for an additional DDG–51 destroyer.

In addition, the Secretary of the Navy was really determined to build a second *Virginia*-class submarine for 2014. And it was not in the budget, but he convinced us that it was important to do; and so besides the DDG–51, we provided the advance procurement to schedule that second *Virginia*-class submarine for 2014.

In addition, there are three cruisers that were about to be decommissioned; and for a lesser fee than decommissioning, we determined to keep those cruisers in business and keep them capable and keep them available for that naval buildup that our hearings told us the Navy felt that they really needed.

One other issue that I would like to raise is the Air Force—and we're not at war with the Air Force, by the way, but we have some differences. The Air Force determined to take away aviation assets from the Air National Guard in our States. And we heard from all of our Governors. We heard from all of our TAGS, the adjutant generals, that this would really be crippling to the mission of the Air National Guard and the National Guard if those assets were lost.

So we recommended to the Air Force, we provided $850 million to do what we call a ''pause,'' to let's get together and let's work with the States, let's work with the Governors, let's work with the adjutant generals to see what is the right thing to do here, and not deny the States the assets that they need, the aviation assets that they need.

There's so much more to this bill. The bill has been available online. The copies of the bill have been available. The lists of all of the issues have been isolated in press releases, so the actual contents of the bill have been available for weeks and so at this point I'm not going to go further into the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army	43,298,409	40,777,844	40,730,014	-2,568,395	-47,830
Military Personnel, Navy	26,803,334	27,090,893	27,075,933	+272,599	-14,960
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	13,635,136	12,481,050	12,560,999	-1,074,137	+79,949
Military Personnel, Air Force	28,096,708	28,048,539	28,124,109	+27,401	+75,570
Reserve Personnel, Army	4,289,407	4,513,753	4,456,823	+167,416	-56,930
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,935,544	1,898,668	1,871,688	-63,856	-26,980
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	644,722	664,641	651,861	+7,139	-12,780
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	1,712,705	1,741,365	1,743,875	+31,170	+2,510
National Guard Personnel, Army	7,585,645	8,103,207	8,089,477	+503,832	-13,730
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	3,088,929	3,110,065	3,158,015	+69,086	+47,950
Total, title I, Military Personnel	131,090,539	128,430,025	128,462,794	-2,627,745	+32,769
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	31,072,902	36,608,592	36,422,738	+5,349,836	-185,854
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	38,120,821	41,606,943	41,463,773	+3,342,952	-143,170
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,542,937	5,983,163	6,075,667	+532,730	+92,504
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	34,985,486	35,435,360	35,408,795	+423,309	-26,565
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	30,152,008	31,993,013	31,780,813	+1,628,805	-212,200
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,071,733	3,162,008	3,199,423	+127,690	+37,415
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,305,134	1,246,982	1,256,347	-48,787	+9,365
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	271,443	272,285	277,377	+5,934	+5,092
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,274,359	3,166,482	3,362,041	+87,682	+195,559
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,924,932	7,108,612	7,187,731	+262,799	+79,119
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,098,780	6,015,455	6,608,826	+510,046	+593,371
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,861	13,516	13,516	-345	---
Environmental Restoration, Army	346,031	335,921	335,921	-10,110	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy	308,668	310,594	310,594	+1,926	---
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	525,453	529,263	529,263	+3,810	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	10,716	11,133	11,133	+417	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	326,495	237,543	237,543	-88,952	---
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	107,662	108,759	108,759	+1,097	---
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account	508,219	519,111	519,111	+10,892	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	105,501	274,198	50,198	-55,303	-224,000
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance	163,073,141	174,938,933	175,159,569	+12,086,428	+220,636

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,360,334	5,853,729	6,115,226	+754,892	+261,497
Missile Procurement, Army	1,461,223	1,302,689	1,602,689	+141,466	+300,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	2,070,405	1,501,706	1,884,706	-185,699	+383,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,884,424	1,739,706	1,576,768	-307,656	-162,938
Other Procurement, Army	7,924,214	6,326,245	6,488,045	-1,436,169	+161,800
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,675,734	17,129,296	17,518,324	-157,410	+389,028
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,224,432	3,117,578	3,072,112	-152,320	-45,466
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	626,848	759,539	677,243	+50,395	-82,296
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	14,919,114	13,579,845	15,236,126	+317,012	+1,656,281
Other Procurement, Navy	6,013,385	6,169,378	6,364,191	+350,806	+194,813
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,422,570	1,622,955	1,482,081	+59,511	-140,874
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,950,000	11,002,999	11,304,899	-1,645,101	+301,900
Coast Guard (by transfer)	(63,500)	---	---	(-63,500)	---
Missile Procurement, Air Force	6,080,877	5,491,846	5,449,146	-631,731	-42,700
Advanced Extremely High Frequency Communications Satellites, Advanced appropriation FY 2014	---	833,500	---	---	-833,500
Advanced appropriation FY 2015	---	763,900	---	---	-763,900
Advanced appropriation FY 2016	---	708,400	---	---	-708,400
Advanced appropriation FY 2017	---	1,107,200	---	---	-1,107,200
Advanced appropriation FY 2018	---	1,013,700	---	---	-1,013,700
Total, Advanced appropriations	---	4,426,700	---	---	-4,426,700
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	499,185	599,194	599,194	+100,009	---
Other Procurement, Air Force	17,403,564	16,720,848	16,632,575	-770,989	-88,273
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,893,428	4,187,935	4,429,335	-464,093	+241,400
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	---	---	2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
Defense Production Act Purchases	169,964	89,189	63,531	-106,433	-25,658
Total, title III, Procurement	104,579,701	101,621,377	102,496,191	-2,083,510	+874,814
FY 2013	(104,579,701)	(97,194,677)	(102,496,191)	(-2,083,510)	(+5,301,514)
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	8,745,492	8,929,415	8,593,055	-152,437	-336,360
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	17,753,940	16,882,877	16,987,768	-766,172	+104,891
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	26,535,996	25,428,046	25,117,692	-1,418,304	-310,354
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	19,193,955	17,982,161	19,100,362	-93,593	+1,118,201
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	191,292	185,268	185,268	-6,024	---
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	72,420,675	69,407,767	69,984,145	-2,436,530	+576,378

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,575,010	1,516,184	1,516,184	-58,826	---
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,100,519	608,136	564,636	-535,883	-43,500
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds	2,675,529	2,124,320	2,080,820	-594,709	-43,500
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance	30,582,235	31,349,279	31,122,095	+539,860	-227,184
Procurement	632,518	506,462	521,762	-110,756	+15,300
Research, development, test and evaluation	1,267,306	672,977	1,218,377	-48,929	+545,400
Total, Defense Health Program 1/	32,482,059	32,528,718	32,862,234	+380,175	+333,516
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance	1,147,691	635,843	635,843	-511,848	---
Procurement	---	18,592	18,592	+18,592	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	406,731	647,351	647,351	+240,620	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/	1,554,422	1,301,786	1,301,786	-252,636	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	1,209,620	999,363	1,133,363	-76,257	+134,000
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 2/	---	227,414	217,414	+217,414	-10,000
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	---	99,477	---	---	-99,477
Office of the Inspector General 1/	346,919	273,821	350,321	+3,402	+76,500
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	35,593,020	35,430,579	35,865,118	+272,098	+434,539
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	513,700	514,000	514,000	+300	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA)	547,891	540,252	511,476	-36,415	-28,776
Total, title VII, Related agencies	1,061,591	1,054,252	1,025,476	-36,115	-28,776

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005)	(3,750,000)	(5,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-750,000)	(-2,000,000)
Indian Financing Act incentives (Sec.8019)	15,000	---	15,000	---	+15,000
FFRDC (Sec.8023)	-150,245	---	---	+150,245	---
Overseas Military Facility Invest Recovery (Sec.8028)	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8040)	-2,575,217	---	-1,019,316	+1,555,901	-1,019,316
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8051)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
O&M, Army transfer authority (Sec.8066)	(124,493)	(133,381)	(133,381)	(+8,888)	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8068)	4,000	---	4,000	---	+4,000
National grants (Sec.8076)	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Shipbuilding & conversion funds, Navy (Sec.8081)	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
Global Security Contingency Fund (O&M, Defense-wide transfer)	(200,000)	(200,000)	---	(-200,000)	(-200,000)
Working Capital Fund excess cash balances	-515,000	---	---	+515,000	---
Excess Army Working Capital Fund carryover (Sec.8087)	---	---	-2,460,900	-2,460,900	-2,460,900
Fisher House transfer authority (Sec.8093)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
ICMA transfer authority	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	(-20,000)	(-20,000)
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8098)	(135,631)	(139,204)	(139,204)	(+3,573)	---
Alternative Energy Resources for Deployed Forces	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec.8107)	250,000	---	270,000	+20,000	+270,000
(transfer authority)	---	(51,000)	---	---	(-51,000)
MIP Transfer Fund	310,758	---	---	-310,758	---
Eliminate civilian pay raise (Sec.8119)	---	---	-258,524	-258,524	-258,524
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions	-2,597,704	8,000	-3,397,740	-800,036	-3,405,740
TITLE IX					
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (OCO) 3/					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (OCO)	7,195,335	9,165,082	9,165,082	+1,969,747	---
Military Personnel, Navy (OCO)	1,259,234	874,625	870,425	-388,809	-4,200
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (OCO)	714,360	1,621,356	1,623,356	+908,996	+2,000
Military Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	1,492,381	1,286,783	1,286,783	-205,598	---
Reserve Personnel, Army (OCO)	207,162	156,893	156,893	-50,269	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (OCO)	44,530	39,335	39,335	-5,195	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (OCO)	25,421	24,722	24,722	-699	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	26,815	25,348	25,348	-1,467	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (OCO)	664,579	583,804	583,804	-80,775	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	9,435	10,473	10,473	+1,038	---
Total, Military Personnel	11,639,252	13,788,421	13,786,221	+2,146,969	-2,200

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (OCO)	44,794,156	28,591,441	26,682,437	-18,111,719	-1,909,004
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (OCO)	7,674,026	5,880,395	5,880,395	-1,793,631	---
Coast Guard (by transfer) (OCO)	---	(254,461)	(254,461)	(+254,461)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (OCO)	3,935,210	4,066,340	4,566,340	+631,130	+500,000
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (OCO)	10,879,347	9,241,613	9,136,236	-1,743,111	-105,377
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (OCO)	9,252,211	7,824,579	7,790,579	-1,461,632	-34,000
Coalition support funds (OCO)	(1,690,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,750,000)	(+60,000)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (OCO)	217,500	154,537	152,387	-65,113	-2,150
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OCO)	74,148	55,924	55,924	-18,224	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (OCO)	36,084	25,477	25,477	-10,607	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OCO)	142,050	120,618	120,618	-21,432	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (OCO)	377,544	382,448	382,448	+4,904	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (OCO)	34,050	19,975	34,500	+450	+14,525
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (OCO)	---	---	3,250,000	+3,250,000	+3,250,000
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	77,416,326	56,363,347	58,077,341	-19,338,985	+1,713,994
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (OCO)	400,000	400,000	375,000	-25,000	-25,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (OCO)	11,200,000	5,749,167	5,026,500	-6,173,500	-722,667
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (OCO)	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance	89,016,326	62,512,514	63,478,841	-25,537,485	+966,327
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (OCO)	1,137,381	486,200	541,600	-595,781	+55,400
Missile Procurement, Army (OCO)	126,556	49,653	49,653	-76,903	---
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (OCO)	37,117	15,422	15,422	-21,695	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (OCO)	208,381	357,493	338,493	+130,112	-19,000
Other Procurement, Army (OCO)	1,334,345	2,015,907	2,005,907	+671,562	-10,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (OCO)	480,935	164,582	146,277	-334,658	-18,305
Weapons Procurement, Navy (OCO)	41,070	23,500	22,500	-18,570	-1,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (OCO)	317,100	285,747	284,450	-32,650	-1,297
Other Procurement, Navy (OCO)	236,125	98,882	98,882	-137,243	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (OCO)	1,233,996	943,683	943,683	-290,313	---
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	1,235,777	305,600	305,600	-930,177	---
Missile Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	41,220	34,350	34,350	-6,870	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (OCO)	109,010	116,203	116,203	+7,193	---
Other Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	3,088,510	2,818,270	2,785,170	-303,340	-33,100
Procurement, Defense-Wide (OCO)	405,768	196,349	217,849	-187,919	+21,500
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (OCO)	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund (OCO)	2,600,170	---	---	-2,600,170	---
Total, Procurement	13,633,461	7,911,841	7,906,039	-5,727,422	-5,802

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (OCO)	18,513	19,860	14,860	-3,653	-5,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (OCO)	53,884	60,119	60,119	+6,235	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (OCO)	259,600	53,150	53,150	-206,450	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (OCO)	194,361	112,387	107,387	-86,974	-5,000
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	526,358	245,516	235,516	-290,842	-10,000
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (OCO)	435,013	503,364	293,600	-141,413	-209,764
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (OCO)	1,228,288	993,898	993,898	-234,390	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (OCO)	456,458	469,025	469,025	+12,567	---
Joint IED Defeat Fund (OCO)	2,441,984	1,675,400	1,614,900	-827,084	-60,500
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (OCO)	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Office of the Inspector General (OCO)	11,055	10,766	10,766	-289	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	4,137,785	3,249,089	3,088,589	-1,049,196	-160,500
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (OCO) (Sec.9002)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-1,000,000)	(-1,000,000)
Troop reduction (OCO)	-4,042,500	---	---	+4,042,500	---
Rescissions (OCO) (Sec.9014)	-380,060	---	-579,900	-199,840	-579,900
Total, General Provisions	-4,422,560	---	-579,900	+3,842,660	-579,900
Total, Title IX	114,965,635	88,210,745	88,208,906	-26,756,729	-1,839
Total for the bill (net)	622,862,127	601,225,998	599,885,279	-22,976,848	-1,340,719
Less appropriations for subsequent years	---	-4,426,700	---	---	+4,426,700
Net grand total	622,862,127	596,799,298	599,885,279	-22,976,848	+3,085,981

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2013 (H.R. 5856)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent)	22,000	22,000	22,000	---	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent)	9,000	9,000	9,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund:					
Defense function	---	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---
Non-defense function	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
DHP, O&M to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund:					
Defense function	---	-139,204	-139,204	-139,204	---
Non-defense function	---	139,204	139,204	+139,204	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Department of State:					
Defense function	-200,000	-100,000	---	+200,000	+100,000
Non-defense function	200,000	100,000	---	-200,000	-100,000
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 4/	10,733,000	8,026,000	8,026,000	-2,707,000	---
(OCO) 3/	117,000	271,000	271,000	+154,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	10,881,000	8,328,000	8,328,000	-2,553,000	---
Adjusted total (includ. scorekeeping adjustments)	633,743,127	605,127,298	608,213,279	-25,529,848	+3,085,981
Appropriations	(636,318,344)	(605,127,298)	(609,232,595)	(-27,085,749)	(+4,105,297)
Rescissions	(-2,575,217)	---	(-1,019,316)	(+1,555,901)	(-1,019,316)
Total mandatory and discretionary	633,743,127	605,127,298	608,213,279	-25,529,848	+3,085,981
Mandatory	(513,700)	(514,000)	(514,000)	(+300)	---
Discretionary	(633,229,427)	(604,613,298)	(607,699,279)	(-25,530,148)	(+3,085,981)
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	131,090,539	128,430,025	128,462,794	-2,627,745	+32,769
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	163,073,141	174,938,933	175,159,569	+12,086,428	+220,636
Title III - Procurement	104,579,701	101,621,377	102,496,191	-2,083,510	+874,814
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	72,420,675	69,407,767	69,984,145	-2,436,530	+576,378
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,675,529	2,124,320	2,080,820	-594,709	-43,500
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	35,593,020	35,430,579	35,865,118	+272,098	+434,539
Title VII - Related Agencies	1,061,591	1,054,252	1,025,476	-36,115	-28,776
Title VIII - General Provisions (net)	-2,597,704	8,000	-3,397,740	-800,036	-3,405,740
Title IX - Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO)	114,965,635	88,210,745	88,208,906	-26,756,729	-1,839
Total, Department of Defense	622,862,127	601,225,998	599,885,279	-22,976,848	-1,340,719
Scorekeeping adjustments	10,881,000	8,328,000	8,328,000	-2,553,000	---
Less appropriations for subsequent years	---	-4,426,700	---	---	+4,426,700
Total mandatory and discretionary	633,743,127	605,127,298	608,213,279	-25,529,848	+3,085,981

FOOTNOTES:
1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
3/ Global War on Terrorism (GWOT)
4/ Contributions to Department of Defense Retiree Health Care Fund (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375)(CBO est)

Mr. DICKS. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2013 Department of Defense bill.

I first want to thank Chairman YOUNG for his very generous comments about my service on the Defense Subcommittee. And he is absolutely right, we have always, no matter who was chairman or which party was in control, we've always, on a bipartisan basis, worked to take care of the needs of our troops to make sure that we were properly funded in equipment and to do it on the basis of what was right and what was necessary. I appreciate his leadership of this subcommittee, and I wish him well as we finish up this year.

This bill continues the Defense Subcommittee's long tradition, as I mentioned, of bipartisanship and finding common ground as members work together, under Mr. YOUNG's leadership, to provide for the Department of Defense. I'm pleased to report that the subcommittee has again crafted a bill that places national security and the needs of U.S. servicemembers above partisan politics.

I strongly support the priorities set in this bill. The bill supports our troops. It includes funding for the third consecutive year to replace inadequate schools owned by local educational authorities and the Department of Education that are located on military installations.

It includes $40 million above the request for Impact Aid.

It includes $125 million above the request for traumatic brain injury and psychological health, as well as an additional $20 million above the request for suicide prevention and outreach.

And the bill has a total of $1.2 billion in Defense Health Program research and development, $545 million above the request.

The bill continues the committee's longstanding support for peer-reviewed breast cancer research, peer-reviewed prostate cancer research, vision research, spinal cord research, and many other medical research initiatives.

The bill supports the Guard and Reserve. It includes funding to pause force structure reductions and aircraft retirements proposed by the Air Force that would affect Air Guard and Reserve units across the country.

And the bill contains $2 billion for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account.

The bill supports today's equipment needs and develops tomorrow's technology. It supports Secretary Panetta's strategic focus on the Asia-Pacific region by including robust funding for shipbuilding and the Patriot missile defense system.

The bill supports DOD's intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance needs by providing the resources for Global Hawk UAVs.

The bill addresses the Navy's strike fighter shortfall by funding F–18 Hornets and providing advance procurement for F–18G electronic attack aircraft.

The bill provides for ground equipment such as the Abrams tank, Bradley Fighting Vehicle, and HMMWV modernization. This funding provides for Army equipment needs, including the Guard and Reserve, and helps maintain a stable industrial base.

The bill includes $250 million for the Rapid Innovation Fund that will continue the committee's efforts, started in 2011, to promote innovative research and defense technologies among small businesses; and the bill includes funding above the request for joint U.S.-Israeli missile defense activities, including $680 million for Iron Dome.

The bill funds operations in Afghanistan consistent with the President's plan to wind down our presence as agreed to in the Lisbon Accord of 2010 and this year's NATO summit in Chicago.

The bill also includes important restrictions on DOD activities. The bill prohibits permanent U.S. bases in Iraq or Afghanistan and prohibits U.S. control over Iraqi oil resources. The bill prohibits the torture of detainees. The bill prohibits training foreign military forces if these forces are known to commit gross violations of human rights. And the bill limits reimbursements to Pakistan until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies that Pakistan is working cooperatively with the U.S. against terrorist activity.

While I support the funding level and priorities included in this bill, I must also express my objection, not to Mr. YOUNG, but to the majority decision to renege on the bipartisan agreement reached less than a year ago in the Budget Control Act. I believe the reduced discretionary allocation in the Ryan budget threatens to stall economic growth and job creation; and in the near term, it introduces uncertainty in our appropriations process that imperils our ability to produce these bills in a timely manner.

Accordingly, it is my belief that we could save a considerable amount of time in the appropriations process if we simply returned to the agreement reached last year in August, the $1.047 trillion allocation level for this year, a level which even the Republican other body leadership concedes is where we will eventually end up.

Despite this reservation, I want to congratulate Chairman YOUNG for producing a bill that meets the most pressing needs of the Department of Defense, and for doing so in the best tradition of the Appropriations Committee.

And I must say that I feel we have one of the best staffs on the whole Hill. And I know Paul and Tom have worked together when Paul was the clerk and Tom was representing Mr. YOUNG as the ranking member. And the cooperation of all the staff members has been extraordinary, and they've worked very hard to prepare this bill for the floor, and I want to congratulate them on their good efforts.

□ 1410

Also, I want to thank Mr. ROGERS for his efforts to restore regular order. I think it's outstanding that we have had this bill in a subcommittee markup, a full committee markup, now brought to the floor under an open rule. This is the way this committee should operate, and I appreciate his efforts to provide that leadership.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise in support of this essential bill.

It provides more than $519 billion in critical resources for a strong national defense, supporting our warfighters and protecting the American people. This is an increase of $1.1 billion over last year and more than $3 billion more than what the President asked of us. It is also more than $8 billion over what the Senate Democrats would like to provide.

This Nation, with all the opportunities it provides and the rights it grants, would not be the bastion of freedom without the greatest defense system in the world. Freedom is not free. As we continue to face threats to our safety and way of life, we must deal with the costs of war, keep our military at the ready, and stay constantly vigilant.

This bill supports and takes care of our troops at the highest level possible, providing a 1.7 percent pay raise. We have also increased the critical health and benefits program that our troops deserve, providing $35.1 billion for health and family programs, including funding for traumatic brain injury research and suicide prevention outreach programs.

This legislation keeps America at the forefront of defense technologies by continuing research and development efforts. We boost key training and readiness programs to prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions with an increase of $12.1 billion for operations and maintenance. We also enhance our military arsenal with $102.5 billion for equipment and upgrades, and we continue fighting the global war on terror by including $88.5 billion for overseas contingency operations.

But, in this environment of fiscal austerity, the committee recognized that even the Pentagon should not have carte blanche when it comes to discretionary spending. We increased oversight and took a balanced approach to budgeting. Commonsense decisions were made to save tax dollars wherever possible, including rescinding unused, prior-year funds and terminating unnecessary programs like the

Medium Extended Air Defense System; but we can guarantee that none of these cuts will affect the safety or success of our troops and missions.

The bill also prohibits funding for the transfers of Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. or its territories, prohibits funding to modify any facility in the U.S. to house detainees, and places strict conditions on the release of detainees—all provisions that were authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act.

I want to take a moment, Mr. Chairman, to recognize the Appropriations Committee's ranking member, Mr. DICKS, who also serves as ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee. He has been a formidable servant of the American people and a dedicated usher of appropriations dollars for some 36 years, and we appreciate his service. As he moves to another phase of his life, we wish him well and Godspeed. He has been a great member of this committee and subcommittee and of this Congress.

Also, I want to say a word of thanks to JERRY LEWIS of California, who has been a member and chairman of the Defense Subcommittee and the full committee, for his many years of service to the appropriations process and to this Congress.

We will be sorry to lose the expertise, the leadership, talent, and friendship of these two gentlemen when they retire at the end of this year, but we wish them well in their next pursuits in life. The Appropriations Committee has been made stronger, more responsive, responsible, and respectful thanks to these two outstanding and upstanding legislators and appropriators.

I also want to say a word of congratulations and thanks to our chairman, BILL YOUNG, and to this great staff that NORM DICKS has referred to as the greatest on the Hill, and I can't dispute that. They worked long and hard on a very, very tough bill, under austere circumstances, in order to put together a bill that is necessary for our Nation's defense. These many hours and capable hands that have had a touch on this bill, I think, have crafted a successful bipartisan bill that all of us can be proud to support.

So congratulations, Chairman YOUNG, for another great job. You bring such expertise and experience to this chore, which is so much appreciated by this body.

Mr. Chairman, this is a must-pass piece of legislation that is vital to the security of our homeland and to the safety and health of our troops and veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this great Nation and to approve this necessary bill.

Mr. DICKS. I yield 3 minutes to a very senior member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

I want to acknowledge the work of our full committee under the chairmanship of Mr. ROGERS, and obviously the wonderful work of our chairman, BILL YOUNG, and of our subcommittee ranking member, Mr. DICKS. Their collegial work has made this bill possible, and it will benefit our entire Nation, our men and women in uniform, our Armed Forces, and all of those who are touched by this legislation.

I would like to add my voice to those who wish to recognize the magnificent work that Congressman DICKS has done during his years of service to our country back from the time when he first worked for Senator Warren Magnuson. We would like to wish him, his wife, Suzie, and their beautiful family many healthy and productive years ahead. We thank him for his distinguished and honorable and intrepid service—always dutiful, always enlightened. When he walks from these Halls officially, he takes great knowledge and should take great satisfaction with him for a job well done, indeed.

I want to extend to Congressman JERRY LEWIS, as well, deep appreciation from the people of our States and country for your incredible service.

I would venture to say, when both of you gentlemen leave these Chambers, nearly a century of knowledge will walk with you. You have left America with her strongest defense globally, and you have been a part of crafting every single line of these bills. America thanks you and the free world thanks you.

This bill has been written in a bipartisan way by our subcommittee, and I thank the members for working collaboratively together. It is a model for our committee and Congress on how to do the work necessary to meet the needs of the American people.

The bill includes $125 million above the President's request for funding health research for traumatic brain injuries and posttraumatic stress, which are the signature wounds of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our bill includes an additional $246 million for cancer research, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, ovarian cancer, and lung cancer.

The bill also includes necessary funding for the Iron Dome. During the last decade of war, our National Guard and Reserve units have proven themselves as the strategic reserve force for our Nation. The Air Force, in submitting its FY13 budget, did not appear to appropriately appreciate the importance of the Guard and Reserve because they targeted those units for mission reductions and cancellations. Our subcommittee has fixed this oversight by providing the necessary funding to allow the Guard and Reserve to continue their missions, which they do extremely well and at considerably less cost than the Air Force does.

Our bill fixes a continuing issue from the executive branch and maintains our Nation's industrial base by making sure we do not end the domestic production capability for tanks for the first time since World War II. The bill averts a plan to shut down the production line for 2 years. Shutting the lines would have cost the American taxpayers more money than producing tanks over the same time and would dismantle the critical, fragile supplier network.

The legislation also continues the military's commitment to lead our Nation towards energy independence. The Pentagon, as the largest petroleum user in the world, must lead our Nation toward energy independence. No challenge could be more vital to our national security and economic security interests. High fuel costs are an enormous burden on America's families. It is also a severe and wasteful burden on our service branches, and it diverts funds from important readiness and modernization needs.

Thank you, Mr. DICKS, for this time. Godspeed to you and to your family in the years ahead.

Thank you, Congressman LEWIS. To you and to your wife, Arlene, may you enjoy many wonderful years ahead.

Thank you, Chairman YOUNG, for being a chairman who brings this Congress together at the subcommittee level, and Chairman ROGERS, at the full committee level. Thank you for working with all of our Members to meet the needs of our Nation and our Nation's defense.

□ 1420

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), who is an extremely important member of this subcommittee and also represents this subcommittee with the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and for his leadership, and that of Mr. DICKS, as well.

In preparation for this debate, the subcommittee held a lengthy series of hearings examining such varied issues as our operations in Afghanistan, the so-called pivot to the Asia-Pacific region, Army modernization, Navy shipbuilding, Marine end strength, and the Air Force restructuring proposals.

Most of these issues relate, as the chairman has said, to mitigating risk in the Defense budget in what is called the ''new strategic guidance'' from the Department of Defense. It's what I would characterize as protecting our gains in the Middle East and elsewhere, as well as preparing for future and current threats, such as China's growing military capacity, instability in the Korean peninsula, civil war in Syria, Iran's pledge to close the Strait of Hormuz, and others.

As you'll hear during this debate, the committee weighed in with its own options. As the chairman said, we pause the Air Force restructuring decisions. In light of the tyranny of distance that characterizes the Asia-Pacific region,

we bolster the Navy's shipbuilding accounts and add back in a Virginia-class submarine and a Burke-class destroyer.

Our goal here, and throughout the bill, was to provide the resources to support our warfighters now and in the future whenever the next crisis arises. We clearly recognized the Nation's debt and deficit, and found areas in programs where reductions were possible without adversely impacting our Armed Forces and modernization readiness efforts.

Exercising our mandate to adhere to sound budgeting, we reclaimed funding for programs terminated or restructured since the budget was released. We've achieved savings for favorable contract price adjustments, such as multiyear procurements of complicated weapons systems. We cut unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need. We also took recisions from surplus from prior year funds. Frankly, it is important that we find savings without harming readiness or increasing the risks incurred by our warfighters.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us includes funding for critical national security needs and provides the necessary resources to continue the Nation's vital military efforts abroad. In addition, the bill provides essential funding for health and quality-of-life programs for our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—and their families.

I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member DICKS, Chairman ROGERS, and all the Members of the subcommittee for their work, and the excellent staff we have, and our past leadership and our continued leadership from Congressman JERRY LEWIS of California. We were all able to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure that our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—and their families have the support they need. The years ahead will be challenging, but our defense bill will meet those needs.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). He and I were in the same class together and enjoyed many spirited debates on national security issues. I consider him to be a good friend and someone who cares a great deal about these issues.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS and I started 36 years ago at the height of the Cold War, with each country building more and more nuclear weapons, more and more defense systems in an ever escalating war of nerves that kept both countries and the whole world on edge.

In this Republican fantasy land, gold-plated nuclear weapons systems budget, there are going to be programs that have long outlived their usefulness that are lavished with canyons filled with cash. In this fantasy land, the Cold War never ended. The Soviet menace lives on, making it necessary to maintain vast stockpiles of nuclear weapons and build new bombers to penetrate the Iron Curtain. In this fantasy land, there are mountains of money for intercontinental ballistic missiles towering over the landscape and providing shade and comfort to the legions of defense contractors making nuclear weapons we no longer need and we can no longer afford. In this fantasy land, the Republicans want to retroactively re-fight the Cold War that we won. This makes no sense.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to get real. Sequestration is coming. The Republicans, in their budget, are ignoring the doomsday clock that has nearly reached midnight for millions of hard-working Americans. We must prepare for this reality. The bill the Republicans have brought to the floor today provides the Pentagon with a billion more dollars than this year's spending level, and $3 billion more than the Obama administration requested. Despite sequestration, despite budget pressures, despite the fragility of the economy, the Republicans still want to increase defense spending. Why? To pay for more radioactive relics of the past that no longer are needed in order to protect our country.

But I have good news for my friends on the other side of the aisle: the Cold War ended more than 20 years ago. The Soviet Union crumbled. It's okay to stop funding nuclear weapons to perpetuate a Cold War rivalry that has disappeared into the mists of history. We don't have to buy into this insanity. That is why I plan to offer several sane amendments to reduce Pentagon spending on unnecessary, outdated nuclear weapons programs.

Here is the bottom line: beginning January 1 of next year, 5 months from now, $55 billion has to be cut out of the defense budget and $55 billion has to be cut out of civilian social programs. That is $55 billion and $55 billion apiece. The Republicans are increasing defense spending heading into that. Moreover, they're saying, Don't cut defense at all, cut the social programs.

What does that mean? That means cutting the NIH, cutting CDC, cutting the National Cancer Institute. They're already going to be cut under sequestration. What the Republicans are proposing is to really create a true doomsday machine, and that doomsday machine is the lack of a cure for Alzheimer's, for Parkinson's, for all of the other diseases which actually do pose a terrorist threat to families across the country when they get the call that once more that disease has come through their family because we—that is, the Republicans—have decided that they're going to continue to cut the research for the cure for disease and instead build more nuclear weapons to be aimed at targets that no longer exist.

This is an important debate to have. It's a sequestration anticipation debate where we begin to be forced to get real. We have to have a debate about what the priorities in the 21st century are going to be, and not some Dr. Strangelove smiling from his grave, being so happy that we're still debating additional nuclear weapons.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to say to the House that we understand the importance of sequestration, and we've got to stop sequestration. It's just not good, especially for our national defense. This Congress, this committee has not ignored the issue.

□ 1430

Last year, last year alone, this committee recommended a bill that reduced fiscal year '12, fiscal year '13, a total of $39 billion, but we did it carefully. We did it by not just going across the board, cutting muscle out of our national defense. We took money that wasn't going to be spent anyway. We understand the importance of meeting deadlines on funding reductions.

We don't want sequestration. It is not good for the military, it is not good for the country, and it is not good for the economy.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who is one of our subcommittee chairmen on Appropriations.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Let me first say thank you to the chairman, Chairman YOUNG, and Congressman DICKS, the ranking member. Thank you not only for your leadership in bringing this bill to the floor, but thank you for your spirit of cooperation, your spirit of bipartisanship, which has pervaded our subcommittee. As we bring this before the full House, I think there is great agreement among those that serve on the subcommittee.

When you stop and think about the fact that national security is probably the number one responsibility of the Federal Government, the only way to keep America safe is to keep America strong, and I think this bill does that. Now, you'll hear people say, you just heard people say, why do we need to spend so much money on defense, the Cold War is over, we're pulling out of Afghanistan, we're no longer going to be in Iraq; why don't we just kind of pay a peace dividend?

Well, as Chairman YOUNG just pointed out, we are in the midst of a program where we are reducing spending on national defense. We looked at every agency. The Federal Government said you've got to do more with less, you've got to tighten your belt, and the Defense Department is no different.

We're in the middle of actually reducing spending $487 billion over the next 10 years. Then, of course, we face this draconian cut of sequestration. I think that we have got to keep in mind that it is the number one responsibility. We ask our troops, ask our military to do things. We certainly have the best trained and the best equipped military in the history of this world.

But you look at our Navy, for instance. We have half as many ships as we had 30 years ago, half as many, and yet we're asking them to do so many things. Sure, the ships are more technologically advanced. Sure, we've got better trained people. But stop and think about it. When you ask the Navy to go out and interdict drug runners in the Caribbean, and you say chase the pirates off the coast of Somalia and send a carrier into the Mediterranean, guard the Strait of Hormuz when Iran rattles its saber, conduct humanitarian missions down in Haiti, and, by the way, keep an eye on the Pacific Rim, because that's where China is flexing its muscle, remember, numbers matter. The world is no smaller.

We still haven't solved the problem of how do you have one ship in two places at the same time. So it's important that we continue to provide the resources that we need to have a strong national defense.

I think this bill does that. I think we should all support this.

Mr. DICKS. We have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a very important member of this subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, as I am the most junior member of this subcommittee.

But I would be remiss not to echo the praise of my colleagues, both for the chairman and the ranking member. They have worked together extraordinarily well in a way that makes us all proud. Frankly, Mr. DICKS, I am going to miss you greatly from this committee. You have been a mentor and a friend. Thank goodness Mr. YOUNG will be here, and I will have somebody's knee to learn at.

This is a good bill. It does, as has been mentioned earlier, add roughly a billion dollars from roughly $519 billion in the base defense bill. What hasn't been mentioned, though, is that our overseas contingency fund, 8, $8.5 billion, is actually down $27 billion, so we are actually spending less overall on defense this year.

We reduced the number of personnel by over 21,000. We ought to recognize, for those of our friends who think we're spending too much, we are actually at the beginning of a long drawdown. If you look over the next 5 years, sadly, we're going to reduce defense spending by $500 billion. That means less capability. That means 70,000 fewer soldiers, 20,000 fewer marines. That means 25 fewer combat vessels—288 instead of 313. Seven fewer aircraft fighter wings. Real reduction in capability.

A lot of our friends think we spend too much on defense. The reality is we spend less and less as a percentage of our Federal budget and our overall wealth every year. In the 1970s we were spending 40 percent plus of the Federal budget. This year, it's less than 20. We were spending 9 percent of GDP at the height of the Cold War, this year barely 4.

For those of us that think that this investment hasn't made a difference, I would just recommend in closing, please read Robert Kagen's splendid book, ''The World America Made,'' and think how much freedom and security we have enjoyed for a relatively small price and think about the risk we have run as we go forward if we reduce too far too fast.

I want to thank again the chairman, the ranking member, for making sure that didn't happen. I look forward to working with him to make sure sequestration does not occur. As he rightly points out, it would be devastating.

We should pass this bill, and we then should get about the longer term challenge of making sure sequestration does not occur.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Florida for the time and for your leadership on this critically important bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the push and pull and give and take of the congressional appropriations process we have had many important debates on the proper role of the Federal Government in society. But despite our differences and competing priorities, it is clear that Americans believe in a Federal Government that provides a strong common defense as a priority.

American military leadership is important for our own security but also for global stability and global human rights. It is also important for my home State of Nebraska. Over the past 10 years, Mr. Chairman, 15,000 Nebraskans in uniform have served overseas. Today, 17,000 men and women stationed in Nebraska work tirelessly to strengthen our national security. American troops are steadfast, selfless, and undeterred in their service and deserve our unwavering support.

This bill, I believe, reflects responsibly the challenges of our times. Further amendments may actually strengthen the bill creatively in balance with our fiscal responsibility obligations, but moving forward with our primary obligation to govern in defense of our Nation should be our guiding principle here.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that I learned in this debate that this is Mr. DICKS' retiring session, and I also want to add my thanks for your many years of good service.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he has further speakers on the general debate.

Mr. DICKS. I have no further speakers. Is the chairman going to close?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to take a minute to thank the staff who have worked tirelessly on this bill, Mr. DICKS mentioned them earlier on. We have the responsibility to appropriate for the authorization of the Intelligence Committee and for the authorization legislation of the Armed Services Committee. You can imagine that that is quite a responsibility. The staffing is extremely important because our staff is limited in size to the combined numbers of staff on those two committees that we do appropriate for.

But I want to call special attention to, for example, the minority staff who worked directly with Mr. DICKS, Paul Juola and Becky Leggieri. Paul Juola actually worked in that capacity for the majority staff when we were the majority. In fact, when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I hired Paul. So you can see, this is a very nonpolitical subcommittee.

I would also like to recognize Brooke Boyer on the majority staff; Walter Hearne; Tom McLemore, who is the chief clerk of the majority staff; Jennifer Miller; Tim Prince; Adrienne Ramsay; Ann Reese; Megan Rosenbusch; Paul Terry; BG Wright; and Sherry Young. They are quite a team.

□ 1440

They are able to analyze the budget requests, the budget justifications, and keep the membership advised. So I want to thank them very much for the good work that they do.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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. 5856

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, 2013, 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, $40,730,014,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I have an amendment at the desk printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $96,950,000)''.

Page 3, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $25,550,000)''.

Page 3, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $23,710,000)''.

Page 4, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $23,900,000)''.

Page 8, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $10,100,000)''.

Page 8, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,360,000)''.

Page 8, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $2,230,000)''.

Page 8, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,970,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $187,770,000)''.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Before I do my prepared remarks, I would very much also like to thank both Chairman ROGERS and Chairman YOUNG for the courtesies and all the help that they and their staffs have given me since being on the Appropriations Committee in the positions they are in.

Mr. DICKS, I would especially like to thank you for being a mentor and a guide star through this, not only on the Defense Appropriations bill, but on the Interior bill and, just in general, working on health care. Thank you so very much.

Over the past 4 years, the Department of Defense has spent a stunning $1.55 billion on military bands, musical performances, and concert tours around the world. That's right, $1.55 billion in taxpayer funds for 4 years for military bands. This amendment reduces the Pentagon spending for military bands and musical performances from the $388 million in this bill to $200 million for fiscal year 2013. The $188 million reduction is a transfer to the deficit reduction account. In the National Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 4310, the House included language to limit the authorization for military musical units not to exceed $200 million. This amendment conforms with the defense authorization while cutting spending by $188 million.

Our Nation is in a fiscal crisis. The Pentagon is on pace to spend $4 billion over the next decade on military bands. Is the United States really going to borrow money from China and other foreign countries so the Defense Department can spend billions of dollars for its 140 bands and more than 5,000 full-time professional musicians? How does this enhance our national security?

Congress has a duty to provide the necessary resources for our Armed Forces and to ensure our national defense. We also have an obligation to ensure that every dollar in this bill is strengthening our national security. Spending $388 million of taxpayers' money on military music does not make our Nation more secure. It is a luxury the Pentagon and the taxpayers can just no longer afford.

Before he retired last year, former Defense Secretary Robert Gates said:

> We must come to the realization that not every defense program is necessary, not every defense dollar is sacred and well spent, and that more of everything is simply not sustainable.

Mr. Chairman, the defense dollars I want to cut from military musical units is not necessary; it is not sacred and not well spent with so many other pressing needs. In this fiscal environment it is simply not sustainable.

I don't think anyone here today will tell the American people that there is no waste or excess in the Pentagon's budget. This Congress should not be protecting waste and excess in the Pentagon. It should cut it.

There's a lot of talk, mostly from my Republican colleagues, about protecting defense from the sequester and protecting millionaires and billionaires from expiring tax cuts. Protecting every single defense dollar means shifting the burden and the pain for billions of additional budget cuts onto local communities, middle class families, seniors, the poor, and vulnerable children.

Is this Congress going to really kick more kids off the school lunch program or make deeper cuts to our first responders in order to justify paying for more military music? Well, that will not be my choice. That does not reflect my values, and it is not the legacy I want to leave behind as a policymaker.

This amendment cuts a program that has grown out of control. It reduces the deficit, and it does nothing to impact military readiness, mission strength, or our troops' ability to defend our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support the McCollum amendment and cut unnecessary funding for military bands.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I'm reluctant to do that because I have the privilege of working with Ms. MCCOLLUM on other subcommittee and on the full committee, and she's always very sincere and very generous in the way she treats the issues that she's working with, but I just don't think that we want to eliminate military bands.

First, I must tell you that those who play in the band are trained as basic combat troops and they are called upon in a time of emergency. They are called upon to provide security for military headquarters, wherever it may be located. So I don't think that we want to do away with that capability.

Now, 91 percent of the money that goes to these military bands is to pay the members and their allowances—their uniform, their food—and I just don't think that we want to do that. Our military bands play for the President, play for military functions; but many communities in our country are constantly inviting military bands to come play patriotic programs in our hometowns, and this is good for our community. This lets us be part of our military. This doesn't put our military in a barracks someplace and keep them isolated from the general population, and I think the military should be part of our general population.

I just believe that this is not a good idea.

Ninety-one percent of this money will come out of the military personnel account, which pays for very important things like salaries, military expenses of feeding and caring for our military personnel. Why should we have our military isolated in the community? They should be part of our communities. It's an all-volunteer force, and this country needs a good shot of patriotism because we've had too much negativism coming at us from all different directions.

This is a positive country. This is a patriotic country. We ought to allow our military to show off their talents not only on the battlefield where they risk their lives, lose their lives, or are terribly injured.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1450

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the 2013 Defense appropriations bill.

First, I want to thank my chairman and friend, Chairman YOUNG, and my friend, Ranking Member DICKS, for their hard work, and their staffs, both the majority and the minority, for an

extremely thoughtful and balanced bill.

In crafting this bill, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee held countless hearings and ensured that strong congressional oversight was alive and well. It's been an honor to serve on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and I can attest to the hard work that's gone into this bill.

Our Nation's first priority is the protection of our citizens and our national interests around the world. This bill fulfills that duty. The FY13 Defense appropriations bill also fulfills a promise to our U.S. servicemembers that they will continue to receive the best training, equipment, and health care. Likewise, the bill fulfills needed requirements to ensure that our commanders have the tools they need to accomplish U.S. missions around the world and support America's defense industrial base.

I understand that many Members may have objections to the overall funding level of the defense bill, and there's no doubt that every aspect of government, including defense, must come under close fiscal scrutiny. However, the short-term benefits of decimating defense will only leave us in a more economically precarious position in the future. This bill properly balances the need to make responsible cuts while ensuring that America maintains its military superiority.

On a personal basis, I want to thank some friends that are leaving the committee, JERRY LEWIS and NORM DICKS, for their many years of service. Not only are they colleagues, but they're good friends, and we're going to miss their service here in this institution. So I thank you for all your hard work.

Lastly, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, this year marks the 12th consecutive appropriations season that the United States has been funding and fighting the war in Afghanistan. Sometimes it's easy to forget that we are still deep in war in Afghanistan. The threat of nuclear weapons in Iran, drone strikes in Pakistan, and the nightmare of mass murder in Syria garner the attention of the news media, but we currently have more than 90,000 troops on the ground in Afghanistan and about 110,000 contractors.

Some of these troops are slated to come home over this summer, but many more, approximately 88,000, will remain. And the exact number of troops that will remain in Afghanistan as the U.S. and allies transition to local security forces through 2013 and 2014 is still unclear. Neither the Pentagon nor the administration has publicly laid out post-2014 plans, but they are clearly leaving open the possibility of a significant military presence. This is the reality we face as we open debate on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not convinced that there is any light at the end of the tunnel. I am not convinced that this war is coming to an end, and I do not believe we should continue sacrificing the dedication and blood of our servicemen and -women for a deeply flawed and corrupt government that is simply not ''fixable.'' Oh, we can change the names, the programs, and the projects, but it's simply more of the same problems over and over and over again.

It is regrettable that this war is not more of a priority in public debate, and it is unconscionable that debating this war is not a top priority for this Congress. The majority wouldn't even let us have a full debate and vote on an amendment during the Defense authorizations bill to make sure that the commitments made by the administration to draw down our troops over the next 2 years are kept.

Congress is deeply complicit in maintaining and continuing this war. We've allocated $634 billion for military operations in Afghanistan since 2001, including the $85.6 billion in this bill. We're not just spending those billions, Mr. Chairman, we're borrowing them. Every single penny for the war in Afghanistan has been borrowed, put on the national credit card, exploded our deficit and our debt—every single penny.

Each week of the war in 2012 costs about $2 billion. If the Pentagon's ''enduring presence'' means thousands of troops remaining in Afghanistan after 2014 for who knows how long, then we are looking at a trillion dollar war.

Meanwhile, we're cutting funds for our schools, preparing to slash billions of dollars from the safety net that's supposed to keep our people out of poverty. We're watching our roads and our bridges crumble, water systems and infrastructure decay, and we're told there's no money to invest in health care and scientific research.

And for what, Mr. Chairman, for what? Show me where our military might has put a permanent end to instability, violence, or corruption. Even though the media isn't focused on it, the violence in Afghanistan goes on.

The U.S. death toll for Operation Enduring Freedom is over 2,000—1,919 of those deaths happened in Afghanistan. Members of the Afghan military and security forces continue to turn their guns on our troops and murder them. According to the Pentagon, 154 Active Duty soldiers committed suicide in the first 159 days of this year—that's almost one per day. And as for our veterans, the VA estimates that a veteran dies by suicide every 80 minutes.

How long will we ask our troops and their families to pay this price? Because they're the only ones paying for this war, Mr. Chairman, the only ones.

I don't believe we should abandon the people of Afghanistan, but I do believe we must end this war sooner rather than later. And I'm not convinced we're anywhere close to an end.

And it's the fault of Congress. We approve the money, and we remain silent year after year after year. We need to stop. We aren't supporting our troops; we're committing them to suffer lifelong trauma from too many deployments for too long a time over too many years for a war without end, for a war that always needs just a little more time and just a few billion dollars more.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to support amendments over the next 3 days to reduce the funding for this war, bring it to an end, and honor the sacrifice of our troops by bringing them and our tax dollars back home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I join my friend from Massachusetts and anyone else, Republican or Democrat, who says it's time to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS for an excellent bill. I agree with probably 80 percent of it, but I cannot continue to support legislation that sends billions and billions and billions of dollars to Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I have a book here in my hand called ''Funding the Enemy: How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban.'' And one of the critiques I would like to read on the back of this book is from the State Department Foreign Service Officer named Peter Van Buren:

> Sober, sad, and important, ''Funding the Enemy'' peels back the layers of American engagement in Afghanistan to reveal its rotten core: that the United States dollars meant for that country's future instead fund the insurgency and support the Taliban. Paying for both sides of the war ensures America's ultimate defeat.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm here today is because I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district. I have signed over 10,474 letters to families who have lost loved ones since we were lied to in order to go into Iraq.

And while we were continuing to support Karzai, I saw where Vice President Cheney was on the Hill yesterday. I have seen my colleagues today talking about sequestration. I didn't see Mr. Karzai here. No. Why should he be here? He's got his money in this bill. He doesn't have to worry about sequestration. All he's got to do is take care of his corrupt government in Afghanistan.

It is time, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the Congress listen to 72 percent of the American people who say: Bring our troops home now, not later. And I join my friend from Massachusetts, my concern about cutting programs for children who need milk in the morning

and senior citizens who need sandwiches in the afternoon. We're going to cut their money, but we're going to still continue to support the Taliban who are killing American kids in Afghanistan because we have no accountability where this $88 billion is going.

It is time for this Congress to come together and say, Yes, we will support our military, but we will not support a corrupt government who is not going to survive anyway. The enemy, the Taliban, will take over Afghanistan when it's all said and done.

Please, America, bring pressure on the Congress to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. God help our men and women in uniform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, we'll be spending the next several days debating the Department of Defense budget, a whopping $519.2 billion. By anyone's accounting, that's a lot of money.

What we won't be debating is the future of our presence in Afghanistan. You'd think a Congress obsessed with the deficit and cutbacks would take a look at the costliest item on our books: the war in Afghanistan.

Nope. No debate on that. Instead, a few of us are coming here to the well to take a handful of 5-minute slots. This is for a war that has cost our Nation in blood and treasure, in ways we may never be able to add up.

And what are those costs?

□ 1500

What are those costs? As of today, we've spent $548 billion on the war. That's $10 billion a month. Actually, it's more than this year's DOD budget.

This year, we face the 2,000th death in Operation Enduring Freedom. More than 15,000 of our brave men and women in uniform have returned home wounded. Every day we lose one more servicemember to suicide. And the Afghan people, how many of them have died and been wounded?

So the other side of the aisle wants to talk about cost. Well, let's do that. What has this misguided war cost us in international standing? Is the U.S. more popular in the Middle East and Central Asia? No. Are we any safer? Probably not. As a new generation of Afghan children grow up in an occupied country, aren't they learning to hate the West? Yes.

What's the cost here at home? How many cops could we have put on the beat? How many homes could have been saved from foreclosure? How many farmers could get drought relief? How many small business jobs could have been created? How many more patients could we have cared for at our veterans hospitals? We'll never know. Because instead of having an honest and open debate about our spending priorities, we have to grab 5 minutes here and 5 minutes there. That's not what the American people want. They want transparency. They want more debate. Further than that, they want this war to be over. They want our troops to come home.

So, yes, by all means, let's talk about cost; but let's not squeeze it in among $500 billion worth of weapons, planes, and the rest of the military industrial complex.

I urge the House leadership to have a real debate on the war in Afghanistan, and let's shine some light on how much it costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to talk a little bit about the appropriations that are going on, in particular, the appropriations for the very, very long war in Afghanistan. Nobody knows when it's going to end.

There's always a pretense. There's always a thought that tomorrow's going to be a better day. I was in the military in the sixties, and there was always this promise that we're just around the turn, and we're going to have peace and prosperity and have perfect results. Well, so far we have not had any perfect results in Afghanistan—there is a lot of unknown—and here we are appropriating even more money to continue this war.

When you talk about war power and the resolution on how we go to war, it becomes very complex today. It was originally intended to be very simple: you went to war when there was a declaration; and the people, through their Congressman, voted up or down on whether you should have a war. Today, we slip and slide and we fall into these traps. We go to war under the U.N. banner and NATO. We never know why we go to war and what the goals are and when the war is over. And they persist.

But there is one analysis made which bothers me a bit and, that is, even if there isn't a declaration of war, if some of the Members come along, as we have been for quite a few years, and say, you know, the Congress never really declared war, the argument they make is, well, as long as you fund a war, you give it credibility, and therefore you indirectly support the war.

Of course, the argument is not so much on how we go to war, but if we get into war, the whole thing is you can't vote against any money. Well, then you don't care about the troops. Oh, you're un-American. Don't do that. That carries the weight of the argument, and people shy away and say, no, I don't like the war, we shouldn't have done it, but I can't go against the troops.

Well, I've had a little experience in the last several years traveling the country and talking about issues like this and looking for support for a position which is quite a bit different than what we have followed here recently. Let me tell you, guess what, the troops give me strong support. They gave me a lot of support. It was huge. For anybody to argue that you don't want to send troops carelessly into no-win, endless wars, to think you're against the troops, it's nonsense.

When I was in the military—I was still in in '65, and that's when the escalation came in Vietnam—the last thing I was wanting to say is, oh, I want somebody in there that wants to expand the war. Why don't we go into Cambodia and Laos. No, I didn't want that. Troops don't want to go to war. I was in a Guard unit as well as Active Duty. People join the Guard and Reserves because they want to defend the country. They don't want to take six trips to the Middle East and endlessly see what's happening.

I get stories all the time about their buddies being killed, the loss of limbs. Then they say, well, we're fighting for freedom. Think about it seriously. How in the world does going over there and fighting in either Iraq or Afghanistan have anything to do with our freedom? Oh, we're fighting to defend our Constitution. Well, we never had a constitutional declaration of war. So that's all a facade. That's all to make people feel guilty that if you don't keep the war going—in Vietnam, it was we have to win, we have to win. So we lose 60,000 troops and we didn't win. So what does that mean?

After McNamara wrote his memoirs and was a bit apologetic about it, he was asked: Does this mean you're apologizing for the kind of war you're in in Vietnam? He said: No. What good is an apology if you don't change policy? That is the thing. If this is not doing well and not doing right, just to say either you're sorry, you're continuing it, we have to have victory and pretend there is a victory around the corner, I think we're fooling ourselves.

We shouldn't deceive ourselves. We should wake up. If we lived within the Constitution and lived within our means, believe me, we would not be in Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for an end to the war in Afghanistan and the removal of U.S. troops and security contractors.

We face real and ongoing challenges from terrorist groups around the world; but after 10 years of fighting, it is clear that an ongoing military presence in Afghanistan is simply not the answer. The over-$630 billion we've spent on this war over the past 10 years has not brought us security, and we cannot bring stability to Afghanistan through an ongoing troop presence.

I support the President's efforts to begin the withdrawal of U.S. troops, and I applaud him for starting that important process. Yet we need, in my

opinion, to act faster to end the war. We need an accelerated timetable for troop withdrawal and a plan to ensure that all U.S. forces are redeployed.

Madam Chairman, over 2,000 Americans have given their lives in Afghanistan in service of their country. That includes almost 1,500 since January 2009 and an estimated 400 since the death of Osama bin Laden. Another 12,000 have been wounded. Perhaps most staggering, more soldiers have committed suicide than have died in combat in Afghanistan. Our troops bear devastating physical and psychological wounds of war.

The war in Afghanistan has placed a devastating strain on our military, our troops, and their families. We've asked more and more from them, with many soldiers serving multiple dangerous deployments, taking them away from their homes and their families for long periods of time.

□ 1510

The suicide rate, again, is a stark reminder that we're not meeting our obligations to these men and women.

Madam Chairman, keeping our troops in Afghanistan comes at great cost to us. Not only does it cost some $8 billion a month, but it continues to cost American lives. It is time for us to end this war. Instead of more boots on the ground, we need to redirect funding toward diplomatic and economic engagement with the Afghan people.

We need to invest in Afghan women, ensuring that they have basic human rights protections, as well as educational and economic opportunities, because Afghanistan will never be stable and prosperous if half of its population is oppressed.

The bottom line is this: hundreds of billions of dollars, and over 2,000 American lives, have not brought us security. Keeping our troops in Afghanistan will not end the threat of terrorism, nor will it bring stability to the Afghan people. We need a new strategy, shifting from military force to true engagement.

Madam Chairman, we are fighting a war that has no military solution. In fact, far from making us safer, our ongoing troop presence actually fuels the insurgency and breeds anti-American sentiment. Instead of pouring another $88 billion into continuing this war for another year, I strongly believe we need to end funding for military engagement in Afghanistan and finally bring our troops home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,359,624,000)''.

Page 3, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,197,682,000)''.

Page 121, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,359,624,000)''.

Page 122, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,197,682,000)''.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I am going to reserve the point of order to allow the gentleman to have his 5 minutes to explain what it is he wants to do.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and also the ranking member for the opportunity to present this amendment.

Madam Chair, the amendment is something different for me. It is not an amendment to reduce spending, and it's also not an amendment to increase spending. In fact, this amendment is outlay neutral.

Similarly, consistent with what the chairman and the ranking member discussed when introducing the bill, this amendment is not a partisan amendment. I do not seek to lay blame on either party or on the President or on the Congress for the circumstance in which we find ourselves.

This amendment regards simply a policy, a policy that traditionally has had bipartisan support in this House, and that policy is that we keep separate spending on the base defense budget, and spending on the Overseas Contingency Operations, or the war budget.

It has come to our attention, and both the CBO and the GAO have confirmed, that there is $5.6 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operation budget, in the war budget, that should be in the base budget. We have taken things such as the base salaries for men and women in uniform who are not deployed and are charging that spending this year to the war budget.

Madam Chair, since 9/11 we have had a policy in this House of keeping those two items separate so that we know the real cost of the war against terror. We have taken the base defense spending and accounted for it in one fashion, and accounted for the war budget in an entirely separate system. This year, for the first time, Madam Chair, we are blending those numbers. We take $5.6 billion of what should be in the base budget and move it to the OCO budget.

Madam Chair, the committee itself recognizes that it is not good policy. If you look at the bill, you will see that the committee itself says let's make sure not to do this next year and the year after that and the year after that. And indeed, we have not done it since 9/11. But we do it this year, this year only in this particular bill, and I think it's important that we continue to abide by the policy that accounts correctly for the cost of the war overseas.

So, Madam Chair, what I say to you is, this amendment is not about spending more money. It's not about spending less money. It is about accounting accurately for the spending that we do so that we can tell folks back home exactly what we spend on the base defense of this Nation and what we spend in the wars overseas. And for that reason, Madam Chair, I would ask for a ''yea'' vote on this particular amendment.

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 is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2013 on May 22, 2012, House Report 112–489.

The adoption of this amendment would cause the subcommittee general purpose suballocation for budget authority made under section 302(b) to be exceeded, and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MULVANEY. I ask to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, it is true that a new point of order was created under the Budget Control Act preventing any legislation from being considered in the House that would cause discretionary spending to exceed the caps established in the Budget Control Act. Under that part of the act, Madam Chair, the entire bill is technically out of order because the entire bill exceeds the BCA caps by $7.5 billion.

Ironically then, if this point of order is sustained, then we will effectively keep within the shadows a nonpartisan policy, something that everyone has supported in the past, a good governance issue, while allowing the entire bill, which also violates the same point of order, to proceed.

My amendment is outlay neutral. It does not increase spending, it does not decrease spending. It simply moves spending from the war budget to the base budget, and vice versa. If the amendment were agreed to, the budget authority in the bill will be exactly the same as it is if the amendment fails, $608,213,000,000.

Accordingly, the amendment does not violate section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act, and overruling the point of order gives us the chance to abide by the precedent established long ago and embraced by both parties.

I respectfully ask that the Chair overrule the point of order.

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

Under House Concurrent Resolution 112, as made applicable by House Resolutions 614 and 643, the Subcommittee on Defense has both a General Purposes allocation and an Overseas Contingency Operations allocation. The accounts in the bill on pages 2 and 3 are under the General Purposes Allocation. The accounts on pages 121 and 122 are under the Overseas Contingency

Operations allocation. The amendment transfers funds from the latter to the former.

The Chair is authoritatively guided under section 312 of the Budget Act and clause 4 of Rule XXIX by an estimate of the chair of the Committee on the Budget that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority in either allocation would cause a breach of that allocation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill under the General Purposes allocation. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. WELCH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Chair, the war in Afghanistan had a legitimate purpose when it began. That was the grounds from which Osama Bin Laden engineered the attack on the World Trade Center. Congress supported going into Afghanistan to take out Osama Bin Laden and to deny a safe haven to terrorists. At a certain point, the policy transformed from an effort to protect us against a base of operations into a nation-building mission.

□ 1520

That was a grave mistake. Adopting nation-building will be seen through the lens of history as being about as effective as trench warfare in World War I.

Our military will do whatever is asked of them. Our job is to make requests of them that are reasonable for them to do. It is not the job of the men and women who serve in the U.S. military to build nation-states in Afghanistan. That policy failed militarily. That policy is unsustainable economically. That policy does not make us more secure. Why?

One, it is not the job of the military to build nation-states. It is the job of the military—and it is one they do very well—to protect America from attack.

Two, if you are attempting a nation-building strategy, you need an ally that is going to be a partner with you. The Karzai government is corrupt. It is infected with corruption. It has exceeded our wildest and most pessimistic expectations of what corruption can be. We do not have a reliable partner.

So the question becomes: At what point do we step back when we have the responsibility to set a policy that protects this Nation, to set a policy that respects our taxpayer, to set a policy that acknowledges the willingness of men and women to serve but that accepts our burden of giving them a policy that is worthy of their unrelenting ability and willingness to sacrifice?

As we know, the American people believe it is time to come home from Afghanistan. They understand it. The President of the United States has said that we will bring our troops home by the end of 2014. So the policies have been changed. The war in Afghanistan, in fact, is over. The question for Congress is: Will we end it?

We are giving it ever more money for a policy we know doesn't work. We know the Karzai government is incapable and unwilling to be an honest partner. We know that nation-building is a strategy that cannot succeed. We know that the threat of terrorism, as persistent as it is, is not a nation-state-centered threat. It is dispersed, and our military response to that has likewise become dispersed.

So why are we pursuing this policy when we have renounced it, acknowledged that it has failed?

The American people don't support it. It's inertia. It is the unwillingness of Congress to take a definitive action where our policy should match our deeds. We are bringing our troops home. We should have as a policy that we bring those troops home as quickly—as quickly—as we responsibly can.

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

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I deeply appreciate the difficult job that Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS have. This is important legislation, difficult balancing. It is a time of strain in terms of the budget, and it is a time of strain for the military. But I do think that my colleagues who come to the floor and who are questioning whether we need to continue the same policy, the same funding, the same direction with Afghanistan are right on point. This Congress should be spending more time actually engaging in a debate on our policy, our practices, our future in Afghanistan.

We initially went to war to deal with the protection of the United States. It was in Afghanistan that Osama bin Laden hatched the plot that led to the 9/11 attacks. He was protected by his Taliban enablers, and it was entirely appropriate for the Bush administration and this Congress to go after him to end that threat and obtain justice.

Sadly, before the job was done in Afghanistan, before Osama bin Laden was actually captured, we veered into a tragically misguided, flawed, and expensive mission in Iraq. As were many of the colleagues who are joining us today on the floor, I was strongly against it. It was a mistake in terms of strategy; it was a horrible price paid by our troops; and it was dramatically unsettling. It has limped along to an unsatisfactory resolution, but it wasn't until 9 years later that we finally finished the job with the death of Osama bin Laden.

I commend the President for being in charge of that operation. But it's done. It's over. We killed Osama bin Laden. It is time for us to stop the longest war in American history, whether it is formally declared or not, and I strongly identify with many of the comments from my friend RON PAUL on the floor here a moment ago.

It is time for the United States to stop spending more in a month in Afghanistan than it would cost to hire every man and woman in Afghanistan of working age. That's what we're spending. You could rent the country for a year for what we are spending for a month, and the resolution is going to be exactly the same. Whether it's 2013, 2014, 2015, whether it's another 100, another 1,000 American lives, whether it's $10 billion or $100 billion, it is time for us to give the military a break, to listen to the American public, to reposition and deal with the challenges at hand.

Madam Chair, I am haunted by the notion that we have lost more men and women to suicide than we have to hostile action. There are terrible consequences for this operation that need go on no longer.

I suggest it's time to end—to save lives, to save money, to save the strain on our military—and for this Congress to get to work on things that will make a difference for international peace and security, for restarting the American economy and for making our communities safer, healthier, and more economically secure. If we do our job in Afghanistan, in scaling it down and in getting the troops out as quickly as we responsibly can, we will take an important step in that direction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, first of all, let me note that our goal after the vicious terrorist attack on the United States on 9/11 was to eliminate Osama bin Laden and to clear Afghanistan, which had been the staging area of the 9/11 attacks, of Osama bin Laden's allies, who happened to have been the Taliban.

My fellow colleagues, Osama bin Laden is dead. The Taliban were cleared from Afghanistan years ago. So it is time for us to declare victory and to bring our troops home. It is not time for us to declare that there is going to be an extension of the deployment of our troops and to leave them there to expend their lives for a cause that has already been decided. They have done their duty. We have accomplished the mission. Let's have a victory parade, not an extension of deployment.

Why are we in this predicament? Why are we even discussing $88 billion and perhaps hundreds, if not thousands, of more American lives being sacrificed halfway around the world, in some canyon somewhere, where some young

American loses his life or loses his legs? Why are we even discussing the expenditure of the billions of dollars that we really need so much here at home if, for nothing else, than to help bring down this level of deficit spending?

□ 1530

Why are we in this position now? Why are we not recognizing this? First of all, let's just note that we are now in a situation where year after year it is taking place after we've actually accomplished our goals in Afghanistan, and our troops are still there losing their lives. It's almost like a ''Twilight Zone'' episode. It is worse than some of the situations that we saw in Vietnam that degenerated year after year after year of America's deployment of forces there. We don't need to spend this money. We don't need to lose their lives. We just need to say we've done our job and come home. Who are we watching out for?

The State Department ended up basically stealing victory out of the jaws of defeat. We won this years ago. Years ago the Taliban were cleared out of Afghanistan. Now we find the situation getting worse. I've been in Afghanistan. I fought with the mujahadeen against the Soviets there personally. Over the years, I was deeply involved with Afghan policy, and people know that. The longer we stay there, the more enemies we're going to make for the United States.

It's going to be harder for us to get out next year than it is for us right now, and we will have made more enemies out of those people when they see foreign troops. Who cares if there is someone in a canyon far away screaming that he hates America? So what. Our guys are going out there right now and investigating situations like that and putting their lives on the line because someone was heard to say good things about the Taliban in some desolate canyon somewhere. What a waste of American lives. What a waste of our resources. On top of it, our State Department has created a system of government—we created a system of government—for the Afghan people, and we're shoving it down their throats now, the most highly centralized and corrupt system of any government in this world. Mr. Karzai is creating a kleptocracy in Afghanistan. No matter how much we're trying to help, that money is disappearing. We're not able to accomplish it, even though the money is going out.

We should recognize that we cannot make history for the Afghan people. They will have to make it for themselves. We have cleared Afghanistan of the Taliban. We have eliminated Osama bin Laden. The Afghan people will now have to shape their own destinies. It is not up to us to expend more of the lives of our young people in order to get the goal that we want, especially when we know now that our government is allied with such a corrupt regime that it will never succeed.

It is time for us to cut the spending, get the troops home as soon as we can, and not waste the lives of more of our people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, first of all, let me just say thank you to my colleagues, Representative JONES and Representative MCGOVERN, and to all of the Members today in calling for a real debate on the war in Afghanistan, which really should have occurred when it was authorized in 2001, which, of course, I could not support then knowing it was a blank check. It was an overly broad resolution for war without end. I have to thank my colleagues today for their leadership in calling for a safe and swift end to this war in Afghanistan. We all know the simple truth: there is no military solution in Afghanistan. Earlier this summer, we passed the sad milestone of 2,000 American lives lost in Afghanistan. Tens of thousands suffer more from wounds both visible and invisible.

As we remember and honor our dead and our wounded and pray for their families and their loved ones, we also have the duty and responsibility and opportunity to act today to ensure that further losses are avoided and that we accelerate the transition to Afghans ruling Afghanistan.

Later on today, I'm going to introduce an amendment to this Defense appropriations bill to limit funding in Afghanistan to the responsible and safe withdrawal of troops. We have the power of the purse strings in this House. For those who believe enough is enough, we should vote for this amendment.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Lee amendment, which will save at least $21 billion and, most importantly, the lives of countless Americans and Afghans. Quite frankly, as has been said earlier, it is time to use these tax dollars to create jobs here at home. It is time to rebuild America and also to provide for the economic security of our brave troops. They have done a tremendous job. They have done everything we have asked them to do. They have carried a tremendous load over the past decade of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Asking them to stay in Afghanistan 2 more years when there is no indication that circumstances on the ground will change is really unconscionable.

Before we send our men and women in uniform into Afghanistan or ask them to stay for another 2 years, we have an obligation to answer simple questions like: What national security interest does the United States currently have in Afghanistan? To what extent does the United States presence in Afghanistan destabilize the country by antagonizing local Afghans? How critical is the overall effort in Afghanistan compared to other priorities in our own country?

Earlier this year, along with my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES and Congresswoman WOOLSEY and Congressman MCGOVERN, we held a hearing on Afghanistan with Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis. This was an ad hoc hearing, mind you, because we should have had the authority to hold that hearing in the House Armed Services Committee or the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but quite frankly the leadership would not let us have a formal hearing. So we had our own.

We had an ad hoc hearing with Colonel Daniel Davis, a brave, outspoken whistleblower, who risked his career to tell the truth about what he saw on the ground in Afghanistan. It was a hearing that every Member of Congress should have heard before voting to spend tens of billions of dollars and risking the lives and limbs of tens of thousands of Americans in uniform.

Those of you who attended the hearing or read the witnesses' testimony understand that the current strategy of propping up a corrupt regime in Afghanistan will almost certainly fail. Instead of having a full debate on the current strategy in Afghanistan, instead of having a real debate about what we hope to gain with more years in Afghanistan, we are limited to these brief opportunities on the floor to remind Congress that the American people overwhelmingly want to bring the war in Afghanistan to an end. People are war-weary, and they want this over.

This Congress has the opportunity once again to stand with seven out of 10 Americans who want to bring the war in Afghanistan to an end by voting ''yes'' on several of the amendments that we're going to be considering. My amendment I will introduce later in this debate will limit the funding to the responsible and safe and orderly withdrawal of United States troops and contractors from Afghanistan.

Madam Chair, let me thank once again our colleagues, Congressman MCGOVERN and Congressman JONES, for gathering us here this afternoon. We have very limited opportunities to reflect the majority of the American people's sentiment in terms of their weariness of this war. It's time to end it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, we have now had combat troops in Afghanistan for over 10 years. It has become the longest war in the history of our Republic. Over 2,000 brave American men and women have perished in this conflict.

Because of their sacrifice and the hard work, dedication, and sacrifices of thousands more brave young men and women, al Qaeda has been decimated and Osama bin Laden, the perpetrator of the September 11 attacks against Americans, has been brought to justice.

□ 1540

Now, almost 11 years after we first arrived, it is time to bring our military involvement in Afghanistan to an end. Afghanistan is its own sovereign country, and its citizens need to take responsibility for their destiny. As for us, we need to bring our troops home and to start reinvesting in America again.

At the recent NATO summit in Chicago, President Obama and NATO leaders announced an end to combat operations in Afghanistan in 2013 and a transition of lead responsibility for security to the Afghan Government by the end of 2014. These are important steps, but the President also recently signed an agreement in Kabul that could keep American troops in the region until 2024. We need to bring our troops home now, not 16 years from now.

This war is costing American taxpayers $130 billion a year. Especially at a time when we are trying to cut the deficit, reduce unnecessary spending, and reinvest in our own economic growth, this is far too much. The entire GDP of Afghanistan is $30 billion, less than a quarter of what we are spending year in and year out.

The nation and Government of Afghanistan face many tough challenges ahead, including working to foster economic development in the foundations of civil society, such as literacy, education, agricultural development, and the empowerment of women. But these are not challenges that are primarily military in nature. As such, it is time to let local Afghans do local jobs and build their economy rather than rely on government contractors.

I have visited in Afghanistan twice over the course of this conflict and saw firsthand how our renewed attention to the region since 2009 and the counterinsurgency strategy developed by General Petraeus has brought marked improvements in securing areas, in training security and police, in establishing the rule of law, and in developing local economies.

Perhaps, most importantly, on a trip last March, I felt a sense of optimism in Afghanistan that was not there before, as well as an understanding among our military that the Afghans must soon take over and govern their own nation.

The time is now. For over a decade, our troops have accomplished the mission that they were given. They have performed heroically. They, including thousands of brave servicemembers from Connecticut, have been operating in one of the most inhospitable environments one can imagine, making sacrifices for their country by serving, as well as losing this time with their families.

It is time to bring our troops home and for the people of Afghanistan to forge their own destiny.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, after 11 years, over 2,000 Americans killed, 16,000 Americans wounded, nearly $400 billion spent, and more than 12,000 Afghan civilians dead since 2007, we have to question the U.S. presence in Afghanistan.

Should we continue America's longest war? At what cost and for how long?

The American people have questioned and continue to question time and time again—or should we be there, and the answer has always been a resounding no. It's not new news that the American public, Democrat, Republican and everyone else has soured on the war. The national security rationale has lost its resonance, and the economic and human cost in Afghanistan are crippling our ability to recover from our own deep recession.

According to The New York Times/CBS report, more than two-thirds of those polled, 69 percent, thought the United States should not be at war in Afghanistan. The U.S. war in Afghanistan is costing the U.S. taxpayers nearly $2 billion per week, over $100 billion per year. Meanwhile, in the wake of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, too many of our neighbors and friends are out of work, struggle to pay their bills, and look to us for job creation and support.

Americans who feel the sting of doing more with less are connecting the dots between our Federal priorities and spending and the pain they're feeling at home. Americans struggling to put their kids through college without Pell Grants or running out of employment benefits with no new job on the horizon cannot ignore the cost of the war.

Arizona families in my district have paid nearly $777 million for the Afghan war since 2001. For that same amount of money, the State of Arizona could have had 336,000 children receiving low-income health care for 1 year; 15,000 elementary school teachers employed in our schools for 1 year; 93,000 Head Start slots for children for 1 year; over 100,000 military veterans receiving VA medical care for 1 year; over 10,000 police officers and law enforcement officers securing our communities and neighborhoods for 1 year; 113,000 scholarships for university students for 1 year; 139,000 students receiving Pell Grants of $5,550. These are just some of the bad trade-offs we are making with our national resources, our treasure and our blood on a war instead of fixing the problems here at home.

I would like to take a brief second to thank, to honor, and to commemorate those warriors from my district, District 7, for your ultimate sacrifice to our country: Sergeant First Class Todd Harris, Sergeant Martin Lugo, Sergeant Justin Gallegos, Master Sergeant Joseph Gonzales, Sergeant Charles Browning, First Lieutenant Alejo Thompson, Sergeant First Class Jonathan McCain, Staff Sergeant Donald Stacy, Private First Class Adam Hardt.

Our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and commitment in Afghanistan. They have done everything that has been asked of them; but the truth is, they have been put in an impossible position, a war with no foreseeable end and a war that is costing not just them and their families, but our country, the ability to prosper and to move forward.

It's time to say enough is enough. It's time to take the responsibility to end this war in Afghanistan, be responsible, but end it. The cost to America, the cost to our future is too enormous to continue on the path that we're on, a path that has no end.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Chair, the appropriations process and the budget is not only a spending plan about future priorities, it's also a statement about our values.

The United States in 2001 went into Afghanistan and took out the Taliban government. We have also taken out Osama bin Laden.

The United States is proposing to spend $88.5 billion again this year in Afghanistan. We're going into our 11th year of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan. Eleven years ago, Afghanistan was among the poorest and most corrupt countries on the face of the Earth. Today, it is still among the most corrupt and poorest countries on the face of the Earth.

We've lost 2,000 American soldiers, 16,000 wounded. Last week the U.S. Government decided to spend $105 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of this country, less than $53 billion in each of the next 2 years for a Nation of over 300 million.

You've just spent $78 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan, a nation of 30 million people. It's time that we do nation-building right here at home.

Of the 34 provinces in Afghanistan, the spiritual and financial home of the Taliban are Kandahar and Helmand provinces, because that is disproportionately where the poppy fields are that finance the Taliban. The literacy rate for women in Kandahar province is 1 percent. The literacy rate for men is about 15 percent.

How do you build up an Afghan police force and Afghan national army with people who are illiterate? We have to build schools and we have to build roads to get them to those schools and electricity to power those schools.

That, Madam Chairman, is nation-building in Afghanistan.

□ 1550

We need to do nation-building right here at home. This $88.5 billion should be directed immediately to rebuild the

roads and bridges of this Nation, in America.

According to Transportation for America, we have 69,000 structurally deficient bridges. In New York State alone, we have over 2,000 structurally deficient bridges. In my home community of western New York, we have 99 structurally deficient bridges, and no plan to address that. Every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient.

We need to get our priorities in order. We need to reaffirm our values. We need to have a vision for rebuilding America. And the best way to do that is start with this appropriation and reprogramming it right back here at home for nation-building here in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I support the military 100 percent and I think we ought to give them all the equipment and spend the funds that are necessary to make sure they're prepared to fight a war anyplace. And I think we need to defeat the Taliban and al Qaeda and make sure that the threats to America are eliminated, at least as much as is humanly possibly.

The reason I took 5 minutes to speak today is not because I don't support the military or the appropriation for the military, but because I was shaving the other day before I came into work and I heard the newsman talking about a young family and a young man that was in the military. I came out while I was shaving and I looked at the television. It was a beautiful family—young man and a woman and their child. And they announced that he had just been hit with an IED and lost both arms and both legs, and I was thinking what a tragedy for this young man and for his family and the horrible things they're going to have to endure throughout the rest of their lives.

And then I started thinking about all the technology we have. We have satellites that can pinpoint a pack of cigarettes on the ground, and we have drones that can fly over enemy territory and pick out a target and hit somebody with a Hellfire missile and blow them to smithereens. And somebody from a thousand miles away sitting at a computer with a television screen can direct that drone and that Hellfire missile. And I started wondering to myself: Why in the world don't we use more of those instead of sending young American men and women into harm's way day in and day out like we do? We have the technology to knock out anybody anyplace in the world that we want to.

So I would just like to ask this question of my colleagues: We have to have special forces. We have to go into certain spots and knock out bad guys. We've got to do that. But when we don't have to, when we know that the enemy is in a certain area, instead of sending our young men and women in there, why don't we send a drone over to a site that we've discovered from a satellite and blow the hell out of those people? Don't send our young men and women into that kind of a situation where they're going to lose their arms and their legs when we've spent all the money on this technology to stop the enemy. And that's my biggest concern. Why in the world don't we use that technology instead of young men and women going into harm's way when it's not necessary?

I understand war is important. I know we have to defeat the Taliban and those who would take away our freedoms. It's extremely important. And we should support the military every way we can, give them all the tools that are necessary. But let's use the tools that we have to stop the enemy as much as possible without putting young men and women in that situation. I don't want to turn on the television next week or next month and see more young men and women who have suffered this way. I've been out to Bethesda and Walter Reed and I've seen the damage that war does. And so if we're going to go to war—and we have to go to war, only when we have to. But if we do, let's use the technology we have and defeat the enemy and minimize the loss of life that our young men and women are experiencing.

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. Madam Chair, I regret what I am about to say could have been and was said a year ago. Not much has changed, but more lives have been destroyed and more billions of dollars have been wasted, all to no intelligent purpose.

The whole premise of the Afghanistan war is wrong. The rationale for the war is to fight al Qaeda, but most of the day-to-day fighting is against an entrenched Taliban insurgency that will outlast any foreign fighters. Fighting in Afghanistan does not enhance the security of the United States in any way.

In 2001, 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 that took about 3 weeks. We should have withdrawn after those 3 weeks.

The CIA told us a couple of years ago that there are fewer than 100 al Qaeda personnel in all of Afghanistan. So why do we still have 70,000 troops there, troops who will continue to risk their lives every day in a war that has already claimed far too many lives? And why should we continue pouring billions of dollars into an intractable mess when we should be devoting those funds to our own economy, our own jobs, our own schools, our own bridges and roads and highways, our own housing, social programs, and education?

Afghanistan is in the middle of what is, so far, a 35-year civil war. We do not have either the need or the ability to determine the winner in that war, which is what we're trying to do. If we continue on this course, in 2 years there will be hundreds more dead American soldiers, 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 2024 or whenever, those provinces will become ''unpacified,'' the Taliban and the warlords will step up the fighting again, and the Afghan civil war will continue its normal, natural course.

Our troops are fighting valiantly, but we are there on the wrong mission. We should recognize that rebuilding Afghanistan in our own image, that setting up a stable government that will last is both beyond our ability and beyond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States.

We fulfilled the mission in protecting America from terrorists based in Afghanistan over 10 years ago. We should have withdrawn our troops 10 years ago. We should withdraw them now. We shouldn't wait until 2014. We shouldn't have several thousands advisers or troops helping the Afghanis for another 10 years. They have their own civil war they have been fighting for 35 years.

I wish we could have waved a magic wand and ended it, but we can't. We should not participate in an Afghan civil war. We do not need to pick the winner in that civil war. We do not have the ability to pick that winner in that civil war. All we are doing is wasting lives, wasting limbs, wasting people, and wasting dollars. We ought to end our involvement in Afghanistan as rapidly as we can physically remove our troops.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $27,075,933,000.

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, $12,560,999,000.

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, $28,124,109,000.

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, $4,456,823,000.

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, $1,871,688,000.

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, $651,861,000.

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, $1,743,875,000.

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, $8,089,477,000.

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, $3,158,015,000.

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, $36,422,738,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. 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:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,100,000)''.

Page 8, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,200,000)''.

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,300,000)''.

Page 8, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,900,000)''.

Page 10, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 11, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $700,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $53,900,000)''.

Page 13, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,200,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $72,300,000)''.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I offer this amendment with Ms. MCCOLLUM from Minnesota today. In fact, it was her amendment from last year that got me involved in this. Basically, what this does is stops the Defense Department from using major sports sponsorships, such as NASCAR motor sports and bass fishing, for a recruitment tool, which is no longer necessary.

□ 1600

There are a number of reasons for this:

Number one, it's not effective. On May 18, 2012, Major Brian Creech said in the USA Today that the National Guard's spending $26.5 million dollars to sponsor NASCAR got 24,800 inquiries. Of those, they got 20 potential recruits. Of those, what did they get for the $26 million? Not one single recruit. I want to say again, $26 million, 24,000 inquiries, zero—zero—recruits. It's not effective.

Now, the National Guard support group has been going around with this document saying, Oh, yes, but look at all the images that we get. Well, again, out of this, according to their own document, they got 40 recruits. So for the money, if you do the math, that's $72,000 per recruit.

And why is that? Well, perhaps because the demographic of NASCAR is that 69 percent of the people are over 35. So when they go and they're pushing their brand or advertising at NASCAR, nearly 70 percent of the people aren't eligible. That's not their target group.

The RAND Corporation, in its 2007 study of recruitment, said that if you want to increase recruitment, then you have to increase the number of recruiters, period. That was the number one thing. That's why on July 10, the Army dropped out of it, and they said:

> Although it is a beneficial endeavor for us, it's also rather expensive, and we decided we could repurpose that investment into other programs.

So when Ms. MCCOLLUM actually originally offered this, it was an $80 million reduction into the savings account, but since the Army dropped it, now we're offering $72 million.

Secondly, very, very important for us to remember is that the military is reducing its size now, not because of sequestration, before sequestration. They're dropping the number of troops in the Army and the Marines by 103,000, alone. The Defense Department's recruiter has said that the recruitment is high right now because of the economy.

Now, number 3, this program has no accountability. In February, our office, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we asked the Pentagon: What are your hard numbers? If you're spending $72 million sponsoring major sports programs, what are you getting out of it? And they couldn't come up with it. Now, that disturbs me as a fiscal conservative, because I want to believe that if the Pentagon is spending that much money on something, they're able to defend it.

The Miller Beer Company actually put it this way. They said it this way. They said, on exposure:

> I don't care how much exposure we get, what that is supposed to be worth, or what our awareness is versus the competition. I need to be able to tell our CEO and our shareholders how many additional cases of beer that I sold.

In short, the Army can't tell us how many recruiters they really do get from this.

And, number four, we've got sequestration facing us, on top of a $487 billion defense cut over the next 10 years,

plus a troop reduction of over 100,000 already. We may have additional cuts. And Secretary Panetta has said that we need to work together to find better ways to spend the money and stretch our dollars.

I'm as pro military as they get. I'm proud to say I believe the First District of Georgia has as much military as any district in the country. I have four major military installations and two guard facilities. We have every branch of the military, and we have a bombing range in there. The only thing that has a bigger population than my military are my NASCAR fans. And yet they're saying to me, We're pro NASCAR, but we realize the situation in America today is that for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. We can spend this money a lot better than we are today.

Again, look what we're spending per recruit. According to the National Guard document which they provided our office—at least they did provide us with a document which we did not get from the Pentagon—it is still costing us over $700,000 per recruit, from their own documentation.

We can do better than this, and that's why Ms. MCCOLLUM and I have worked together and reached across the aisle to say we can spend this money elsewhere more effectively.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I certainly appreciate my colleagues, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KINGSTON, and what they're trying to achieve, and I certainly support paring down the budget where it is appropriate and where it actually saves money.

My colleague references some numbers that come from the Army. The Army is getting out of this type of sponsorship. The numbers that I want to give you are from the National Guard that intends to stay in this form of advertising for recruiting purposes and also for building goodwill among the American people.

This sponsorship program that the National Guard has, in one form, one very specific form of sponsorship that they have, as well as a number of others, but this one form of sponsorship for NASCAR, the National Guard saw a nearly 300 percent return on their investment. Now, that comes from $68 million in media exposure. It comes from 5.5 million pieces of merchandise and apparel that has ''National Guard'' on it, which has a value of roughly $70 million. This is a huge return for the buck. This is why Fortune 500 companies actually advertise through NASCAR—not because it feels good, but because it delivers results.

And the fact is that no matter the size of the military, you're going to still need recruits. And the fact remains, if we look at the example of 2005 where the Army didn't meet their recruiting goals, what we had to do is increase the budget for retention. So the fact of cutting one area of recruiting means that in a couple of years we'll have to actually pay more for retention in order to keep the same folks in the National Guard that we currently need.

Furthermore, back to this one particular form of advertising, I think it's highly inappropriate for this Congress to get into the business of specifying how best the National Guard, or whatever branch, should spend their dollars on recruiting.

The Appropriations Committee has done a yeoman's task of making sure that we scrub the Department of Defense budget from top to bottom. I think this is a very strong and good appropriations bill. It does have bipartisan support. But let's face it, when we start micromanaging advertising programs to try to recruit National Guard members, we've sort of slipped into the absurd.

The National Guard, from the experience that they've had in NASCAR advertising in particular, they generated 54,000 leads. I wish my colleague had referenced that other than these other numbers that you referenced before, which I think are a good reason why the Army is not continuing with that program. They didn't design it appropriately, apparently. But the National Guard has got a huge bang for the buck and has actually gotten recruits because of this form of advertising.

I would encourage my colleagues, if they voted ''no'' on the McCollum amendments last year—there were two different amendments that deal with this very same issue. If they voted ''no'' on those two amendments, they need to vote ''no'' again.

Madam Chairman, I would say this again. If you voted ''no'' on those two amendments that are structurally the same, vote ''no'' again. I would encourage my colleagues to do that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Well, we just heard from the last speaker that part of what all this money is being spent on is branding and goodwill and that the Congress, and we today, should not be making any changes and micromanaging what the National Guard is doing.

□ 1610

I would call to our colleagues' attention legislation, Public Law 106–398, in the 106th Congress. The Legislative Information System, which is available to all of us, directs us as to what really took place in the 106th Congress.

We directed the Secretary of the Army, during a period beginning on October 1, 2000, and ending December 1, 2005, to carry out a pilot program to test various recruiting approaches. One of them was to be an outreach that the Army was going to do with motor sports. It doesn't work, and that's why the Army has dropped it.

The National Guard, through what Mr. KINGSTON had, didn't come to us directly. We were provided some sponsorship information through NASCAR of all the contacts and all the hits. Everybody who walked through the gate was counted as being part of branding. Folks, this was not supposed to be about branding; it was supposed to be about recruiting. That's why the Army spokesman on CNN said, when they announced that they were ending their 10-year, multidollar, taxpayer-funded relationship with NASCAR, ''It was not a great investment.

The Navy pulled out. The Marine Corps pulled out of NASCAR years ago. But yet the Pentagon has paid one racing team—Mr. Earnhardt's team—$136 million in taxpayer funds for the National Guard logo on his car in the name of recruitment. This year, they're paying Mr. Earnhardt again $26.5 million, to which the National Guard has reported—this is what the Guard told me—20 qualified candidates expressing interest, zero actual recruits.

For the past 2 years, the National Guard has spent more than $20 million in taxpayer funds on professional bass fishing tournaments. Folks, we're in a fiscal crisis here. Bass fishing is not a national security priority. This Congress is cutting services to communities and needy families because we're in a fiscal crisis, yet the Pentagon is spending in excess of $80 million on NASCAR racing sponsorships, professional bass fishing, ultimate cage fighting, and other sports sponsorships. The program is a waste of taxpayer money; it doesn't work.

Over the past few days, the professional sports lobby has come out in full force to protect their taxpayer-funded subsidy. For the purposes of the 2013 Defense appropriation bill, those pro teams are military contractors who have failed to deliver on their contract in the past for the taxpayers for recruits.

I want to thank Representative KINGSTON for his leadership on this and joining me to cut a Pentagon program that's just not effective.

This committee, in which we're having this bill discussed right now, has been bipartisan in the way the bill has been put together and bipartisan in the way this amendment has been offered. If the private sector wants to pool their money to sponsor military race car teams to demonstrate their patriotism, I say fantastic and go for it. But it is my job to be a steward of taxpayer funds.

I want to be clear about something else this amendment does not do. This amendment in no way, shape, or form prohibits or limits military recruiters from recruiting at NASCAR races or any other sports event. I just want the military recruiters to attend those

races and community events where there are potential recruits.

We need, as Mr. KINGSTON pointed out, more recruiters doing their job in the right way. They have ideas, folks, on how they can do this better. We need to listen to the recruiters.

So, I think it will be just irresponsible and outrageous that Congress would go ahead and continue to borrow money from China to pay one race car driver's team $26 million for delivering zero recruits. Our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. Communities and families and seniors and vulnerable children are bearing the brunt of deep and painful budget cuts. Congress needs to get its priorities in order and stop protecting military spending that doesn't work.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. KINGSTON's amendment. It's an honor to be a partner to it. We need to cut the wasteful spending in programs and reduce this deficit.

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

Hon. BETTY MCCOLLUM.

CRS RESPONSE: DOD SPENDING ON NASCAR SPONSORSHIP

In response to your request for U.S. Department of Defense spending on NASCAR sponsorships, we are providing the following information.

Budget:

Each of the Military Services use a variety of marketing and advertising strategies to meet their annual recruiting targets. For example, the U.S. Army has sponsored NHRA and NASCAR vehicles and events, as well as the Golden Knights Parachute Team and other activities. The different advertising strategies and approaches are designed for maximum impact upon the target population and derived from annual youth surveys.

U.S. Military recruiting advertising for each of the branches is budgeted under ''Operations and Maintenance.'' At this level, we only have visibility of the Service's overall budget for advertising, not the specific sub programs.

Authority:

Each of the U.S. Military branches receive authority to conduct ''marketing/advertising'' under the auspices of recruiting requirements. Please see the attached document 10 USCS §3013 for the Department of the Army.

An article published on the U.S. Army web site states ''The U.S. Army Motorsports Program began in September 2000 when Congress directed the secretary of the Army to conduct a five-year motorsports outreach test. In 2003, building upon the success of the NHRA program, NASCAR was added.'' For the full article, please: http://www.army.mil/article/30553/armv-to-continue-nhra-nascar-sponsorships/

Legislation Public Law No: 106–398 [106th]

The Legislative Information System (LIS) summary states the following: ''Subtitle F: Matters Relating to Recruiting—Directs the Secretary of the Army, during the period beginning on October 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2005, to carry out pilot programs to test various recruiting approaches. Requires one program to be a program: (1) of public outreach that associates the Army with motor sports competition; (2) under which Army recruiters are assigned at post-secondary vocational institutions and community colleges to recruit such students and graduates; and (3) that expands the scope of the Army's current recruiting initiatives. Authorizes such Secretary to expand or extend a pilot program after notification of the defense committees. Requires a report on the above programs.''

For more information see House Report 106–945, Subtitle F—Matters Relating to Recruiting. This report is available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CRPT-106hrpt945/pdf/CRPT-106hrpt945.pdf

We hope that you find this information helpful.

NESE F. DEBRUYNE,
Information Research Specialist; Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Section; Knowledge Services Group; Congressional Research Service.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Like my colleague, Mr. MCHENRY, I also am rising because I do oppose this amendment, saying that the Department of Defense has to limit what they do and decide how they can recruit. And mainly, it's micromanaging.

The biggest issue here is this approach is not going to save a dime in the long run because when recruitment goals aren't met—and that is a challenge—the military pays out nearly $1 billion a year in extra recruitment bonuses to maintain needed recruitment numbers. We're talking, of course, about the National Guard, who did have a 4–1 return on investment in motor sports.

But we've got to be aware that we've got to recruit men and women where they are. We need the best men and women that we can in our military service. Of course, we owe all of those who are currently serving a great debt of gratitude, but I don't believe that we need to tell them how to best do their recruiting.

I'm also a conservative, and I believe strongly in rooting out government waste, but that's not what this amendment does because in the long run we end up spending more money on recruitment.

As my colleague said before, the House has twice voted down this amendment—it's the same vote—and I urge them to do so again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Just this past weekend, I had the great honor and privilege to send over 150 young men and women off to Fort Bliss to prepare for their final training to go overseas. This is the 857th Engineering Company. Their mission is horizontal construction, which is pretty much they're going to be clearing roads. As we know, that's one of the most dangerous missions in Afghanistan.

Now, I was too busy shaking hands and talking to families and others to notice what I would probably have seen in the parking lot, and that would have been a lot of bumper stickers. On those bumper stickers, there wouldn't be faces or political advertisements—of course, I wish there would be some—but it was more numbers: number 3, number 11, number 24, number 14. Most likely, there would have been a few number 88s out there, which is the car Dale Earnhardt drives for NASCAR. So with that, right now there is absolutely no reason this Congress should be telling the Department of Defense how and where to spend money on recruitment.

Sport sponsorships have continually been a major source of recruitment and provided a great deal of return on investment. The only other option is to spend more on recruitment and retention bonuses. As my colleague just mentioned, when they fall below a certain number, they spend billions of dollars, and we're not talking about billions of dollars. So this actually saves taxpayers' money so we can continue to find the young men and women to serve in our Nation's military.

As it currently stands, the National Guard cannot advertise on television, which significantly limits their opportunities to reach the audience that they want to reach. This is an effective program that remains a key tool for our National Guard and other branches of our military services.

This bill is already taking serious cuts from advertising and marketing budgets for the Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and National Guard accounts. They have all been cut significantly already before this amendment. There is no reason why we should continue to tie their hands by cutting more funds from the budget.

These sponsorships provide the ability to market and create branding opportunities and familiarity with the service branches in areas where market research shows that the target audience spends its time. For example, data shows that NASCAR fans are very large, up to 70 million—I think that's a low number—very patriotic, very pro-military fan base, and are extremely loyal to sponsors of teams and drivers. This is exactly who we want joining our U.S. military.

Madam Chair, we are currently dealing with very serious cut to our military because of sequestration. This is not the time or the place to be cutting the tools that our military is using to recruit the very best, patriotic young people who want to serve our Nation in the military.

The military is maximizing their resources to fulfill their mission at home and abroad. If this wasn't successful, they wouldn't be doing it. I ask that my colleagues oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I'd like to voice my opposition to the amendment sponsored by Mr. KINGSTON and Ms. MCCOLLUM, aimed at banning pro-sports sponsorship by the Department of Defense.

Truly, we are in an era where the people's government should take proactive efforts to trim excesses from the budget wherever possible. This measure, Madam Chair, does not attack an excess of government. If accepted, the U.S. Government would be cutting out a proven successful investment in our Nation's military personnel.

The Army, the National Guard, and the National Guard Association strongly oppose this amendment. Last year, over 280 Members, in a bipartisan vote, opposed this amendment.

□ 1620

Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS and Defense Subcommittee Chairman YOUNG have both been opposed to this measure in committee votes and floor votes. Chairman YOUNG has repeatedly said in 2012 that he opposes it.

Our military deserves access to the most qualified potential recruits available. A vote in favor of this amendment would handicap our military's recruiting efforts.

Starting in 1999, marketing the military through sports opened the door for the DOD's efforts to brand and to showcase their services to a specific target audience. The National Guard cannot advertise on broadcast television, so professional sports sponsorships become an efficient, effective means of reaching target markets for recruiting and retention of citizen soldiers and airmen.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are athletes. It only makes sense to advertise and market to professional sports venues. Athletes share common values with the military such as honor, integrity, individual responsibility, teamwork, and self-sacrifice.

Additionally, athletes are a key demographic in the men and women we want to serve. With the DOD's strict requirements for a recruit to qualify, only one in every four young people is even eligible to join. The DOD's success rate in recruiting stems from their direct access to potential recruits and influencers of men and women, like-minded about their interest in joining the military, often found at sporting events.

Pro sports sponsorships increase the DOD's visibility, generate recruitment opportunities at events, and provide a national platform to promote each branch's image.

In addition to recruitment and a recognizable national profile, military sponsorships in motorsports spotlight a good return on investment, dollar for dollar. In 2011 alone, the Army National Guard spent $44 million on motorsports sponsorships. But based on market value, the total media exposure the Guard received totaled over $150 million, a 336 percent return on investment.

If less is spent on advertising, history proves that DOD will have to increase dollars for bonuses to retain current military personnel and increase dollars for recruiting bonuses.

DOD motorsports partnerships have resulted in key transfers of technology. For example, the first Humvee sent to Iraq had canvas doors. Additional armor added created challenges to the Humvee's suspension systems. The marines turned to NASCAR engineers to help solve the problem.

An additional project developed by the marines is the mine roller. Pushed in front of trucks, the roller can detonate explosive devices, while protecting the marines in the vehicle. One of the first rollers in Iraq took a blast and saved the three marines inside. The mine roller uses new suspension technology developed by the Joe Gibbs NASCAR racing team. Base commanders say that cooperation between base workers and businesses across the country is saving troops' lives.

Beyond the direct investment, DOD pro sponsorships positively influence communities surrounding our Nation's personnel. For example, the National Guard works together with their partners in Panther racing and IndyCar to address unemployment affecting servicemembers and their families by sponsoring hiring fairs, outreach efforts, and employer education.

This amendment would likely limit the military from participating in the Olympics, flyovers over games, sponsoring marathons such as the Marine Corps Marathon, as well as the Blue Angels, the Thunderbirds, and the Golden Knights.

Cutting all funding towards DOD pro sports sponsorships hinders military recruitment of qualified candidates, impairs employment resources for our Nation's military families, and severely damages a positive financial investment for our military.

To directly quote the DOD:

> To ensure the Nation fields a military fully capable of performing any assigned mission, we must recruit highly qualified men and women from across America. This amendment will directly impact the recruiting quality and overall mission requirements, increasing costs, and forcing reductions in the standards for accessions.

A vote for this amendment is a vote against the effectiveness of our military. Please join me in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KISSELL. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KISSELL. I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I'm not going to repeat what my colleague from Georgia just said. He covered the facts well.

I think it's important here that we recognize that relationships matter; and the relationship that we have seen with the military and especially NASCAR seems to be getting the brunt of the attention here, a long-time relationship, an important relationship.

NASCAR grew up in North Carolina. Its home is in my district in central North Carolina. While NASCAR has spread out throughout the Nation, which we're excited about, still the roots are here at home and in kind of rural America.

I don't think it's any coincidence that when we look at our military forces, about 41 percent of our military is from what we describe as rural America, which is only 17 percent of our population. And that relationship between the military and rural America is very important. The relationship between NASCAR and rural America—and all America—is very important. We don't need to interfere with that relationship.

I don't think it's any surprise that the most popular driver in NASCAR drives the National Guard car, No. 88, Dale Earnhardt, Jr. This brings kind of the relationship and the viewing that cannot be done in many other ways, and so we don't need to strike that relationship. We need to build upon that.

And when you start looking at the ramifications, as my colleague talked about earlier, other ways that this money can be used to help build this relationship, we look at NASCAR, the Special Forces working with NASCAR to develop equipment for our military.

I'm cochair of Invisible Wounds, the idea of how we can absorb the energy to help our soldiers that are in combat situations. NASCAR works on this.

The tickets that are given to our military families, to the military themselves, this is all part of that relationship. It works. We need for it to work.

I oppose this amendment and ask my colleagues to also oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POSEY. We were at home watching NASCAR on television a couple of years ago, and my wife said, What are the armed services doing sponsoring NASCAR cars? Don't they have a better use to spend their money than to spend those big bucks on NASCAR?

And I said, Well, Katie, I can understand why you would think that. But, you know, we have a volunteer military, and they have to advertise for recruits somewhere. Where would you think the money would be better spent?

Do you think they should advertise at the philharmonic? Or maybe you think they should advertise at the ballet. We could surely get some burly,

mean paratroopers if we advertised at the ballet. I think that NASCAR is a very appropriate place to advertise for recruits, just like boxing rings might be, cage fights might be.

So I made some inquiries about it to our armed services, and they said, you're exactly right on point. As our good friend, Mr. MCHENRY, from North Carolina shared with you a little while ago, the statistics are overwhelmingly in favor of expenditures where you get the greatest return. And the NASCAR sponsorship seems to have the greatest return, which results in the greatest savings for our taxpayers back home.

Now, I wish we were spending this time right now, rather than trying to micromanage how our military most efficiently advertises for recruits, discussing the $14 billion our government overpaid to people who were not entitled to unemployment compensation, but got it anyway.

I wish right now we were discussing the $4 billion in refunds in the form of tax credits our government has given to bogus dependents of people who are here illegally.

I wish we were talking about the millions of dollars we've wasted in the GAO.

I wish we were talking about the millions of dollars we've wasted in crony capitalism investment in Solyndra and the like, and so-called green energy enterprises.

□ 1630

But no, we're not. We are sitting here today. Some people are trying to micromanage how our military gets recruits for its all-volunteer Army, and they are telling the people who are best at managing our military how to do their jobs. It's an old adage. It's an old cliche. It seems like everybody knows how to make a baby stop crying except the person holding it. I think, in this case, that applies, and I think we should yield to the best judgment of our armed services in how they feel they need to recruit.

I have seen Democratic Presidential candidates advertise on NASCAR. I saw a Democratic gubernatorial candidate advertise on race cars. As far as Okeechobee Speedway, I was at Okeechobee Speedway once, and I ran into somebody from the other side of the aisle whom I never expected to see at a racetrack.

I said, What are you doing here?

She said, Well, when person ''blank,'' who was running for Governor, decided we needed to focus on middle America, she decided she wanted to sponsor a race car at Okeechobee Speedway.

Before that, I didn't even know there was an Okeechobee Speedway.

She said, Do you know what? It was the best investment of campaign money we've ever spent.

These are from the other side of the aisle. I'm sure I could talk a lot about my friends on this side of the aisle and about how they've made good and wise investments, too.

Again, in this case, I'd like for you to rely upon and reflect upon the comments made by Mr. MCHENRY, who talked about the very pure and simple results and accountability that has been achieved by letting the military—the people we trust the most with protecting our country and our freedoms—do the job that they are entitled to do.

Madam Chairman, 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. Much of the debate that I would have on this amendment would be very similar to the one I'd had earlier when the issue was of the military bans, so I won't repeat those again.

I would mention the fact that this amendment was defeated by this same House several times last year on the Defense appropriations bill. We have an interesting situation here, though, today. This amendment is very similar to language later on in the bill that is subject to a point of order. It has been skillfully rewritten so that this one is not subject to a point of order, but it is basically the same issue.

Now, understand the United States of America does not have the largest military in the world. We do have, by far, the best—but not the largest—and our military is all volunteer. Members of the military serve because they want to. Yet, as the all-volunteer force rotates and changes, members are leaving—they retire; their time is up; they get out; they have to constantly be replaced. There has to be a constant flow of recruits coming in as the older members leave. The military has been running recruiting programs for years and years and years and very, very successfully. They know a little bit about what it takes to encourage recruiting.

The amendment, itself, does more than just strike out the sports—NASCAR—and all of these issues. It actually cuts $30 million more than is spent on these issues. I don't know why they won't take that extra $30 million. Anyway, we should not pass this amendment. It is, like I said, very similar to one that is already in the bill that is subject to a point of order.

I say let the military run the recruiting as they have done successfully for all of these years in order to maintain an all-volunteer force—a powerful message to the young Americans or the older Americans who want to serve. Men and women want to serve their country in the military, and these recruiting programs get their attention and direct them where they need to be directed. So I think this just isn't a good idea to pass this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleagues, Rep. MCCOLLUM and Rep. KINGSTON. And let me say that while I wholeheartedly agree to the notion that this body must take the lead in putting our nation back on the path towards fiscal responsibility, the move to prohibit our military services from advancing recruitment and retention goals through various athletic sponsorships is unwise.

At a time when the men and women of our Armed Forces are undertaking operations around the world, we must not move to end the successful platforms used by the Department of Defense to recruit able men and women into their ranks.

Contrary to popular belief, these sponsorships also go far beyond driver appearances, commercials and decals on race cars. In fact, the National Guard's sponsorship of the Panther Racing IndyCar team has not only been successful in raising the Guard's profile and getting it in front of potential recruits, but also technology transfers between these entities will allow for our service members to be better protected when downrange.

J.R. Hildebrand, who drives the National Guard IndyCar, wears ear sensors that measure the G-forces he experiences during a crash on the racetrack. Those sensors, known as an Integrated Blast Effects Sensor System, are now worn by troops in harm's way. The information gathered can be very useful to neurosurgeons who treat soldiers suffering from Traumatic Brain Injury, often the result of roadside bomb attacks.

Understanding the nature and effects of Traumatic Brain Injury advances the ways in which we protect and treat our fighting men and women, and those same sensors worn by J.R. Hildebrand have a direct benefit to our troops in Afghanistan. Furthermore, helmet technologies developed in IndyCar and the National Football League have been adapted for military use. And these represent just a few of the results from the military's sponsorships, or partnerships with professional sports.

As our service members return to civilian life, they are often faced with a continuing unemployment crisis. In partnership with the National Guard, Panther Racing continues to work with the Employer Support of the National Guard (ESGR) program, an agency within the Department of Defense designed to connect citizen soldiers with employers. Panther Racing continues to work with the Chamber of Commerce to support the Hiring our Heroes program. At race events across the country, the National Guard partnership with Panther Racing brings military members and their spouses together with CEO's of local businesses and ultimately helping get our nation's veterans back to work.

Madam Chair, utilizing military partnerships with professional sports can be a vital tool in improving the lives and care of our service men and women. The results of these programs speak for themselves. Amendments similar to the one currently before this body have been rejected by wide margins and I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to stand with those who wear the uniform and oppose the Kingston/McCollum amendment.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, after more than a decade of war, it is time to accelerate our drawdown of troops in Afghanistan and bring this war to a close.

We've sent our brave servicemen and -women to Afghanistan to eliminate the international terrorists who would do us harm. They have successfully executed this mission with phenomenal dedication and capacity: they have driven al Qaeda from Afghanistan, destroyed their training facilities, killed or captured most of their top leaders. Under President Obama's decisive leadership and thanks to the courage and competency of our special forces, the 9/11 mastermind—Osama bin Laden—has met his just end.

The President has outlined a plan for winding down this war, and I support drawing down our military presence in Afghanistan even more quickly than the President has suggested. We should welcome our troops back as heroes and ensure they receive the support and care that is due when they return.

Our military servicemembers and their families have borne and continue to bear far more than their share of the burden of this war. I am a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and I represent the 10th District of California, which is home to Travis Air Force Base—the largest Air Mobility Command unit in the Air Force. Nearby in Marysville, California, is Beale Air Force Base, which is the leader in intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. Together, 16,000 servicemembers across the active duty National Guard and Reserves, as well as over 75,000 veterans, live in my district and in the surrounding area. These are the people who are disproportionately bearing the cost of this war.

As their Representative, I owe it to them to make sure that we do not ask of them any more than is absolutely necessary in order to ensure America's national security. But the majority here in this House is determined to prevent even a serious debate about ending the war in Afghanistan. They have inserted language into the National Defense Authorization Act that would actually slow down the withdrawal of U.S. forces and keep nearly 70,000 troops in Afghanistan until at least 2015.

When the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee tried to offer an amendment to replace this provision, the majority said it was out of order. When a bipartisan group of Members of Congress joined together on an amendment replacing this provision, the majority blocked that amendment. This is the longest war in America's history, claiming thousands of lives and costing hundreds of billions of dollars, and the majority simply doesn't want to talk about it.

We must talk about this war. We must take time to think deeply about the sacrifices of those who are serving and who have served. To date, 1,875 of our military servicemembers have been killed in Afghanistan, leaving thousands more to endure the unimaginable grief of the loss of a loved one. 15,322 of our troops have been wounded seriously, suffering life-altering injuries. Not included in that number are those with psychological wounds—invisible but no less devastating. We have spent a half a trillion taxpayer dollars on the war in Afghanistan, and this legislation would allocate $88 billion more to be spent in this year alone.

There are some who would continue this war indefinitely. They oppose the fixed timeline for ending combat operations and for bringing our troops home. They oppose any concrete plans for transitioning full responsibility for Afghanistan's security as quickly as possible. Even worse, they would have American troops continuing to fight against a domestic insurgency in Afghanistan, and they think it's America's job to defeat those armed factions that threaten the Karzai Government, which is, perhaps, the most corrupt government in this world. In fact, they have inserted language into this bill that says the U.S. objective in Afghanistan is to defend the Karzai Government against the Taliban. They also have an interest in American troops defeating the Haqqani Network and any other faction that is taking on the Karzai Government, involving us in a multisided civil war.

□ 1640

It was never the American mission in Afghanistan, nor should it be. As President Obama clearly said last week, ''Our goal is to destroy Al Qaeda.'' We began a military operation in Afghanistan with a very clear reason. It's time for us to end this war and bring our troops home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $41,463,773,000.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I want to have a colloquy between myself, the chairman, and the gentleman from Washington on an issue regarding costs associated with the security clearance process.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I would be happy to discuss the costs of the security clearance process.

Mr. FARR. As the gentleman knows, security clearances are necessary to protect our national security and are required for thousands of jobs. This process is also expensive.

DOD pays billions of dollars to the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, to manage the DOD security clearance program. OPM has made some improvements in their investigation process so the program is no longer on GAO's high-risk list, but the problem remains that OPM relies on manual labor to process DOD security clearances.

The research scientists at Personnel Security Research Center, PERSEREC, under the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, have developed a suite of automated tools. Those tools could save millions of dollars without sacrificing quality if these tools were incorporated into the security reinvestigation process. I greatly appreciate that the chairman and ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee have included report language encouraging DOD to investigate more in automated tools for the security clearance process.

Would my colleagues agree that DOD needs to leverage the resources of PERSEREC to integrate their research, called ACES, into the DOD security reinvestigation process?

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. To my good friend from California, I appreciate the attention that you bring to this issue. It seems that this is a commonsense thing that the Department can do to save millions of dollars with no negative impact to the security clearance process. Requiring DOD security reinvestigators to use the Automated Continuing Evaluation System, ACES, tool will preserve national security despite the tight budget constraints that the DOD is facing.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his response.

I had hoped to attach to the bill language directing DOD to conduct a review, but in the interest of the House rules and jurisdictional matters, I chose not to.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am aware of the gentleman's deep interest and appreciate his flexibility in finding ways to address this issue. Like my good friend from Washington (Mr. DICKS), I agree that we should work with our good friend, Mr. FARR, to ensure that

DOD is leveraging the security clearance research of the PERSEREC to improve the DOD security reinvestigation process.

Mr. FARR. I thank both of you for your friendship, leadership, and cooperation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $6,075,667,000.

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, $35,408,795,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGLY

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $24,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

Page 27, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Chairwoman, my amendment will provide funding to the Air National Guard so it can obtain much-needed firefighting equipment so they can more effectively combat the devastating wildfires that destroy millions of acres of land and homes every year in the western United States.

The likelihood of calling upon MAFFS-equipped Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve C–130s has increased significantly. MAFFS are modular air firefighting systems that drop retardant to create firebreaks.

In 2003, the U.S. Forest Service had 44 fixed-wing aerial firefighting aircraft. By 2004, the number had dwindled to 19. And as of June 3 of this year, that number stands at only eight. An additional aircraft, on interim contract with the Forest Service, and air tankers borrowed from Canada and Alaska are being utilized to try to fill the shortfall.

While the Forest Service firefighting fleet has gotten significantly smaller, the number of wildfires have been increasing. In fact, in 2011, 74,000 fires burned 8.7 million acres. The most recent 10-year average indicates that the fires burned an average of 7.4 million acres a year.

As the fleet diminishes, stress on remaining aircraft increases. Further, the distance between fires and available aircraft have been increasing. The result is more fires burning out of control. Additionally, an increase of flight time and cycles contributes to an earlier demise of the remaining aircraft.

Only eight C–130s equipped with MAFFS units are equipped to supplement the Forest Service fleet. Even when all eight are called upon, the number of heavy air tanker aircraft is less than half that existed in 2003. We clearly need more aircraft, and the Forest Service is not likely to produce aircraft capable of meeting the need for the next 2 or 3 years, or probably longer.

My amendment will provide an interim solution to this problem by providing $8 million to the Air National Guard so they can make two existing Guard wings capable of operating and flying two legacy MAFFS, one unit each. That will give us four additional tanker aircraft to fight wildfires that have been ravaging the western United States.

My amendment will also appropriate $16 million for the Air Force to procure two new aerial dispersal units for use by the Air National Guard. Activating the legacy MAFFS units will help get more planes fighting fires this next year while these new aerial dispersal units are being produced and hopefully available for use within 2 years.

Our Nation desperately needs our aircraft to fight wildfires, and the Air Guard is ready to go to work. The U.S. needs more aircraft available to fight the wildfires that have ravaged Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah this season alone. I urge the support of my colleagues.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment seeks to add more funding to purchase equipment vital to the disaster mission of the Air National Guard.

Recently, forest fires have been devastating Colorado, and the Air National Guard has been fighting alongside the Forest Service. The Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System, or MAFFS, provides emergency capability to supplement existing commercial tanker support on wildland fires. This system aids the Forest Service. When all other air tankers are activated but further assistance is needed, the Forest Service can request help from the Air Force's MAFFS unit, who can be ready in a few hours notice with this modular system.

When the Air National Guard adds the Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System to their C–130 aircraft, they are adding another capability to their aircraft. Creating a dual-mission aircraft without major modifications to an existing piece of equipment is efficient and cost effective.

Quite frankly, we need to get new C–130Js for the Guard. I hope that we can do that. That's been a problem we've had with OMB over the scoring on this, whether you can lease them or buy them. This is an interim step, which is a good one, and I think we should accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

□ 1650

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $31,780,813,000: *Provided*, That not more than $30,000,000 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 $35,897,000 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 $8,563,000, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $88,952,000)''.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $88,952,000)''.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, we take great pride in the American military, trained fighting force. We work hard to make sure they are properly equipped, but decades of military training has left dangerous explosives and harmful chemicals on millions of acres of United States land.

This contaminated real estate now serves as housing, schools, parks and playgrounds in every congressional district in the country. In fact, you may have read in the morning paper down at what is called The Yards near Nationals stadium, the development that is being done there, they discovered a thousand-pound bomb less than 1 kilometer from where we're debating today.

To help the Department of Defense become a better partner for our communities and our constituents, I strongly urge that my colleagues support an amendment that would preserve the Department of Defense efforts to employ skilled labor and high-tech companies to clean up these dangerous liabilities and create economic development opportunities on these dangerous properties.

Congress established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program-Formerly Used Defense Site Program, DERP-FUDS, in 1986 to remove hazardous material from former Department of Defense properties and allow for safe reuse. Over two decades later, 2,600 properties nationwide require cleanup at an estimated cost of over $18 billion; and I will tell you, my colleagues, after having worked in this area for over a dozen years, that probably understates it.

The current funding for the program is less than $300 million, one-half of 1 percent of base defense spending. At this rate, the Department estimates, at this low-ball figure of $18 billion, we will not finish cleaning up the sites we know about for the next 250 years. My amendment would simply restore funding to the current level to ensure that we continue work removing these dangerous burdens from our communities within our lifetime, to say nothing of our great, great grandchildren's.

At a time when total military spending amounts to more in 1 day than what we spend in an entire year, I strongly urge my colleagues to reprioritize our investments. These sites are decades—in some cases they are hundreds of years old.

Now, the Defense Department has an obligation to clean up after itself, and they have made great progress. They have made critical technological breakthroughs in removing unexploded ordnance, making it less expensive, and some of the investments that we have made have actually saved lives overseas, because the same technology that will help us figure out whether it's a hubcap or a 105 millimeter shell can make a difference in IEDs overseas in Afghanistan or Iran.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It has operational impacts today for our military. It has economic development impact, which will help us return millions of acres to productive use; and it's the right thing to do.

I don't want a situation where we shortchange what the Department of Defense does. Remember, in prior debates—Mr. DICKS, Mr. YOUNG may remember—I brought to the floor Larry the Lizard coloring books that we were distributing to school children to warn them of the hazards because we hadn't invested enough to clean up, or the children that were killed in a former defense operation in San Diego because they found a bomb when they were playing.

I strongly urge that you approve this amendment and simply return the funding to the level that we have today. It will make a difference for the military now and for generations to come.

I appreciate your consideration and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment, what he wants to do. But a lot of these sites, there is no disposition. We don't know what's going to happen to them.

Will they stay as owned by the Federal Government, will they go to communities? We don't know the answer to that. We don't know the disposition. But they do need cleaning up, and there is no doubt about that.

Here's my problem with this amendment. He takes the funds from the defense-wide readiness fund, the operations and maintenance fund, which provides for our readiness, which provides for training. It provides for our Special Forces; it provides for the support, safety and quality-of-life programs for our troops and their families, including programs to assist spouses of servicemembers with employment and job training, which is a key initiative of the First Lady.

As much as I agree that this needs to be done, we do not want to take it out of the defense operations and maintenance, which is our defense-wide operations and maintenance funding.

I oppose the amendment. While I would like to help him in some other way to accomplish this, not from this fund that is so important. Readiness is readiness is readiness; and our troops have to be trained, they have to be equipped, they have to be ready, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your understanding of the importance and your concern about prioritization. If we don't prolong it in debate and recorded vote and all of this sort of thing, would it be possible to work with you and the ranking member as we move forward to see if there is an opportunity for us to plus-up this fund a little further in other areas?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for the question, and I say absolutely yes. I would very much like to do this, because I believe we need to do what it is you want to do.

But I just can't support taking it from an account that provides for readiness of our troops.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I would also support the gentleman in efforts to find another less objectionable source for the funding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. 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 35, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chair, today I, along with my colleague BOB FILNER, am offering an amendment to restore an overall loss of $10 million in research funding dedicated to finding a cure for gulf war illness, an illness that directly affects over one-fourth of veterans from the first gulf war.

This amendment has the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It has the support of the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the support of the National Vietnam and Gulf War Veterans Coalition.

□ 1700

According to the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce total outlays by $7 million.

Veterans of the first Gulf War suffer from persistent symptoms, including chronic headache, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicines or psychiatric diagnosis. Research shows that as these brave veterans age, they're at double the risk for ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease, as 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.

Gulf War Illness research was slated to receive a total of $25 million in fiscal year '12: $15 million at the VA and

$10 million at the DOD's Gulf War Illness Research Program. We've learned that the VA cut $10 million from its FY '13 program, which more or less supports allegations that VA officials, whose views on Gulf War illness have been discredited by the Institute of Medicine and the scientific community, are obstructing the research. The veterans of the first Gulf War who remain without a cure should not have to pay the price for this controversy. That's why this amendment would restore $10 million into a research program that has proven itself: The Defense Department's Gulf War Illness Research Program.

Last year, researchers funded by this program completed the first successful pilot study of a medication to treat one of the major symptoms of Gulf War Illness. The critical increase in funding from this amendment was built on progress that's already been made, including a followup clinical trial, as well as other promising studies which have been waiting for funding. The offset for this amendment comes from the $32 billion Operations and Maintenance Defense-Wide Account in title II.

Congress has a responsibility to ensure that these Gulf War veterans who put it all on the line and who are paying with a lifetime of pain and a potentially shortened life—it's our responsibility to make sure they're not left behind. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to fully fund research into Gulf War Veterans Illness.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I'm happy that I'm finally given an opportunity to be supportive of an amendment offered by my friend, Mr. KUCINICH, because so often I have to oppose his amendments.

This bill already includes $10 million for the program. He's concerned that the Veterans Affairs and Military Construction Subcommittee did not include an additional $5 million. And I understand that. And that's okay. But medical research on Gulf War Illness, or whatever it is, is important. What we learned from this program could help us in other programs on diseases coming from Iraq and Afghanistan. We're seeing, if you get a chance to visit at Walter Reed Bethesda Hospital, some very strange bacteria and viruses and mold and funguses that are coming from places that we never expected to see. But we're seeing them now.

So this research program could help another research program to deal with these deadly diseases that are affecting our troops in large numbers. And so while we've already done $10 million in this bill, I'm going to agree with Mr. KUCINICH and agree to his amendment to add the additional money.

Mr. DICKS. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the chairman. This Gulf War Illness has been something that bothered me a great deal. This was a very difficult diagnosis, what was causing this. But I think an additional investment here is worthy, and I think we should accept the amendment. I'm glad the chairman accepts it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for those comments, and I thank Mr. KUCINICH for offering the 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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. 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 $7,800,000)''.

Page 35, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the chairman. I also want to let the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member know that I appreciate their support for the Gulf War veterans in the previous amendment. I also submit that this particular amendment addresses another area that is receiving attention in the media but needs some money behind it to make sure that it receives attention from the Department.

This amendment to the Defense appropriations bill will increase funding for suicide prevention among our soldiers by $6 million. Now I happen to know there are members on this committee who are very concerned about the increased level of suicide among those who serve. And it's a bipartisan concern. We know the heartbreak that's out there when someone who serves this country finds that the conditions that they're in either during service or just afterwards are so horrendous that they take their own life.

Far too many troops coming home from war have sustained numerous mental insults, including post-traumatic stress order and traumatic brain injury. The mental anguish for them is so unbearable that they're stripped of hope and they just feel that they have to take their own lives. And sometimes they take not only their lives but the lives of loved ones as well.

There was a New York Times article in June of 2012, which said:

> The suicide rate among the Nation's active duty military personnel has spiked this year, eclipsing the number of troops dying in battle and on pace to set a record annual high since the start of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan more than a decade ago.

There's almost one troop suicide per day. Women face additional difficulties and have a higher rate of attempted suicide. Being a victim of sexual assault, for example, is a known risk factor for suicide. The disincentives to simply reporting such an assault are many and strong, which means getting help is even harder.

The epidemic of veteran or active duty military suicides is not only a reason to increase funding for prevention of suicides, it's a reason to end the wars. It's one of the hundreds of reasons that are independently sufficient to end the wars. But until we end these wars, the very least we can do is to summon a good faith effort to do everything we can to prevent soldier suicides.

The amendment's offsets come from the Pentagon Channel.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. With all due respect, we have accepted the gentleman's previous amendment. On this one we have already added $20 million to the budget for this purpose, and we will, if necessary, go higher in conference because of the gentleman's concern, the chairman's concern, and my concern. But to totally eliminate funding for the Pentagon Channel, I think, is a mistake. There's very valuable information that is received by the military, by the Congress, by everybody who watches this thing.

It's the source of the amendment. So I would ask the gentleman if he would withdraw the amendment and then work with us and we will do the best we can to get to a higher level in conference.

Mr. KUCINICH. The short answer is yes.

Mr. DICKS. This has become the issue of this war, when more people are dying of suicide than are in combat. We don't want to lose any lives. It means that there is a serious problem. And we want to work with you to address that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Can I ask the chairman of the full committee if he would enter into a colloquy for this?

First of all, I want to acknowledge my friend from Washington for his commitment. This isn't the first time you and I have talked about this long commitment to address this suicide prevention.

I would ask the chairman of the full committee, would you be willing to support such an endeavor to plus-up the funds for suicide prevention in the conference?

□ 1710

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This issue is extremely important to all of us. At every one—well, almost every one—of our hearings, we insisted on getting good answers from the military as to what they could do, what would they

do, what did they plan to do to prevent the suicides. We have supported so many programs and added the additional money that Mr. DICKS has talked about.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We have also funded money for the Yellow Ribbon Foundation, which is actually to help servicemen and -women return to society to avoid their desire to commit suicide.

Just putting money here is not going to solve the problem. It's going to take a lot of work on the part the military, on the part of the social workers who deal with these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines coming out of the services. Just money is not going to solve this problem. It is a bigger issue than money. But we have provided a lot of money, and we continue to keep pressure on the military organizations to do everything they can.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time just for the moment, the point is we have also added money for traumatic brain injury, for posttraumatic stress disorder. Our subcommittee has been at the forefront of providing additional resources beyond the administration's request for a number of years, since this has become a major issue. But I would just ask the gentleman to try to work with us on this one because of the source issue, and we'll work together and do the best we can.

Mr. KUCINICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I have confidence in the good faith of the chairman and the ranking member. I know that you're both concerned about this, you've said so now, but I also know that you've demonstrated this at other times. So what I would ask is that we could work together to look at the amount that is in there programatically right now, find a way to plus it up so that we can make sure that the people on Active Duty and those that just left Active Duty know about programs, have access to programs, and have access to the kind of treatment that would be necessary to cut down the number of suicides.

In view of this colloquy, I will withdraw the amendment. Again, I thank both gentlemen.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HANNA

Mr. HANNA. 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 $30,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chair, I would first like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their good work on this bill. I'm inclined to support the underlying bill but believe it can be, and should be, strengthened through this amendment.

The Department of Defense faces more than 10 million cyberattacks every day. The damage and frequency of these attacks have been rapidly increasing over recent years. Attacks against our networks cost our businesses more than $1 trillion per year in lost intellectual property and other damages, resulting in theft of innovation and real damage to our economy and American jobs.

For example, a cyberattack in March of 2011 against the military contractor resulted in the loss of 24,000 Department of Defense files. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has stated that 60,000 new software programs are identified every day which threaten our security, our economy, our citizens, and our military.

High-tech threats require high-tech defenses to combat the attacks that face our armed services on the front lines and our businesses here at home. Proper funding for our cybersecurity defenses and advanced research projects is critical to our national security in today's high-threat environment.

The Air Force has always taken the lead in cyberspace defenses, yet over $1 billion is proposed to be cut from their research, development, test and evaluation programs under this bill. These cuts are not justified based on the frequency and magnitude of the threats.

These cuts would further expose our networks and adversely affect our service departments and agencies such as Strategic Command, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency.

Secretary Panetta has stated:

The next Pearl Harbor we confront could very well be a cyberattack that cripples our systems.

We simply need to protect our networks by providing the funding levels necessary to do just that.

My amendment would restore $30 million to the Air Force's Research, Development, Test and Evaluation programs and reduce Operations and Maintenance by the same amount to support research and development of cyberdefense, advanced communication and information technology programs.

Recognizing the need for fiscal restraint, if adopted, my amendment would still fund the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation account by $1.6 billion, or 6 percent, below this year's level; and overall, Operations and Maintenance would still receive $12.1 billion above the enacted levels.

Now is simply not the time to cut back on high-tech research and development without justification. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to restore funding for these programs which are vital to our 21st century defenses.

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 reluctantly have to oppose this amendment for much of the same arguments I used earlier by taking the money out of O&M defense-wide accounts, which is where we provide for our readiness. And we just cannot continue to take money out of this fund and use it as a slush fund. Readiness, we have got to maintain. We can't take a chance on not being ready in the event a situation develops.

Now, on the issue of cyber, there's no doubt that this is a growing threat. It's even a larger threat than most people realize today. And members of this committee understand that threat because we have spent a lot of time dealing with cyber. But there are other places in this bill where the gentleman could offer his amendment that would, I think, apply better.

If we're dealing with a nonmilitary cyber program, it should be done through the Homeland Security bill, and they do have money in that bill. If it has to do with the FBI's law enforcement work on cyber, it should be in the Commerce-State-Justice bill where there is money there for that.

I'm afraid this gets a little close to being an earmark that is not an earmark. For example, there are those in the media suggesting that Members are increasing program amounts just so that that program would favor something in their own district. This gets very close because of a particular laboratory in Mr. HANNA's district. I'm not opposed to his supporting his laboratory, but I think it does get to the point that maybe this is a program increase that could be directed to a specific district or a specific project.

We've already funded a lot in cyber, and we will continue to fund cyber. Every year it grows, we grow with it. But we can't do this at the expense of our defense-wide Operation and Maintenance accounts that provide for our readiness.

□ 1720

I'm not going to produce a bill or support a bill that cuts into the readiness of our Nation, the ability to defend our Nation. We're not going to do it. The cyber accounts have their own place in the legislation, and they are being taken care of properly.

So I'm opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 35, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to add $15 million to the RDT&E in the Defense Health Program for the purpose of augmenting the Spinal Cord Injury Research Program within the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program.

Spinal cord injuries are a serious combat-related condition affecting many of our servicemen and -women. In response, Congress established the Spinal Cord Injury Research Program in 2009 to support research into regenerating and repairing damaged spinal cords and improving rehabilitative therapies.

More than 30 years ago, when I was first injured with a spinal cord injury, I was told that I'd never walk again and that you just can't repair the spinal cord. Well, now, some 30 years later, we know that that is not accurate. In fact, it is no longer a question of if we can repair spinal cords, but when. This offers great hope to our men and women in uniform who have been the victims of a spinal cord injury in combat. In fact, recent research promises to make the repair of spinal cord injuries a reachable goal in the very near future.

In one study released earlier this year, in fact, rats with severe spinal injuries were able, following a groundbreaking new treatment, to walk, run, and even climb stairs. Scientists in charge of the trial said a similar approach could be used on human patients with spinal injuries, with a clinical trial possible within 1 or 2 years.

This and other research provides real hope to our military servicemembers and veterans who have suffered severe nervous system damage while defending our freedom, as well as the 1.275 million Americans estimated to be paralyzed as a result of a spinal cord injury. But without sufficient funding, these therapies will not be able to undergo further development or clinical trials.

The research is real and shows incredible promise. There is a genuine and exciting possibility that we can soon repair these debilitating injuries that affect so many. I believe that we must make sure that momentum is not lost and that the benefit of decades of research into spinal cord injuries is realized.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank my good friends, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member DICKS, and the committee staff for working very closely with me on crafting this 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 strong support of this amendment. I commend my friend from Rhode Island for his efforts in this regard, and I just hope that this research will be successful. I know with his leadership, it will be.

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. The gentleman, the sponsor of the amendment, has discussed this with us at length for quite some time. This is an immediate problem and a growing problem and one that we have to face up to.

We do not oppose this amendment. We agree with the amendment.

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. LANGEVIN).

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

Page 35, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 23, 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'd like to recognize both of the gentlemen that are here on behalf of the committee today, the gentleman, Mr. DICKS, and the gentleman, Mr. YOUNG, for their outstanding service not only to our country, but to this Congress, on behalf of making sure that we have freedom and that the men and women who protect this country are properly taken care of. I express my gratitude to both of them.

Also, I want to thank HAL ROGERS, and certainly the gentleman from New Jersey who is sitting in for the committee today. I want to thank him also.

Mr. Chairman, today, I stand up in support of the dedication and hard work this Congress has done for work on something on known as TBI, traumatic brain injury, and posttraumatic stress disorder, PTSD. This Congress, as you may know, Mr. Chairman, has continued increasing funding for TBI and PTSD overall, and by this bill by $125 million.

On May 18, 2012, during the National Defense Authorization Act debate, the House unanimously adopted my amendment to create a pilot program administered by the Department of Defense that would strengthen treatment for our troops coming home with TBI and PTSD. Today, Congress has the opportunity to appropriate funds for this program.

My amendment, offered with my dear friend from California, the gentleman, MIKE THOMPSON, specifically moves $10 million from more than $31 billion in the Operation and Maintenance Defense-Wide budget to increase the Defense Health Program by $10 million. This money will directly assist these soldiers who have TBI-related injuries by allowing them to be reimbursed for attending private sector facilities that perform cutting-edge treatments.

One in four recent combat veterans treated by the Veterans Health Administration from 2004 to 2009 had a diagnosis of PTSD, and about 7 percent have been diagnosed with TBI. 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. These soldiers leave at a rapid rate.

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 the country are working to provide treatment to brain injury patients with new and innovative treatments, with remarkable results. One such treatment utilizes hyperbaric oxygen to reduce or eliminate chronic symptoms of TBI, such as headaches, memory loss, and mood swings.

While the Department of Defense has made many, many strides in research under the direction of Colonel Scott Miller, many innovative treatments, unfortunately, are not available within the military facilities. So, this amendment that I offer today would allow these men and women who seek treatment to be able to do so at our leading-edge facilities that are private around the United States of America. My amendment will provide for treatment and recovery that is desperately needed.

I urge my amendment to be approved, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the chair and the ranking member for the good work they're doing on this bill.

I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The Department of Defense estimates that more than 230,000 servicemembers have sustained a traumatic brain injury between 2000 and 2011. During that time, as the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, Mr. SESSIONS, pointed out,

Congress has dedicated an unprecedented level of funding for TBI treatment and research, which has allowed DOD to make great strides in identifying and treating brain injuries. But despite the increased funding, servicemembers and veterans suffering from posttraumatic stress and TBI are still limited as to where and when they can be treated. Sometimes the very best treatment for their injuries can be found outside of the traditional DOD/VA networks. There are some outstanding programs providing first-class, effective treatment to our returning soldiers, yet those programs are not eligible for payment.

□ 1730

I had a chance to visit one of these facilities, the Pathway Home program, run out of the California Veterans Home. It's just an outstanding program providing great service to some very deserving heroes, and they should be reimbursed.

Our troops and veterans have earned—they've earned the very best treatment and care that we can provide. But sometimes, as I said, the best treatments aren't available at military and veteran medical facilities.

The Sessions-Thompson amendment will make sure that our heroes who return from combat with TBI or PTS have access to the highest quality care our Nation has to offer. We have a responsibility to help those who have sacrificed so much in defense of our great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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, we're pleased to accept the gentlemen from Texas and California's amendment. We know what happens to those who suffer from traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress syndrome.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I just want to concur. I think this is a deserving amendment. We cannot do enough on these issues because this is going to have a lifetime effect on these people; and the more we do, as they come home, and even before they go to find out who is susceptible, this is critically important and will save us a lot of money.

We will accept the amendment on our side.

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.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. Ranking Member, I recently wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense to ask for his assistance in documenting the annual cost to the military of treating servicemembers and veterans who are living with hydrocephalus.

Hydrocephalus is a medical condition characterized by the abnormal accumulation of fluid within the brain. Experts suspect that two-thirds of the 41,000 servicemembers diagnosed with moderate to severe traumatic brain injuries over the past decade also suffer from hydrocephalus.

The primary treatment for hydrocephalus, a shunt implanted in the brain, was developed decades ago and has the highest failure rate of any implanted medical device. Veterans living with this condition will face a lifetime of medical uncertainties and incur costly brain surgeries, unless a better treatment is found.

Would the ranking member, the gentleman, be willing to work with us to help gain a better understanding of the incidence and cost of hydrocephalus among our injured servicemembers and veterans so we can focus the appropriate amount of DOD research dollars on finding a better treatment?

I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. The committee recognizes the serious trouble of traumatic brain injury, as you just noted, and related conditions; and I'm happy to work with the gentleman from New Jersey to improve understanding of this important issue as we confer with the other body and work with our majority Members here who are deeply concerned, as we are, about this amendment.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. 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 the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,00,000)''.

Page 35, line 23, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the great work they're doing on this. I'd also like to thank them for their commitment, not just to the defense of this Nation, but to the care of those warriors who so dearly pay for that defense.

What this amendment does is it increases the appropriation in the Sensory Injury Defense Research programmatic request from $5 million to $10 million for core vision and eye research. This important research will be paid for by redirecting funds from Operations and Management Budget.

You've heard it on the last several speakers talking about traumatic brain injury, the issues that come from that. One of the core indicators and one of the first indicators of traumatic brain injury or mild traumatic brain injury is eye injury.

The brave warriors that sustain these, whether they're puncture injuries or whether they're from concussive blast injuries, start to manifest themselves in loss of vision and eye injuries. Of all of the TBIs that happen in the war zone, 70 percent suffer some type of vision loss. The research to deal with this has long-term benefits.

It is, as I said, one of the first indicators of brain injury. We could start to get early treatment on that, and all the research seems to show that cognitive ability is affected positively the sooner we get on top of that.

There is $600 million and I know tough decisions are made in this bill towards research and battlefield injuries; 15 percent of all those injuries are eye injuries. The $10 million number that we're requesting gives us basic adequate numbers, a floor number, if you will, to start getting that research done.

So I am very appreciative of the tough decisions that get made in this. I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to beef up the eye injury research, and I would argue it's morally the right thing to do. We've been trying to work on this with a combination of VA and DOD to get that going.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We're pleased to accept the gentleman from Minnesota's amendment, and we salute him for his advocacy.

I could tell you from a personal visit from a soldier who lost his sight, Tim Fallon from Long Valley, New Jersey, who came into my office to advocate, that these are dollars well spent. We need to spend more on these types of investments because too many soldiers are coming home with, I think, things that could be potentially benefited from this type of investment in terms of having the potential.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I concur with the chairman and want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota, we appreciate his service to the country. You know a lot more about this than some of us who were not in the service, and we appreciate your leadership on this issue.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

Mr. HIGGINS. 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 the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 18, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense oversees important research into the varied threats that face our Nation. This research is essential to safeguarding our communities and empowering research institutions and universities to come up with the creative solutions to detect, confront, and neutralize weapons of mass destruction.

My amendment is very straightforward. It would increase funding by $10 million for the defense-wide research, development, test and evaluation account. It is offset by reducing funding for the operation and maintenance defense-wide account.

The intent of this amendment is to support the ongoing work that is being performed through basic research programs at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, which is the Department of Defense's official Combat Support Agency for countering weapons of mass destruction.

The grants provided by this funding support 160 research projects across the Nation. Twenty-one universities participate in competitive research projects that help to define, detect, and mitigate the proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction. This important work is providing us with a better understanding of the threats we face and creating new innovative solutions to the security risks posed by a chemical, biological, or nuclear attack on the United States homeland.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and the important lifesaving research being performed at important institutions across the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1740

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 strongly object to the arbitrary reductions to the Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide appropriations account.

The Operations and Maintenance appropriations account funding, as Mr. YOUNG stated a few minutes ago, is critical to the readiness, safety, and quality of life for our brave men and women who volunteer to serve each and every day. Cutting this account would hurt our readiness, and that is something we cannot do at this point in time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was rejected.

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, $3,199,423,000.

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, $1,256,347,000.

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, $277,377,000.

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, $3,362,041,000.

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), $7,187,731,000.

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, $6,608,826,000.

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, $13,516,000, 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, $335,921,000, 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, $310,594,000, 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, $529,263,000, 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, $11,133,000, 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, $237,543,000, 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), $108,759,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

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, $519,111,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $50,198,000.

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, $6,115,226,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $1,602,689,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $1,884,706,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $1,576,768,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $6,488,045,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the commonsense amendment I am offering for Ms. BUERKLE and me to help State National Guard units across the country better perform their missions. This amendment requires the National Guard to complete a capability assessment of the medical equipment its domestic Humvee ambulances should be required to carry in Federal and State missions.

Right now, these ambulances have no requirement to carry cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment, limiting their capability to adequately treat a wide range of injuries in emergency situations. MRAP ambulances, used by the Army and National Guard in overseas contingency operations, do, however, carry cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment. This capability assessment would determine whether or not Guard Humvee ambulances used domestically should carry cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment comparable to MRAP ambulances currently fielded in overseas contingency operations.

The National Guard's missions include responding to terrorist attacks, homeland security emergencies, natural disasters, and providing defense

support to civil authorities. How can the Guard carry out its required missions if it does not have the proper equipment necessary to deal with severe injuries?

As these Humvee ambulances are currently equipped, medical personnel are extremely limited in the available treatment they can provide to an injured person. Essentially, an ambulance in this configuration can only provide very basic care and the simple transportation of a patient from one place to another. For example, I understand that medical personnel would be unable to treat a patient experiencing cardiac arrest. This is a serious problem.

State National Guard units across the country want this equipment and have indicated that it could make the difference between life and death in emergency situations. The Adjutants General in eight different States, including Washington, Montana, North Dakota, Hawaii, New York, Arizona, and my home State of Oregon, have submitted resolutions for the emergency procurement of cardiac monitoring equipment to be used by their individual State Guard units, but because the National Guard Bureau does not view this equipment as ''required,'' it has backed out of a plan to purchase it despite the support of multiple States.

This amendment will require the National Guard Bureau to reexamine whether or not cardiac monitoring and resuscitation equipment is required and necessary for the Guard to fulfill its homeland security, terrorist attack, national disaster response, and defense support to civil authorities responsibilities. Should the capability assessment find that the equipment is necessary, under this amendment, the Army may use funds from this section to retrofit and install the equipment in domestic Humvee ambulances currently in use by the National Guard.

This is a commonsense issue. The Guardsmen and -women who operate ambulances should be provided the best capability available to save lives across this country in the event of an emergency.

I urge my colleagues' support of this bipartisan amendment, and 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 want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this issue to our attention. I have no objection to it. I accept it. I think its assessment would be valuable to be made.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentlewoman for her amendment. I think it's well-thought-out, and I hope it has the desired effect. I congratulate her on offering it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $17,518,324,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $3,072,112,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $677,243,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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,

Carrier Replacement Program, $578,295,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,217,601,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $1,597,878,000;

CVN Refuelings,$1,613,392,000;

CVN Refuelings (AP), $70,010,000;

DDG–1000 Program, $669,222,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer, $4,036,628,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer (AP), $466,283,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,784,959,000;

Joint High Speed Vessel, $189,196,000;

Moored Training Ship, $307,300,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $47,930,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $284,859,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $988,000,000)''.

Page 25, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $988,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $988,000,000)''.

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

□ 1750

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague from Illinois to offer a bipartisan commonsense amendment to the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Our amendment cuts $988 million from the bill, which the committee added but the Navy did not request, for a 10th DDG–51 destroyer. It also puts the savings toward deficit reduction.

Let's back up for a minute and explain how we got here. As part of the Department of Defense's new strategy, they are realigning force structure by reducing ground forces and making new investments in more agile sea and air forces. Toward this end, the Navy has entered into a multiyear procurement—or MYP—arrangement to purchase nine DDG–51 destroyers over the next 5 years. In order to fulfill one year of this MYP arrangement, the Navy requested just over $3 billion in the FY13 budget, yet the committee took it upon itself to give the Navy an extra billion dollars it didn't request and likely doesn't need for a 10th destroyer.

To be fair, there was talk of purchasing a 10th destroyer, but on March 29, 2012, Sean Stackley, the Navy's acquisition executive, testified before a House Armed Services Subcommittee that he thought through competition he could get 10 ships for the price of 9. He notes in his testimony that the Navy has ''competition on this program—two builders building the 51s, and the competition has been healthy.'' He goes on to explain how he hopes to get a 10th ship out of the multiyear arrangement, saying ''our top line allowed for nine ships to be budgeted, but when we go out with this procurement, we're going to go out with a procurement that enables the procurement of 10 ships if we're going to achieve the savings that we're targeting across this multiyear arrangement.''

Mr. Stackley ends by explaining that the Navy can use leverage and competition to get 10 ships for the price of

nine, and he thinks they have a pretty good shot. But rather than letting the Navy do its job, and letting the competition acquisition process work by putting the billion dollars on the table up front, the committee cut the legs out from underneath the competitive process. The addition of the extra billion dollars for another ship by the committee ends competition and negotiation, and puts a billion dollars on the table that we don't have to spend.

Why not let the acquisition process take its course, and see what happens? I don't think we need the 10th ship, and I'm not completely convinced we need the other nine either. But even for those who do support a 10th destroyer, cutting this funding now does not preclude them from adding it later if it's needed.

Unfortunately, this is one of the many examples of Congress supplanting its own parochial interests for that of the military and what's best for the country as a whole. This defense bill and all those before it are riddled with funding for weapons, bases, and projects we don't need to keep America safe. Rather, these bills include projects that support special Member interests back home. We can no longer afford to allow the desire to stimulate local economies to drive our defense and foreign policy. As we emerge from a deep recession and face a deficit topping $1 trillion for the fourth straight year, we must right-size our budget.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of the ability to let Mr. DOLD speak, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois may not yield blocks of time. He may yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we're focused on finding savings in every area of government spending. Without a doubt, the Defense Department has made significant and painful contributions to our efforts to reduce the debt, and I want to make sure that we recognize that.

The Defense budget actually accounts for roughly 17 percent of all Federal spending, yet it has contributed over 50 percent of the deficit reduction. I do want to recognize that we're already cutting a significant amount of money, Mr. Chairman, out of the Department of Defense. We need to be looking at commonsense ways for us to be able to save money.

This amendment is about promoting efficiency in the Department of Defense and achieving valued savings wherever possible. The amount of funds provided in this bill for these ships is $1 billion above the Navy's own budget request. In the spirit of seeking to achieve cost savings throughout this government, I believe it's appropriate for us to act consistent with the Navy's view of allowing the competitive bidding process to play out, which, as the Navy acquisition executive has testified, may very well allow the Navy to acquire its 10th ship at lesser amounts included in the Navy's budget request. If these bids come back and a 10th ship cannot be realized this year, I'm certainly supportive of providing additional resources next year for the 10th ship. But I do believe we should allow the Navy to operate and try to maintain at lower costs while achieving our Nation's security.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, all throughout this last year, we have heard from the administration and we have heard from the Navy that it is important to be able to have a large presence in the Pacific area. This is something that we're going to do that is new. We're going to have an increased presence in the Pacific. That is the administration's statement.

During our many hearings, all of those hearings that we did on the Central Command area in the Mideast, the Persian Gulf, the Strait of Hormuz, the threats from Iran, we were told by the military leadership who fight those wars there that they needed a larger naval presence in order to counter any threat from Iran and similar threats, and to keep open the Persian Gulf, and especially the Strait of Hormuz.

Today, we don't really have as much naval capability as they suggest that we need. So the committee added this DDG–51 for this year. The Navy actually asked for advanced procurement for the DDG–51 so they can build it next year. We were able to find the funds to actually build it this year so that we can begin to prepare for the presence that the Navy and the President have all said that we have to maintain. That's the DDG–51.

In addition, in order to try to accomplish the coverage that the Navy said they need, we have taken three cruisers that would have been taken out of service, and we reconfigured those cruisers. We provided funding to reconfigure the cruisers to add to this effort, to add to the effort to have more naval presence in the Mideast, and to cover the Pacific. As everyone in the military and in the White House has said, we've got to have that presence.

We have to oppose this amendment. We need this DDG–51 in order to meet our obligations.

It is interesting that we understand that some of these programs are costing more than was anticipated. The CBO just issued a report saying that in order to do the President's budget request, it will cost $123 billion more than they estimated that it would cost. We do have a problem with numbers, and with dollars.

Covering the Pacific region, covering the Mideast region, the Persian Gulf, the Strait of Hormuz, that is important to our national security interests, and that's important to our allies, and to our troops overseas in that region.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It is not a good amendment. It is not good for our national defense.

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

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $372,573,000.

In all: $15,236,126,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2017, 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, $6,364,191,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $506,660,000)''.

Page 35, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $235,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $235,000,000)''.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment we should be able to come together on. The administration requested $101 million for the operation

and upgrading cruiser ships used by the United States Navy. That's what the Pentagon and the administration requested, $101 million.

However, what's been recommended is $607 million. That $607 million is an increase of over $500 million from what the Pentagon asked for, five times what the Pentagon asked for. At a time when so many of my colleagues are calling for a decrease in the spending on the Federal Government side, it seems that they should heed the requests of their constituents, the budget, and the advice of Congress and will refrain from throwing $500 million at this program that the Department of Defense is trying to phase out.

Now, my amendment would allocate $235 million of that 506 excess to defense health programs. The rest would be toward deficit reduction.

Americans would be better served if that $235 million didn't go to a program of buying cruiser ships that the Department of Defense doesn't want, and rather have this money go to health care research, which the Department of Defense does in the area of cancer research, breast cancer research, prostate cancer research, and other cancer research.

The Department of Defense has a strong cancer research program and can always use more money to save lives. I have been a strong supporter all my life of putting money into research in the National Institutes of Health and joining with Senator Specter in getting an additional $10 billion in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for the National Institutes of Health.

One day, through research dollars, we will have a cure for cancer, a headline we want to see, a headline that cancer scientists find the cure for cancer. It may come because of an appropriation like this and not Congress passes five times the amount of money the Department of Defense wants for cruiser ships.

My goal in offering this amendment is to see that the cancer research programs are benefited, that they are doubled; and this investment in health care research is an investment in our Nation's future and an investment in every human being here as a potential victim of cancer. There are other diseases which the National Institutes of Health look at. Whether it's Alzheimer's, diabetes, heart disease and others, cures need to be found and government should be investing monies in those places.

This is one place where the Department of Defense emphasizes cancer research. Even with the doubling of investment of cancer research, this amendment does reduce the overall cost of the appropriations bill. At a time when we have seen cuts to other research programs like the National Institutes of Health, it's important to identify every single dollar that can be used to further research efforts.

A vote for this amendment is a vote in favor of furthering our country's cancer research and protecting all citizens out there who are potential victims of this awful disease and reduce the overall cost of this legislation as well.

I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that cancer research is already funded in this bill at a $246 million level.

I also want to say that Mr. YOUNG, Mr. Murtha, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. LEWIS have had a long tradition of leadership on cancer research in the Defense Appropriations Committee. We have always been very supportive of it and will continue so. The bill is already at $246 million.

Secondly, why did we put the money into the cruiser program? We did so because at a time when we are pivoting much of our Navy fleet into the Pacific area, we believe we needed to have as many of these ships capable of missile defense, or the Aegis system, as possible because the world is so unstable.

Many of these ships will probably go to the Pacific. There are six of them that we are re-outfitting for this system, and then some of them may go to the Middle East.

Now, I just got back from spending a night on a carrier that was part of the Fifth Fleet in the Persian Gulf, and our trip also included Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and Djibouti. I wish that some of the Members of Congress could get some of the briefings that we got in terms of the missile threat in the Middle East alone, because it is an unstable part of the globe right now, and we have to have our best technology out there and our best sailors and our best airmen ready at all times in case there is a missile attack, and that's what the Defense Committee on a bipartisan basis recognized with this $506 million.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $1,482,081,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $11,304,899,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $5,449,146,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $599,194,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $16,632,575,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $4,429,335,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $2,000,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: *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 during fiscal year 2013, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and each Reserve Component Chief, may each use not more than 3 percent of the funds made available to the National Guard or such reserve component, as the case may be, under this heading to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities related to adding technological capability to platforms or to modernize existing systems.

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), $63,531,000, 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, $8,593,055,000 to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

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, $16,987,768,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: *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.

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, $25,117,692,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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, $19,100,362,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, $250,000,000 for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program shall only be available for expenses, not otherwise provided for, to include program management and oversight, to conduct research, development, test and evaluation to include proof of concept demonstration; engineering, testing, and validation; and transition to full-scale production: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program to appropriations for research, development, test and evaluation 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 30 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $250,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $250,000,000)''.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the Rapid Innovation Fund and save the taxpayers over $250 million. As a veteran, I know how important it is that we use every single dollar that goes to our Department of Defense in an intelligent way.

This fund, this Rapid Innovation Fund, has never been requested by the Pentagon. This is money that the Pentagon doesn't say that it wants. It was created in the FY 2011 Defense bill in response, frankly, to the loss of earmarks here in the House of Representatives. So far the Appropriations Committee has put over $700 million in 2 years into this fund, and yet to date the Department of Defense has spent only $32.5 million of the $700 million already appropriate and provided.

But instead of waiting to see if the fund is working and if it could be successful and of any value to the warfighter, this year the committee is pushing for another $250 million of taxpayer money to go into the so-called Rapid Innovation Fund.

□ 1810

I urge my colleagues to reject this effort. First of all, the Pentagon, as I said, never asked for this money. Four DOD agencies declined an invitation to even participate in the fund. There is clearly no one in the military clamoring for what is essentially a slush fund. With sequestration looming, now is the time to make tough choices, not to add $250 million of wasteful spending. We must focus our very scarce resources on validated military requirements.

Second, this Rapid Innovation Fund is neither rapid, nor innovative. The fund allows the Department of Federal Acquisition Regulations Procedures to move forward—just as they do for any other procurement process. The first contracts took over a year to be signed. I don't find anything rapid about that. In addition, this fund simply doles out money to projects that are similar to those previously supported by the now-discredited earmark system. There's nothing innovative about that either.

Let me be clear: this fund was created by Congress because Congress ended earmarks, and some have wanted a way to have earmark-type projects continue to receive government money.

This fund is, third, wasteful and unnecessary. The DOD base budget is well over $500 billion—built through a time-honored and trusted process to ensure the needs of our warfighters. This fund, however, is completely outside of this process and therefore advances projects that have not been validated and are not proven in this same manner.

Finally, the fund itself is unproven. Only $30 million and change has been spent on this fund and there is no data demonstrating that this fund holds any value to our military or to our taxpayers. But even if it does, there's still $670 million sitting in the fund today. Why not just wait? At the current spending rate, there's over 10 years' worth of funds still available. Why put $250 million more of taxpayer money at risk?

As a Congress, we have to be willing to make tough choices—certainly in our DOD budget. But this one isn't even tough. We can't just throw good money in the hole and hope it helps our Nation's defense.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and 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 rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The Rapid Innovation Fund was authorized and appropriated by Congress in 2011 to allow innovative small businesses to compete for funding within the Department of

Defense. It is a competitive, merit-based program designed to accelerate the fielding of innovative technologies into military systems.

Last fall, each service and the OSBP issued broad agency announcements to solicit proposals for the first round of funding worth $500 million. Of the 3,554 white papers received, 514 received high priority or strong evaluations, valued at about $700 million.

This bill provides an additional $250 million for this successful program for small businesses that are interested in working with the Department of Defense. Also, this money can be used for joint urgent operational needs. This is when the commanders in the field say that they need something in an urgent way, and this money is available for that kind of requirement.

So, again, the gentleman raises a lot of insinuations that this was done because of doing away with the earmarks. It was done because we feel that small businesses in this country have a lot to offer the Defense Department. Not all of the innovations come from Lockheed and Boeing and General Dynamics. A lot of the innovation comes from smaller businesses who are, in essence, going to be cut out. We already have an existing program, the SBIR program, which we wanted to enhance so that small businesses would have a place to go so they could compete, where we would be doing this on a merits basis, that we would be doing it on the services saying these are areas where we need additional work.

So I'm somewhat surprised that the gentleman would oppose something like this, knowing, I'm certain, he's an advocate for small businesses in our country. I think this is a good program and one that should be supported on a bipartisan basis.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to say this. While we all acknowledge there was a numerical explosion and a substantive explosion or a questionable, in substance, on earmarks and that's why earmarks are banned, one of the advantages of earmarks is that it did let the small mom-and-pop innovative small businesses have a crack at the bat at the Pentagon budget. And most of us who are familiar with the Pentagon budget would say it's broken or at least it needs lots of improvement. What the earmarking did do is let small companies have a bite at the apple. So in the interest of banning earmarks, we set up this program to allow small businesses.

I want to give you a graphic example. I had a man come to me one time and said, I used to work with a large defense contractor. He named the contractor and I don't want to name them. But he said, This is a circuit panel. In fact, it's a memory panel. It's about the size of this notebook in my hand. And he said, This is for a nuclear submarine, and it costs about $10 million. I know because I invented it when I was with the large defense contractor. And all nuclear submarines now buy this kind of memory board. But your cell phone—pulling out the BlackBerry—now has more memory in it than that big, awkward panel. But the only way I'm going to get a crack at the business with the U.S. Navy would be through the earmarking process.

Now, I can replace this $10 million circuit memory board for probably hundreds of thousands of dollars, but I can't do that now. You've thrown away that tool for both of us.

So we set up this board to try to let those small businesses have a crack at the bat. And I agree with you there's money in the account that maybe it should be spent down. We need to be looking at it before plussing-up. I think you have raised some good points, but I believe the reason why the program is out there is very important in order to keep the large defense contractors honest, if you will, and provide a path for the small innovators.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I really appreciate what the gentleman just said. Another thing here, the gentleman is saying they should just rush out and spend this money. I don't mind a thorough, professional way of going about this, and to take some time to make sure they've got this right is what we want them to do.

Mr. POMPEO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POMPEO. I just say to the chairman, I'm not urging anyone to rush out and spend this money. I'm urging this money to stay in the pockets of the taxpayers because the Department of Defense has not asked for it. All of the things that have been spoken to, these good ideas, I was a small business owner. I made airplane parts for 10 years. I don't want anybody to rush out and spend the money. I want to leave it in the taxpayers' pockets, where the Department of Defense believes it should be.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, as an airplane parts manufacturer, I can promise you that you know how difficult it was to sell your products to the United States Air Force. And this program would allow a small innovator to do that and therefore reduce the cost to the taxpayers of parts for airplanes.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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 Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $75,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

□ 1820

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, in this bill, not only do the Republicans claim there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to cut in the defense budget, they are actually increasing spending beyond what the Pentagon is asking for. The Republicans have put an additional $75 million for missile defense in this bill—75 million additional dollars that the generals have not asked for.

So my amendment today is simple: It would reduce funding for the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense program by $75 million to bring the 2013 funding level back to the administration's request.

Ground-Based Midcourse Defense is Star Wars, and it's a system that hopes to one day shoot down an incoming nuclear warhead by launching our own missiles from Alaska and California.

But here we have a situation where basically the Republicans are saying that they want to give the Pentagon $75 million more than what the military says it needs right now. And if we can't decide just to take what the Pentagon is asking and rubber stamp it and give it to them, and even that is not enough in a period of fiscal austerity, then how in the world are we going to be successful next year when $55 billion has to be cut?

So, let's start here. St. Augustine's prayer, I think, is applicable here, where he said, O Lord, make me chaste, but not just yet. The Republicans are saying, O Lord, let us reduce the deficit, but not just yet. When it comes to defense spending, we want to give the Pentagon even more than they are asking for. Let's get all of our sinning done before next January. Let's really clear the deck on all the gold-plated planning that—I don't know if it's defense firms because it's not the Pentagon. The Pentagon is saying that the money that's in the bill as the President proposed it is sufficient in order to provide for the development of this missile defense technology.

The bill already funds this program to the tune of $900 million, and the Pentagon is saying ''enough.'' So I know you're talking about canceling sequestration when it comes to defense spending, but this isn't a good sign. This isn't a good sign that we're ever going to be able to reconcile the tension that exists between the need not to cut NIH funding, the need not to cut National Cancer Institute funding, the need not to cut programs that deal with Grandma on Medicaid and nursing homes and all the way down the line. This just goes beyond anything that's even remotely reasonable.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on the Markey amendment, and I hope that it is adopted by the full House.

I yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to say, most importantly, this was authorized in the National Defense Authorization this year which was passed on an overwhelming basis, on a bipartisan vote, and their authorization actually was a lot more than our $75 billion. And the reason why this money is in there and it affects Fort Greely, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base in California is that there are some changes that are going on in the missile silos, so rather than close down the shop and hope that the bad guys give us a pass until we're ready to defend ourselves, we're having to move these missiles and keep them current, keep them active, and keep them capable while this construction is going on, and then we finish the construction and put them back, and that's why the authorizing committee, on a bipartisan basis, authorized it, and that's why our subcommittee has also supported it, although at a lower number.

With that, I recommend a ''no'' vote and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the earlier amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY). The gentleman from Illinois had an amendment to cut $988 million from the Navy's DDG–51 program. The members of the House Armed Services Committee have carefully considered this shipbuilding program. We have met for months in the Seapower Subcommittee and discussed it thoroughly with Navy leadership.

The DDG–51 is the Navy's preeminent surface combatant. It can conduct multiple missions, including ballistic missile defense, and it has proven itself in almost every theater in which it has operated.

This ship has been authorized with a multiyear procurement strategy for DDG–51s, which is an important, cost-saving measure that the Navy has used in multiple situations to save money for the taxpayer.

This is one of the most successful shipbuilding programs ever in the United States Navy because it is one of the best built and best values for the taxpayer and requires a fair and open competition for contracting.

Right now, our Navy has the lowest shipbuilding totals in generations, and many predictions are that the number is only going to shrink further. As we pivot to the Pacific, we cannot afford to be cutting additional ships from our budget.

It is extremely important not only to our economic security, but also our national security. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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, $185,268,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,516,184,000.

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, $564,636,000, 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, $32,862,234,000; of which $31,122,095,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available until September 30, 2014, and of which up to $16,105,245,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $521,762,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,218,377,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014 , 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: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided to develop an integrated Department of Defense –Department of Veterans Affairs (DOD–VA) integrated health record, not more than twenty-five percent shall be available for obligation until the DOD–VA Interagency Program Office submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a completed fiscal year 2013 execution and spending plan and a long-term roadmap for the life of the project that includes, but is not limited to, the following: a) annual and total spending for each Department; b) a quarterly schedule of milestones for each Department over the life of the project; c) detailed cost-sharing business rules; and d) data standardization schedules between the Departments.

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, $1,301,786,000, of which $635,843,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $53,948,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $22,214,000 for activities on military installations and $31,734,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, to assist State and local governments; $18,592,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $1,823,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $647,351,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $627,705,000 shall only be 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, $1,133,363,000: *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.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund,'' $217,414,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, 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, within 60 days of the enactment of this Act, a plan for the intended management and use of the amounts provided under this heading shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees: *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, $350,321,000, of which $347,621,000 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; and of which $2,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be for procurement.

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, $514,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $511,476,000.

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.

(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 $3,000,000,000 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, 2013: *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 2013: *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 none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract that incrementally funds an end item purchased under multi-year procurement authority: *Provided further*, That the preceding limitation shall not apply to advance procurement funding and economic order quantity funding associated with a multi-year procurement: *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 advance 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:

F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft; DDG–51 Arleigh Burke class destroyer and associated systems; SSN–774 Virginia class submarine and government-furnished equipment; CH–47 Chinook helicopter; and V–22 Osprey aircraft variants.

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 2013, 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 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2014 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 2014.

(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.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. 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. 8016. 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. 8017. 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. 8018. 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. 8019. 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. 8020. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Defense Media Activity shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8021. 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. 8022. (a) Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $38,619,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $28,404,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' to support Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance, readiness, counterdrug activities, and drug demand reduction activities involving youth programs;

(2) $9,298,000 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. 8023. (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 2013 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 2013, 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 2014 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.

SEC. 8024. 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. 8025. 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. 8026. 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. 8027. (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.

(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 2013. 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. 8028. 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. 8029. (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. 8030. 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. 8031. (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 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation

supporting the fiscal year 2014 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 2014 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. 8032. 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, 2014: *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, 2014.

SEC. 8033. 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. 8034. 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. 8035. (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. 8036. 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 insure 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.

Mr. KINGSTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 66, line 17, 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8037. (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;

(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; or

(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. 8038. 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.

SEC. 8039. (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.

(c) The conversion of any activity or function of the Department of Defense under the authority provided by this section shall be credited toward any competitive or outsourcing goal, target, or measurement that may be established by statute, regulation, or policy and is deemed to be awarded under the authority of, and in compliance with, subsection (h) of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, for the competition or outsourcing of commercial activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 8039.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, the House has voted repeatedly to strike

problematic and anticompetitive A–76 language from the bill we have considered. The same change and reversal of bad policy should be adopted in this legislation by striking section 8039.

My amendment does just that. As drafted, section 8039 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 red tape and make the use of this cost-saving process easier, not harder.

The requirements in section 8039 are largely codified in existing statute. Retaining section 8039 will obstruct, and potentially nullify, any current efforts to reform the system in ways that improve public-private competitions and bring much-needed transparency, 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 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. 5856.

Mr. Chairman, 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. The amendment tends to remove language from the appropriations bill, which we're going to agree with, by the way. It has been carried in appropriations bills for a number of years. However, when the laws were codified, it became part of the permanent law. It doesn't even need to be in the appropriations bills any longer.

So we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1830

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACA

Mr. BACA. 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 the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 32, line 18, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to considering the amendment at this point in the reading?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I won't object—I will say this is a little unusual for us to agree to do this. But in this one case, we will agree to it and let the gentleman present his amendment.

I believe in as much openness as we possibly can provide for all of our Members, but we just can't make a habit of going back once the bill has been read, once the regular order has been followed. But in this case, we will yield.

I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BACA. I'd like to thank the chairman and Member DICKS for allowing me this effort on this legislation. I also want to thank my colleague, GARY MILLER, for supporting this amendment.

This is a Baca-Miller amendment. It is bipartisan. It directs $10 million to be moved from the Operations and Management portion of the Department of Defense budget to the Research and Development portion of the budget. Moving these funds will allow the DOD to develop cost-effective solutions to environmental problems.

These funds will allow the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program to support, and I state, grants. This is a grant, it's not an earmark, that provides clear water.

My communities in California, including GARY MILLER's district, in the Inland Empire must deal with perchlorate contaminated water. Perchlorate is a rocket fuel additive that can be harmful to women, children, and the elderly, that affects both GARY MILLER's and my district. This contamination has resulted in millions of dollars in cost to the region for cleanup litigation.

Congress should actively support the DOD effort to develop solutions to problems like perchlorate contamination. I ask my colleagues to support the Baca-Miller amendment, a bipartisan amendment.

Again, I thank the chair and the ranking member, and 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, while I did not object to taking up this amendment, I am going to object to the amendment. This one actually was an earmark in the FY10, funded as an earmark at $1.6 million. It also takes the money from that source that I have objected to before, the Defense-Wide Operation and Maintenance accounts. I just really cannot support anything that is going to affect our readiness to defend our country.

So I strongly object to this amendment, although I did agree to allowing us to go back to consider the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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:

''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2011/2013'', $14,862,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013'', $30,100,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013'', $22,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy, 2011/2013'', $12,432,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013'', $65,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2011/2013'', $9,500,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2012/2014'', $80,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014'', $14,400,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014'', $31,572,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $277,050,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $44,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $55,800,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2012/2013'', $63,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 2012/2013'', $120,000,000; and

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2012/2013'', $179,600,000.

SEC. 8041. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military technicians (dual status) 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 technicians (dual status), 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 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, 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 made 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. (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. 8057. (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. 8058. 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. 8059. 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 45 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. 8060. 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. 8061. 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. 8062. 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. 8063. 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 center-fire 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. 8064. 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. 8065. 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. 8066. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $133,381,000 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. 8067. 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 2013.

SEC. 8068. 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. 8069. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $948,736,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $149,679,000 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 SRBMD missiles in the United States and in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with each nation's laws, regulations, and procedures, $74,692,000 shall be available for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, and $44,365,000 shall be for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite, and $680,000,000 shall be for the Iron Dome program: *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. 8070. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of U.S. Navy forces assigned to the Pacific fleet: *Provided*, That the command and control relationships which existed on October 1, 1994, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

SEC. 8071. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $372,573,000 shall be

available until September 30, 2013, 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:

(1) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2007/2013'': LHA Replacement Program $156,685,000;

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2013'': LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Program $80,888,000; and

(3) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2009/2013'': CVN Refueling Overhauls $135,000,000.

SEC. 8072. 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 2013 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

SEC. 8073. 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 committee.

SEC. 8074. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2014 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. 8075. 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.

SEC. 8076. 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. 8077. 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. 8078. 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. 8079. (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. 8080. 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. 8081. 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. 8082. (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. 8083. 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. 8084. 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, 2014.

SEC. 8085. 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. 8086. 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, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program; R–2, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Budget Item Justification; R–3, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project Cost Analysis; and R–4, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Program Schedule Profile.

SEC. 8087. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, due to an excessive level of funded carryover at Army depots, the total amount appropriated to ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by $1,207,400,000, and the total amount appropriated to ''Other Procurement, Army'', in title III of this Act is hereby reduced by $1,253,500,000.

SEC. 8088. (a) Not later than 60 days after the date of 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 for fiscal year 2013: *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 and project; 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 until the report identified in subsection (a) is submitted to the congressional intelligence committees, unless the Director of National Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional intelligence committees that such

reprogramming or transfer is necessary as an emergency requirement.

SEC. 8089. (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 start effort;

(2) terminates a program with appropriated funding of $10,000,000 or more;

(3) transfers funding into or out of the National Intelligence Program; or

(4) transfers funding between appropriations,

unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

(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)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying the Act unless the congressional intelligence committees are notified 30 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds; this notification period may be reduced for urgent national security requirements.

SEC. 8090. 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. 8091. 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. 8092. The Department of Defense shall continue to report incremental contingency operations costs for Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, or any other named operations in the U.S. Central Command area of operation 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. 8093. 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. 8094. 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. 8095. (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. 8096. (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. 8097. 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. 8098. From within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in this Act, up to $139,204,000, 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. 8099. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence shall not employ more Senior Executive employees than are specified in the classified annex.

SEC. 8100. 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. 8101. 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. 8102. Of the amounts appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', the following amounts shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, for the following authorized purposes, 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: (1) $33,000,000 for addressing the need for construction of a mental health and substance abuse facility and construction of a regional public health laboratory; and (2) $106,400,000 for addressing the need for civilian water and wastewater improvements: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating funds for either of the foregoing purposes, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation.

SEC. 8103. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of

Defense to take beneficial occupancy of more than 2,000 parking spaces (other than handicap-reserved spaces) to be provided by the BRAC 133 project: *Provided*, That this limitation may be waived in part if: (1) the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that levels of service at existing intersections in the vicinity of the project have not experienced failing levels of service as defined by the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual over a consecutive 90-day period; (2) the Department of Defense and the Virginia Department of Transportation agree on the number of additional parking spaces that may be made available to employees of the facility subject to continued 90-day traffic monitoring; and (3) the Secretary of Defense notifies the congressional defense committees in writing at least 14 days prior to exercising this waiver of the number of additional parking spaces to be made available: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall implement the Department of Defense Inspector General recommendations outlined in report number DODIG–2012–024, and certify to Congress not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act that the recommendations have been implemented.

SEC. 8104. 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 within 15 days after the end of each fiscal quarter.

SEC. 8105. 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.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8106. 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 $2,000,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act for the National Intelligence Program: *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 a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2013.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8107. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in the Act, there is appropriated $270,000,000 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: *Provided further*, That funds may not be made available for a school unless its enrollment of Department of Defense-connected children is greater than 50 percent.

SEC. 8108. 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 of the United States; 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. 8109. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), 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 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) not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate—

(A) an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance); or

(B) a pre-trial agreement entered in a military commission case prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) A certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that—

(1) 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—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) 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;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(2) includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), 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 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 such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate—

(A) an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance); or

(B) a pre-trial agreement entered in a military commission case prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d)(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability to a detainee transfer of a certification requirement specified in subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1) or the prohibition in subsection (c), if the Secretary certifies the rest of the criteria required by subsection (b) for transfers prohibited by (c) and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, determines that—

(A) alternative actions will be taken to address the underlying purpose of the requirement or requirements to be waived;

(B) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated, but the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate such risks with regard to the individual to be transferred;

(C) in the case of a waiver of subsection (c), the Secretary has considered any confirmed case in which an individual who was transferred to the country subsequently engaged in terrorist activity, and the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism with regard to the individual to be transferred; and

(D) the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual concerned, the following:

(A) A copy of the determination and the waiver concerned.

(B) A statement of the basis for the determination, including—

(i) an explanation why the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(ii) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), an explanation why it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the subparagraph to be waived have been completely eliminated.

(C) A summary of the alternative actions to be taken to address the underlying purpose of, and to mitigate the risks addressed in, the subparagraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual 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 control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay,

(3) 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. 8110. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or 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. 8111. 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, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8112. 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, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 8113. 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)).

SEC. 8114. None of the funds made available by this Act for International Military education and training, foreign military financing, excess defense article, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456) issuance for direct commercial sales of military equipment, or peacekeeping operations for the countries of Chad, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Burma may be used to support any military training or operation that include child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008, and except if such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c-1).

SEC. 8115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 8116. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, realign, or transfer Air Force aircraft, to disestablish or convert units associated with such aircraft, or to disestablish or convert any other unit of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve.

SEC. 8117. The Secretary of the Air Force shall obligate and expend funds previously appropriated for the procurement of RQ–4B Global Hawk and C–27J Spartan aircraft for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

SEC. 8118. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to retire C–23 Sherpa aircraft.

SEC. 8119. The total amount available in the Act for pay for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 shall be the amount otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act for such pay reduced by $258,524,000.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 120, line 12, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8120. None of the funds appropriated, or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a veterans memorial object to a foreign country or an entity controlled by a foreign government, or otherwise transfer or convey such an object to any person or entity for purposes of the ultimate transfer or conveyance of the object to a foreign country or entity controlled by a foreign government, unless such transfer is specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 8121. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to sponsor professional or semi-professional motorsports, fishing, mixed martial arts, wrestling, or other sporting events or competitors.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of sponsorship of amateur or high school sporting events or competitors.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chair, I raise a point of order against section 8121 of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PALAZZO. Section 8121 constitutes legislation because it requires that the Secretary determine what qualifies as ''semiprofessional,'' ''a sporting event,'' and ''mixed martial arts.''

These are not terms that current law requires that the Secretary know, thus, imposing these determinations upon the Secretary violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Mississippi makes a point of order that section 8121 proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. Section 8121 is in the form of a limitation on funds in the bill.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make investigations, judgments, or determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

The fact that a limitation may impose certain incidental burdens on executive officials does not destroy the character of the limitation as long as it is descriptive of functions and findings already required to be undertaken by existing law. The proponent of a limitation assumes the burden of establishing that any duties or determinations imposed by the provision are merely ministerial or are already required by law. As noted in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 61.12, the question is not whether an official routinely makes such determinations but, rather, whether such determinations are required by law.

The Chair finds that the limitation in section 8121 does more than merely impose a negative restriction on the funds of the bill. Instead, it would require the Secretary to make various determinations, such as what qualifies as ''semi-professional,'' as ''mixed martial arts,'' or as ''sporting events.'' The proponent of this language has not proven that these are matters with which the Secretary is charged under existing law.

The Chair finds the proceedings of August 20, 1980, pertinent. On that day, a limitation on funds in an appropriation bill to dispose of ''agricultural'' land was held to impose new duties in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI because the determination whether lands were ''agricultural'' was not required by law.

On these premises, the Chair concludes that the section proposes to change existing law. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to request a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Seeing none, 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:

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $9,165,082,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 121, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $98,697,000)''.

Page 121, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,373,000)''.

Page 122, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $17,482,000)''.

Page 122, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $13,857,000)''.

Page 122, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,690,000)''.

Page 122, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $424,000)''.

Page 123, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $266,000)''.

Page 123, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $273,000)''.

Page 123, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,287,000)''.

Page 124, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $113,000)''.

Page 132, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $412,287,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, under title IX of this bill there is $412 million labeled ''incentive pay'' for Afghan soldiers. Also under title IX, there is $13 million labeled ''incentive pay'' for American soldiers. This is a problem for our military.

My amendment, which is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is very simple. At all does it move some incentive pay from Afghan soldiers to American soldiers.

Last month the Department of Defense published their review of military compensation, a report required by law every 4 years. The report concluded that our system of combat pay is broken. I quote: ''There is little correlation between exposure to danger and compensation pay.''

A recent article on the report by the Marine Corps Times outlined how a Navy captain assigned to Bahrain received more than $1,000 a month while a Marine lance corporal patrolling the streets of Helmand province received much less in combat pay. That's not right.

□ 1850

If you look in this bill and compare the $412 million for the Afghans against the $13 million for our troops, the inequity is clear. My amendment simply moves the incentive pay for the Afghan soldiers to the American soldiers. This money should go to the junior enlisted servicemembers facing the most risk in Afghanistan.

My amendment does not touch Afghan base pay. That $450 million is still in the bill. It does not touch their pay for food and subsistence. That $71 million is still there. It doesn't touch their recruiting money either. The $4 million is still there. It doesn't even touch the money we spent to host ''welcome home'' concerts for the Afghan army when they returned from deployment. That money comes out of the Information Operations fund.

If anyone says that this amendment will hurt America's effort to fund the Afghan army, which we hope will take over its responsibility in just a few years, I invite you to look at the numbers in this fund. The Afghan security forces are well funded.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be accepted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 18, 2012.

Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (VFW) and our Auxiliaries, I am pleased to offer our support for your amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to eliminate $412 million dollars in incentive pay for the Afghan Security Forces and redirect them in full to American service members for incentive pay.

This reprogramming of funds would not affect Afghan base pay or the payments these individuals receive for food and other subsistence needs. Additionally, the ability of the Afghan Security Forces to recruit and train would not be hindered. Your amendment is limited to incentive pay funds—a fund that DoD has not fully obligated funds from in at least two fiscal years.

This is a prudent measure that wisely balances our fiscal challenges, objectives on the ground, and the absolute responsibly we all share to honor the sacrifices of those who choose to wear the uniform. Thank you for taking the lead on this effort, and for your continued support of our armed forces and veterans.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND C. KELLEY,
Director,
VFW National Legislative Service.

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 do not object to what the gentleman is trying to do. Although, I have to be very honest in that his amendment does not accomplish what he thinks it will accomplish. We are okay to transfer the money, so we are not going to object to the amendment.

The fact is that this is controlled by law, not by appropriations. This is controlled by the National Defense Authorization Act, not by the appropriations bill. So, while I understand what the gentleman wants to do and while I agree with what he wants to do, this won't do it, but I am not going to object to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Jones amendment.

I appreciate the efforts of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to provide the Administration with funds for the Afghan military and police who are being trained to take over security from our troops, but $412 million for additional incentive pay is simply crazy.

For the past two fiscal years, funds for this same account remain unobligated. Not unexpended, Mr. Chair—unobligated.

We need to move that unobligated funding stream along, and then determine how much more is needed in incentives for these Afghan forces. But right now we need to stop putting the money out there before anyone knows what they're doing with it. This is nearly half a billion dollars. And it's going to waste.

The bottom line here is this amendment would not touch the base pay for Afghan military and police. It would not touch funds to provide food and other basic needs for these Afghan troops. It would not touch the funds for recruitment and training.

Instead, under the Jones amendment, funds targeted for Afghan incentive pay would be transferred within the OCO account to augment the combat pay of our junior enlisted servicemen and women who carry out daily patrols.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Jones amendment.

It's good policy. It's a good use of funds. And it's only fair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $870,425,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $1,623,356,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $1,286,783,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the

Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $156,893,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy'', $39,335,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps'', $24,722,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force'', $25,348,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $583,804,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $10,473,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $26,682,437,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $5,880,395,000, of which up to $254,461,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $4,566,340,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $9,136,236,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $7,790,579,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,750,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be 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 Enduring Freedom, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided further*, 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 under this heading 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 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: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE 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 125, lines 17 and 19, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,300,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,300,000,000)''.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. As stated in the report language of the bill, my amendment cuts $1.3 billion that is going specifically to Pakistan.

Pakistan seems to be the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call allies. They have proven to be deceptive and deceitful and a danger to the United States. Here is some of the evidence:

For the last 7 months, Pakistan closed down the southern supply route. The route transported about 40 percent of all NATO supplies into the country and to Afghanistan;

Pakistan still refuses to go after the terrorist sanctuaries in the tribal areas of Pakistan. Terrorist groups like the LET, the Pakistani Taliban, and al Qaeda frequently cross over into Afghanistan, kill our troops and then run back into Pakistan and hide where our troops cannot follow them;

On May 23, 2012, Pakistan sentenced the doctor who helped us get Osama bin Laden to 33 years in prison. I thought getting the world's No. 1 terrorist—the terrorist who killed thousands of Americans—was a good thing, but apparently, Pakistan prosecuted him;

In February 2012, a NATO report confirmed our suspicions: the ISI is aiding the Taliban and other extremist groups in Afghanistan and Pakistan by providing resources, sanctuary, and training;

In June 2011, Pakistan tipped off terrorists making IEDs—not once, but twice—after we told them where the bomb-making factories were and asked Pakistan to go after them;

In 2011, Pakistan tried to cheat the United States by filling out bogus reimbursement claims for allegedly going after militants when they weren't doing that at all.

There is more.

On September 22, 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee: ''With ISI support, Haqqani operatives planned and conducted that truck bomb attack as well as the assault on our Embassy.'' The truck bombing he mentions here wounded more than 70 U.S. and NATO allies and troops. Admiral Mullen went on to say: ''The Haqqani Network acts as a veritable arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency.''

What more do we need to hear? Pakistan doesn't deserve American money. By the end of fiscal year 2011, Pakistan had had a total of $21.5 billion of American money since FY 2002. Mr. Chairman, I ask: Has America received its money's worth? The answer is no.

I want to address a couple of arguments I've heard from the other side:

First, some say that the money in this bill for Pakistan is only to reimburse them for going after terrorists. They say we shouldn't take away that carrot. But, since 2002, Congress has already appropriated over $8 billion to the Coalition Support Fund specifically for Pakistan. Where I come from, if you try something and it doesn't work, you don't continue to do it. We've been doing the same thing for over 10 years. It's time for a new strategy with Pakistan. More money is not going to solve the problem.

Second, they say Pakistan just reopened the southern supply route.

Pakistan closed the southern supply route from November 2011 to this month. Pakistan was a bad ally before it closed the supply route. The fact that they messed us around and closed it for 7 months only adds to the long list of evidence that shows they are no friend of ours. It also shows that we don't need them to win the war in Afghanistan. We were able to pursue our mission in Afghanistan without them. What really endangers our troops is not access to the southern supply route, but the failure to get access to Pakistan's tribal areas where Pakistan gives terrorists a safe haven.

Pakistan is playing America. The only thing Pakistan's military rulers understand is dollars, and as long as we keep the money flowing, they have no incentive to change their evil ways.

Our message should be this: Pakistan has a raging insurgency in their country with al Qaeda, the Pakistan Taliban, and the Haqqani Network. Pakistan can either receive assistance and go after these terrorists with us or don't take any of our money, and we will find our own way to take these terrorists out.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in telling Pakistan they will no longer get American money. We don't need to pay Pakistan to betray us. They will do it for free.

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 agree with everything that Mr. POE said. You cannot have an ally who is an ally today but not an ally tomorrow, and that has been our experience with Pakistan. The Defense Department will tell you that it is very complicated because they do enjoy a nuclear capability that could be dangerous if it got into the wrong hands.

I would ask Mr. POE a question and would yield to him for an answer:

Your amendment is not limited to Pakistan. Your amendment would cut across the board and reduce money for the Kurdish Republic, Jordan, which is one of our most important partners and coalitions in the region; funding for the northern distribution networks; and numerous other coalition partners who are helping in the fight against terrorism.

□ 1900

I wonder if we could talk you into amending your amendment or rewriting your amendment to make it specifically to Pakistan. And let me say this to you before you answer, and then I will yield to you.

In this bill, the money for Pakistan cannot be spent. We have fenced this money—all of it—until the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, certifies to Congress that the government of Pakistan is doing this: cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts, including taking steps to end support for terrorist groups and preventing them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross-border attacks; Pakistan is not supporting terrorist activities against the United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan; Pakistan is not dismantling IED networks and is interdicting precursor chemicals used in making IEDs; preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related materials.

There are four or five more, and I won't take the time. I want to do what you want to do, but I don't want to have an adverse effect on our coalition partners that we rely on so much.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My understanding is, in the report language, to specify a certain country would not be ruled in order; therefore, I used the $1.3 billion with the floor statement that applies only to Pakistan and none of our coalition countries that you have mentioned.

I am open to an amendment that would be ruled in order, and I would be glad to work with the chairman on that amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We would probably have to take a few minutes to do that, which I would be very happy to do because what you want to do is what I want to do.

Mr. Chairman, let me inquire as to where we are in this bill so we can have an opportunity to amend this amendment and still not get beyond the point of reading.

The Acting CHAIR. The reading has progressed to page 127, line 2.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Would the gentleman be willing to do just that, withdraw your amendment now, and let us take a few minutes and guarantee that these coalition partners are not included?

Mr. POE of Texas. Yes, I would certainly be willing to do that.

I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much. This is an important issue.

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 an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $152,387,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALTMIRE

Mr. ALTMIRE. 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 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $5,500,000)''.

Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 129, line 4, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $18,500,000)''.

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will restore $15.5 million that was cut from the Yellow Ribbon program under this bill.

While I understand the tough budget constraints we face, I think we can all agree that programs that provide essential services to the brave men and women who risk their lives to serve our country should not be on the chopping block. Simply put, no one should stand ahead of our Nation's veterans and our men and women in uniform when it comes time to making Federal funding decisions.

Congress established the Yellow Ribbon program in 2008 to provide tailored support to meet the unique needs of the National Guard and Reserve combat veterans and their families before, during, and after their deployments. The services it provides includes suicide prevention, career counseling, access to health care, veteran, and education benefits. Last year alone, the Yellow Ribbon program held over 2,100 events across the country, reaching over 300,000 servicemen and -women and their families.

As the number of returning National Guard and Reserve combat veterans increases, the need for these services increases along with it. My amendment will help to ensure the Yellow Ribbon program is there to meet the increasing need. My amendment simply restores funding for the Yellow Ribbon program to its level from the previous year, fiscal year 2012, paid for by transferring funds from the overseas contingency operations transfer account. The $15.5 million returned to the Yellow Ribbon program represents only one half of 1 percent of this account. While I recognize its importance, I think a small part of the funding can and should be used to help our National Guard and Reserve veterans and their families navigate through the challenges associated with their deployment.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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. The Yellow Ribbon program is a very great program, and the gentleman has made the case very powerfully. I am in support of what he is trying to do. I support the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment, and we gladly support it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $55,924,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $25,477,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $120,618,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $382,448,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $34,500,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated $3,250,000,000 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 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 made available in this paragraph may only be used for programs, projects, or activities categorized as Overseas Contingency Operations in the fiscal year 2013 budget request for the Department of Defense and the justification material and other documentation supporting such request: *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: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'', $375,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense 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, which may require 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 under this heading 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 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 such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

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 130, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $375,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $375,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the continued appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Afghanistan infrastructure fund while our national infrastructure is crumbling here in America.

President Obama has laid out a broad vision for completing our work in Afghanistan, turning security responsibilities over to the Afghan people, and bringing our troops home. Now is the time to focus our resources here in the United States, on our own roads, bridges, schools, and infrastructure.

We have already spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan. As we begin drawing down combat operations in Afghanistan, it's the responsibility of the Afghan people to build, operate, and maintain their own civilian and military institutions, and their own infrastructure.

My amendment, which I offer along with the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), would strike the funding of the Afghanistan infrastructure fund and apply the savings to the spending reduction account.

Established by Congress in the fiscal year 2011 National Defense Authorization, in its first year, the Afghanistan infrastructure fund received an appropriation of $400 million. These funds have been dedicated to projects that are jointly approved by the Department of State and the Department of Defense, and the projects include power generation and transmission, roads, and construction of other large infrastructure projects.

□ 1910

According to the April 2012 report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, from fiscal year 2002 to the end of March, fiscal

year 2012, the United States appropriated approximately $89.4 billion for relief and reconstruction in Afghanistan. Approximately $800 million has been provided thus far for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service indicates from 2012 to 2010, the U.S. Agency for International Development allocated more than $2 billion towards road construction and more than $1.2 billion towards electric power in Afghanistan. While we've spent billions of dollars on infrastructure in Afghanistan, we have also seen reports from the Government Accountability Office and others that have highlighted the challenges in accounting for how reconstruction funds are spent and the overall impact that these are having on the society there.

Yet according to a 2011 report by the American Society of Civil Engineers, the cost of our crumbling infrastructure right here in America is real. By the year 2020, our Nation's crumbling surface transportation infrastructure is slated to cost the United States economy more than 876,000 jobs and suppress the country's growth of gross domestic product by $897 billion.

These costs are only going to increase more and more if we don't take the action to make the much-needed and long-deferred investments in our own transportation systems and our own infrastructure. When we look at the bigger picture, including water and wastewater, energy, schools, ports and more, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimated that over the next 5 years we would need an investment of $2.2 trillion just to bring our Nation's infrastructure to a condition they describe as ''good.''

Every year that we wait to take meaningful steps to do this, the cost to taxpayers and to our economy keeps growing and growing and growing. Over the past 18 months, constituents have expressed to me tremendous frustration that we're devoting so many of our resources and so much of our energy to rebuilding the infrastructure in Afghanistan.

They ask why we are dedicating so much to nation-building halfway around the world when there are so many families right here in our own country who are struggling to find work and make ends meet.

We need to do nation-building right here at home in America. This amendment is a strong step in support of reinvesting in our own economy and our own infrastructure right here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and 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 gets to be a very serious issue if we want to get our troops out of Afghanistan. At numerous hearings, General Allen, who commands in Afghanistan, General Mattis, commander of Central Command, this was their recommendation. This is what they said they needed in order to get us and get our troops out of Afghanistan, which I think we all want to see happen as quickly as possible. Certainly I can tell you that I do.

We did not fund it totally because some of the plans were not sufficiently considered; but, generally, this is what our commanders in the field, those responsible for fighting the fight, those responsible for leading our troops, this is what they tell us they need to get our troops out of Afghanistan. I do object and oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). 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 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 130, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $175,000,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $175,000,000)''.

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

Mr. COHEN. I'm not going to repeat some of the arguments that were made by my colleague from Rhode Island, but I understand them.

There is, indeed, a large need for infrastructure in our country. We're falling far behind, and we've invested a lot of money in Afghanistan that has been wasted; a tremendous amount of money has been wasted. The most recent report I saw said that we cannot even begin to approximate how much money has been stolen and wasted in Afghanistan.

We're not providing infrastructure for the people. We're providing a ruling class, a limited—we talk about the 2 percent here—we're talking about the one-tenth of 1 percent in Afghanistan, if that, and giving them the opportunity to put money in their pocket that should be going to the people.

I ask the gentleman on the other side of the aisle who opposed the last amendment to consider this one, which almost passed last year, same basic amendment. This takes 175 million out, leaves 200 million in the fund, but it says they have got to prioritize, pick their projects and pick what they do.

It doesn't decimate the fund; it just prioritizes and takes 175 million out of the Afghan infrastructure fund. We rebuilt Iraq. They're partners with Iran now. Didn't do us a lot of good.

Most of us have been to Afghanistan or, at least, better yet, many of us have. We could do all the infrastructure in the world. It will go to waste. They can't even maintain it.

They don't have vehicles to use the roads. It's crazy to build them roads to go from point A to point B when they don't have cars. They have got oxen and carts.

So I would say that we reduce it by 175 million, we leave 200 million. Certainly I want our troops out. I went and visited with 124 soldiers, Guardsmen in Memphis, who were going down to Camp Shelby before they go to Afghanistan. I went down to visit with them yesterday when they went off, all police people.

I suspect that one of those people may not come back. I hated the idea that those people were leaving Memphis to go to Afghanistan. It will be the last troops going over.

I want them out. If Mr. YOUNG understands, I guess, there is some magic to this money, there would be $200 million left. If it's roads to get them out and airports to get them out, fine. But I can't believe they need all 375; and I have to submit that I think that a lot of that money is for roads, infrastructure, hospitals, grids, whatever that has nothing to do with our troops getting out. It has something to do with some people who continue a policy that has failed to really build up goodwill toward America or to see that the monies go where they belong.

I ask that we think of America first, we get our troops out, we leave $200 million in the fund. I ask you to approve this amendment and reduce the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by $175 million. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would say to the sponsor of the amendment that this is a more reasonable approach—yes, it is—but this actually cuts the fund in half. Now, that is a major cut on something that our military commanders in the field say that they really need to have.

Now, the committee took a $25 million cut, but that was in agreement with the commanders. They felt that they could absorb that cut and still do the program, but I don't think I can support cutting this program in half.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHEN. I didn't know, in your statement to the gentleman from Rhode Island, why are these funds needed to get our troops out? Do we not have airplanes, roads, boats and whatever to get our folks out?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We are having a little trouble hearing at the table here.

Mr. COHEN. I said, in response to the gentleman from Rhode Island, you have said these funds, all $375 million, were needed to get our troops out of Afghanistan. Are we building, like, runways to get all our troops out, roads to get them out?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I want the troops out of Afghanistan as soon as our military commanders advise us and the President that we can do so and we can do it safely.

I have seen on my weekly visits to the Walter Reed/Bethesda Hospital, I have seen the terrible, terrible tragic cost of this war, and that doesn't even talk about those who have lost their lives.

I don't want to walk through that hospital and see any more quadruple or triple amputees. I don't want to see that, and our military commanders must make that decision. We are not in a position to make that decision of how, when, where do we accomplish this departure from Afghanistan with victory.

□ 1920

And so I still have to express my objection to this amendment because it cuts the fund that our military commanders tell us that they need—cuts it in half. And so I just have to 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. 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.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that was offered by Congressman POE, which I understand may well be reintroduced once the wording is worked on a little bit by the end of this discussion. Let me just then move forward with my support for Judge POE's amendment and the basic concept that he's presented, which is to eliminate funding for Pakistan.

Basically, we need to end the charade once and for all that we are buying Pakistani cooperation against terrorist forces in South Asia. Pakistan isn't with us in the war against terrorism. They are at war with us by supporting and funding the very terrorists that we are up against. Pakistan, at best, is a war profiteer, collecting a ransom by taxing our military supply lines that pass through their country. They are laughing all the way to the bank. They are also laughing as their military intelligence, the ISI, takes huge sums of money that they are getting from us and then passing it on to terrorists and radical Islamist elements who are killing their neighbors and killing American military personnel.

After our SEALs went to get Osama bin Laden, the Pakistan military took the wreckage of our downed stealth helicopter and gave it for study to the Communist Chinese. Then they arrested and imprisoned the Pakistani doctor who risked his life to help us find bin Laden. Dr. Afridi still languishes in a Pakistani dungeon even as we speak here today. Some of us understand that this Pakistani doctor—and I hope we should all understand this—is an American hero. He risked his life to bring justice to the murderers of 3,000 Americans who died on 9/11. It is a shame that we even consider giving Pakistan billions of dollars of aid while they keep Dr. Afridi in a dungeon. Who else will ever cooperate with us in the future? Who's going to work with our military overseas, knowing that that's the way we treat people who commit heroic acts? We shouldn't give the Pakistanis one penny until Dr. Afridi is free.

Just recently, I was contacted by a distraught individual in Pakistan asking for help in locating a missing Baloch leader. Sadly, this Baloch leader is probably already dead—another victim of the Pakistani government's ''kill and dump'' policy by which they repress their own people.

We have to understand we have lost over 2,000 American military personnel in Afghanistan. But who has been supporting the side that has been killing our people? The Pakistanis have inspired and supported these very insurgents. They were the creators of the Taliban. And after 9/11, they played us for fools ever since.

Yesterday, this House passed a bill that Pakistani's Haqqani Network should be listed as a terrorist organization. That terrorist organization has been helped and supplied by some members of the Pakistani military. We should have quit bankrolling this rotten regime a long time ago. We should end the charade.

There are people in South Asia that are our friends. Due to the Cold War, we allied ourselves with Pakistan a long time ago, and we were told they were the bulwark against radical Islam. That was a lie. But during the Cold War, we needed them in the fight against the Soviet Union. The Cold War is over. We should ally ourselves with people who share our values and cherish, as we cherish them, a friendship between free people. As I say, we should go towards India, now that the Cold War is over, to help establish a new type of relationship in South Asia that will preserve the peace and preserve the equilibrium in that part of the world.

It is ridiculous for us to continue to support that country, that government that is the basis of support for the most radical elements of radical Islam and the terrorist units that are killing our people and killing their people throughout the world. If we're having trouble getting out of Pakistan, it's because the Pakistanis are on the wrong side. And we all know it. We shouldn't give one more penny thinking we're going to buy their friendship. They disdain us for it. They think we're weaklings for it.

Let's stand up for Dr. Afridi. Let's stand up and make sure that we are courageous in what we're doing in our policy and not trying to curry favor with gangsters that run a country like Pakistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $5,026,500,000, 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 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 contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein 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 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 such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

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 132, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $22,000,000)''.

Page 141, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. I rise to offer an amendment with my good friend from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) to provide greater funding for suicide prevention outreach for our troops on Active Duty. This amendment would add $10 million for suicide prevention outreach in the Defense Health Program of the Operations and Maintenance Account in title IX of the bill. It would pay for this by transferring $22 million from the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. This amendment is fully paid for, fiscally responsible, and incredibly timely.

This is the most recent issue of Time magazine, reporting that military and veteran suicide is a tragic epidemic that has only gotten worse. We are currently losing one U.S. soldier every day to suicide. I know my colleague, Dr. MCDERMOTT, comes to this issue as an expert in the field. I come as a Vietnam veteran and someone very passionate about providing our heroes with the care and the support they deserve.

In 2007, I wrote the Joshua Omvig Veterans Suicide Prevention Act to honor the memory of a young veteran from Iowa who, tragically, took his life in front of his mother. To make sure veterans have 24/7 access to a crisis hotline and other mental health resources, we passed that bill. Since then, the Veterans Crisis hotline has answered more than 600,000 calls and reportedly made more than 21,000 life-saving rescues. Tragically, we still lose a veteran to suicide every 80 minutes. So we have much more to do.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this issue. You worked tirelessly to combat suicide rates amongst our servicemembers and our veterans. I hope you will join me in supporting this amendment. We are losing too many of our heroes. It's up to us to act.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Washington, Dr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Thank you, Mr. BOSWELL.

Mr. BOSWELL and I saw the Vietnam war in different ways—he, by flying a helicopter and me, by being a psychiatrist dealing with people who came home. And I feel strongly that suicide prevention and the intervention must become, in military speak, a core mission of the military.

This week's Time magazine, as you see from that front page, describes military suicides as an epidemic. I would like to take $10 million out of a $19 billion fund in this amendment to go beyond the funding for existing suicide prevention services and toward modifying the culture that keeps some from seeking help. We must also note that any progress in suicide prevention will be fleeting if we don't focus on reducing the stigma associated with seeking psychological health services among our Active Duty people.

□ 1930

I believe the Pentagon can do more to eradicate barriers to mental health care. This means ensuring that mental health and substance abuse issues are treated as medical issues and are taken out of the realm of personnel matters. This means ensuring that seeking and receiving psychological health care does nothing to jeopardize a soldier's security clearance or prospects in his future career.

I would also urge the Pentagon to ensure that a portion of this money goes toward hiring, development and retention of top-tier psychological health talent for our military at this time. It is the tale of cost of this war that nobody calculates when we go to war. What do we do when the people come home? We forget them. We think they should pull themselves together and go back to their regular life. And many of them can't do it without some help. We need to provide it. They become desperate, figure there's no hope and take their own life. That shouldn't happen to a 24-year-old kid, man or woman, who has been in Afghanistan or Iraq giving to our country what we ask from them. Their willingness to risk the whole business of going to war has to be dealt with when they come home.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOSWELL. I yield back the balance of my time and ask for everyone's support.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I had opposed similar amendments in the past because of the source of the funding, the defense-wide O&M accounts which we just really cannot afford to cut into our readiness accounts. This does not take funding from that account. And so I appreciate the gentleman's changing the source of his amendment, and I'm agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. I just want to thank you again for your attention and your dedication to this cause, Mr. Chairman. I've noticed that for years you and the ranking member have worked together, and you're doing the right thing. Thank you very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. DICKS. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts here and my colleague from Washington State who I know has an abiding concern about this, as I do.

This is a tragedy when more people are dying from suicide than are in combat. I know the Army has tried. General Corelli made an enormous effort to try to find the answers, and it's a serious, difficult problem. And a lot of it relies on trying to deal with these people before they go over so that you can find the ones that are going to be susceptible or have problems going in. It's just a very difficult problem.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $541,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Army'', $49,653,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $15,422,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Army'', $338,493,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army'', $2,005,907,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $146,277,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $22,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $284,450,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Navy'', $98,882,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $943,683,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $305,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $34,350,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force'', $116,203,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $2,785,170,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $217,849,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $14,860,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $60,119,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $53,150,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $107,387,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $293,600,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program'', $993,898,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $469,025,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $1,614,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *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 such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 142, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $120,500,000)''.

Page 153, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $120,500,000)''.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I'm here to offer an amendment to strike $120.5 million in undistributed funds from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, matching the Senate authorizers and keeping intact over $1.7 billion for this program.

The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund—more commonly known as JIEDDO—is responsible for leading, advocating and coordinating the Defense Department's efforts to defeat IEDs. After more than $20 billion, Congress has received numerous reports that JIEDDO has had decidedly mixed outcomes, and after three attempts still has not developed a mechanism for tracking the Pentagon's counter-IED efforts. So we've spent $20 billion.

In the Senate, the Armed Services Committee cut $200 million from JIEDDO. In their report, they said JIEDDO suffered from:

Duplication of effort with the military services, excessive contractor support costs, and organizational inefficiencies.

As The Washington Post recently reported, these excessive contractor support costs included noncompetitive contracts given to former government employees profiting from Washington's perpetual revolving door and hundreds of millions of dollars of contracts being subcontracted out to other former military personnel.

Isn't this what our constituents dislike the most about what's going on here, that there are cronyism activities, that there are revolving doors and that military personnel, after they're retired, become mentors?

□ 1940

This bill also recognizes there's a problem here. The bill itself has actually reduced their budget by $60 million.

The IED threat remains significant, but continuing to robustly invest in counter-IED technology makes less sense, both tactically and strategically.

From a tactical level, Pentagon statistics show that IEDs were 25 percent less effective this year than the year before. Strategically, we are shifting away from ground wars and counterinsurgency missions and must begin reallocating some of these funds to more pressing national security needs.

In February, the GAO told Congress that JIEDDO's poor planning and management resulted in many funds going to duplicative projects, creating waste and likely slowing down the ability of the Department of Defense to meet its mission objectives. For example, in 2008, U.S. Central Command began development for a directed energy solution to defeating IEDs. Without coordination, JIEDDO undertook six different efforts to tackle the problem, which cost taxpayers at least $104 million.

When the commander of U.S. Central Command still didn't have a solution by August 2011, he had to write JIEDDO to urge them to coordinate their efforts in hopes of getting something he could field to fulfill what was then a 3-year-old unmet requirement for the warfighter. JIEDDO coordinated the effort of the six projects but deferred making a decision on shifting resources or canceling the project yet again. The organization also admitted that they likely would not have been able to execute their mission to manage the Pentagon's IED efforts in this case without the commander's written protest.

Some soldiers in the field have also expressed disappointment at JIEDDO's results. A marine that served in Afghanistan in 2009 compared the IED-detecting devices issued by JIEDDO to a beachcomber's faulty metal detector and said his IED jammers were frequently broken. Others report that dogs remain more reliable detectors downrange.

It's time to stop signing a blank check for an organization that cannot track its projects or expenditures, that often gives contracts to its cronies, and that the GAO has said is duplicative.

As we draw down in Afghanistan and look to cut funds from much more productive and efficient parts of the Federal budget, I urge you to support these cuts of an inefficient organization that lacks the management controls to prevent taxpayer dollars from being wasted.

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 Joint IED Defeat fund recognizes the fact that we're still a nation at war. The young men and women who come back from war—and God forbid, some come back having paid the ultimate sacrifice, but many come back with unbelievable wounds, double amputees, loss of different limbs. This joint IED task force has done a lot to minimize that possibility.

The committee did recognize, and as the gentlewoman mentions, we did reduce spending in this fund by $70 million. But we're a nation at war. They still have a critical mission. It's important that the work that they continue to do to defeat sometimes the simplest IEDs and sometimes the most complex IEDs continue. It's an investment that we need to make to make sure that, as we finish our job in Afghanistan, that we do our level best to protect our troops, those that are volunteering there, and to bring them back home in one piece.

So we oppose the gentlewoman's 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. SPEIER).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the ''Office of the Inspector General'', $10,766,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

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 fiscal year 2013.

(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, 2013.

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 $250,000,000 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 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. None of the funds provided for the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'' (ASFF) may be obligated prior to the approval of a financial and activity plan by the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC) of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That the AROC must approve the requirement and acquisition plan for any service requirements in excess of $50,000,000 annually and any non-standard equipment requirements in excess of $100,000,000 using ASFF: *Provided further*, That the AROC must approve all projects and the execution plan under the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' (AIF) and any project in excess of $5,000,000 from the Commanders Emergency Response Program (CERP): *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that the AROC has convened and approved a process for ensuring compliance with the requirements in the preceding provisos and accompanying report language for the ASFF, AIF, and CERP.

SEC. 9010. 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. 9011. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to $88,000,000 of funds made available in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' may be obligated and expended for purposes of the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out strategic business and economic assistance activities in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom: *Provided*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section for any project with a total anticipated cost of $5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for each proposed project.

SEC. 9012. From funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' up to $508,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support United States Government transition activities in Iraq by funding the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and facilities renovation and construction: *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.

(AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9013. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9014. 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: *Provided*, That such amounts are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985:

''Retroactive Stop Loss Special Pay Program, 2009/20XX'', $79,900,000; and

''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, 2012/20XX'', $500,000,000.

SEC. 9015. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide'' for payments under Section 1233 of Public Law 110–181 for reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan may be made available unless the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Pakistan is—

(1) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries;

(2) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan;

(3) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs;

(4) preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise;

(5) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(6) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

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.

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, from the Clerk's reading, we've reached the limitations portion of the bill, and we would encourage Members having amendments for us to consider in that arena, or portion, this would be the appropriate time for them to come forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1950

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share the concern of seven Members of this House that represent Army depots and arsenals, including Letterkenny Army Depot in my congressional district in Pennsylvania.

The following letter fully addresses our concerns:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2012.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense, Washington, DC.

Hon. NORM DICKS,
Ranking Member, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG AND RANKING MEMBER DICKS: As Members with Army Depots and Arsenals in our districts, we wish to express our concern over significant funding reductions in this year's House Defense Appropriations Bill that will negatively impact the Army's organic industrial base. The Fiscal Year 2013 Defense Appropriations Bill, Sec. 8087 cites ''excessive levels of funding carryover at Army Depots'' and reduces ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' (OMA) by $1.207 billion and ''Other Procurement, Army'' (OPA) by $1.253 billion. This reduction of approximately $2.5 billion will have harmful consequences far beyond what was originally forecasted and will derail the Army's ability to maintain equipment readiness. Ultimately, we believe this legislation as it currently stands will cripple the ability of depots and arsenals to support our soldiers during a time of war. We understand the competing priorities facing the committee, but we believe it is vital that we work together with you to address this critical issue.

This reduction of funds will not only hurt the ability of Army depots and arsenals to generate and maintain its workload for the next Fiscal Year, but will also have lasting impacts on the defense industrial base that will be felt well beyond 2013. The cuts to OMA and OPA will cause an estimated 3,000 layoffs of specialized technicians that cannot be easily replaced or retrained if workload returns to its normal rate. Core depot logistics requirements will be increasingly difficult and costly to meet and the Department of the Army will be forced to turn to contracted alternatives in order to reduce the backlog. This cut will make the organic base less attractive for program managers and will likely reverse the recent trend of depots and arsenals being the preferred source of manufacture and repair.

It is our understanding that the Army did not provide a detailed explanation for excessive levels of carryover money until after the Appropriations Committee passed this year's Defense Bill. Once the Army provided this analysis, it became clear to all parties involved that the House Appropriations Committee's proposed funding levels would not provide adequate funding to sustain depots and arsenals throughout Fiscal Year 2013. As we approach the debate over the Defense Appropriations Bill on the House floor, it is still unclear to us what possible measures will be taken, if any, to reduce the impact of these cuts.

We look forward to further discussing this issue with you and working with you on any potential adjustments that can be made before this legislation is considered by the House of Representatives. We believe that a strong organic industrial base is critical to maintaining our national security posture and the current Defense Appropriations Bill will result in unrecoverable consequences for our Army depots and arsenals.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER.
DAVID LOEBSACK.
BLAKE FARENTHOLD.
MIKE ROGERS (AL).
RALPH HALL.
ROBERT SCHILLING.

This bill includes reductions in funding for depots and arsenals due to a perceived surplus of funded workload available for previous fiscal years. After further analysis and additional feedback provided by the Army, we believe these cuts, as currently structured, could have a lasting negative impact on the organic industrial base.

It is my understanding that the House Appropriations Committee agrees that these current general provisions should be modified and is already developing an alternative plan.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I look forward to working with the chairman to address these concerns and to ensure we provide adequate funding for depots and arsenals. I know we are both in favor of a strong and capable organic industrial base and value the critical role our depots and arsenals play in maintaining the readiness of our military.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Our depots, arsenals, and their workforce are critical to our national security and ability to rapidly equip our soldiers. For example, in 2003, the Rock Island Arsenal produced 500 Humvee add-on armor kits to protect our troops within 3 months of receiving the order.

We must strengthen our arsenals and depots so that they are able to continue to produce the equipment that is vitally needed by our men and women in uniform. I am strongly concerned that the effects of the bill's reductions will be felt beyond 2013 and across the organic industrial base, and I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with us. I look forward to closely collaborating with him in support of our arsenals and depots, and I appreciate this time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

And the gentleman from Texas, who's not here on the floor, I'd like to talk a little bit about his situation down at the Corpus Christi Army Depot, which is an industry leader of repair and overhaul for our aviation helicopters, employing over 6,000 civilians, of which 56 percent are veterans. Without CCAD, the Army would be unable to sustain maximum combat power for the warfighter.

Further, the depot in Corpus Christi's stewardship of taxpayer dollars is evident in the cost effective repair and overhaul of rotary wing aircraft systems. For example, in fiscal year 2011, a record production year, more than $47 million in cost savings was documented at the CCAD.

With today's rotary wing aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems flying in record numbers, the work at Corpus Christi Army Depot has become invaluable to the aircraft to remain airworthy. I am concerned that any lapse in production of the UH–60 Black Hawk Recap, CCAD's larger single program, would have a negative impact on supporting components programs and major OEM contracts and employers.

I know that the gentleman from Texas looks forward to working work with the chairman—as do I and other Members of the House that represent depots and arsenals—and the House Appropriations Committee as this bill moves forward to conference.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlemen for their comments, and we share in their support of a strong organic industrial base and a strong, ready military.

We are pleased to work closely with members of the army depot and arsenal delegation throughout the conference proceedings to ensure their concerns are fully addressed and the necessary adjustments to depot and arsenal funding are made.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $181,000,000.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, our Nation's transportation infrastructure is in terrible, terrible disrepair. More than ever, we need to be pumping resources into transportation projects and into initiatives for that end.

We need to upgrade and modernize our roads and highways, but we also need to build up mass transit systems, buses, rail lines, et cetera. Doing so improves lives in our communities, allowing people to move around more freely and easily, and it also creates jobs. And by reducing our dependency on automobile travel, this transportation is clean, energy-efficient, and environmentally sensitive, as well.

Luckily, we have a Federal agency, the Federal Transit Administration, or FTA, that exists to make exactly these investments. I'm proud to say that my home district has benefited from FTA grants to the tune of $11 million over the last year. A new commuter train, the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit, or SMART train, that connects the major cities in my district is just one of the local projects that is putting FTA money to good use.

So, at a moment when our transportation needs are so great across the country, wouldn't it make sense to increase the FTA budget? Except that the House, expressing the priorities of its Republican majority, recently passed a fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill that cut $181 million from current FTA spending levels. And at the same time, they're now presenting us with a Department of Defense spending bill that calls for $1.1 billion more in military spending over current levels.

Why are we all being asked to tighten our belts while the military industrial complex gets to loosen theirs by a few notches year after year after year?

If the Federal budget crisis is so dire, Mr. Chairman, so dire that we can pinch pennies on badly needed transit infrastructure, surely we can do the same with a bloated Pentagon budget that has been growing out of control for more than a decade now. And that's the simple concept behind my amendment.

In the interest of fairness and shared sacrifice, I'm proposing a $181 million cut to the Defense appropriations bill identical to the reduction in FTA spending passed by the House a few weeks ago. I trust that all my Republican colleagues, each one more fiscally responsible than the next, will jump at this chance to further cut Federal 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, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. I'm the first to admit that defense should not be immune to reasonable, analytically-based reductions, which are what we've already done over the past few years.

Just 2 years ago, when Congress considered the fiscal year 2011 defense budget, the Department was planning on a fiscal year 2013 budget of roughly $562 billion. Their actual request for 2013, however, was only $516 billion, $46 billion less.

□ 2000

In fact, in the past two fiscal years, our committee has produced a defense budget which totaled $39 billion below the request.

My point is that we have cut defense, but we have done so reasonably and without impacting readiness or threatening the Department's ability to protect our Nation and our allies. This fiscal year 2013 budget is the first we've seen in which there are identifiable and significant risks associated with the budget decisions we've made.

We've talked about that a lot today, about our pivot towards the Asia Pacific, the growing capability of China, things on the North Korean peninsula, for example, in cutting ships and in reducing the required Navy ship fleet size, in retiring large numbers of aircraft, some of which have been delivered, and in significantly underfunding facility maintenance and modernization. We have tried to mitigate these as best we could within our given allocation. Speaking of our allocation, it is essentially in line with both the Ryan budget as well as with the Defense authorization bill, both of which passed the House.

Finally, in just the CBO's most recent analysis of the Department's future-years' defense program, they determined that the Department's plans will cost $123 billion more than they projected over the next 5 years. National security, of course, should never be subjected to partisan politics. Instead, we should show our support for our brave men and women, who have sacrificed so much and who continue to do so on our behalf.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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. MARKEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate or maintain more than 300 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we would like a copy of the amendment, please.

I reserve a point of order until we have had a chance to look it over.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Our current nuclear arsenal has significant overkill that is built into it. Our country continues to spend more and more taxpayer money on nuclear weapons even though the President and the Senate have already agreed to reduce the number of deployed nuclear weapons, and even though there is a growing bipartisan consensus that the United States has an excessive number of nuclear weapons and that the United States spends far more than it needs to for a nuclear deterrent and defense.

That is why I rise today to offer my amendment: to reduce the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic nuclear missiles from 450 to 300.

I believe that this is the soundest approach to both our national security and our economic security needs. Each of our land-based nuclear missiles costs us—and this is an incredible number—$2.4 million every year to operate and to maintain. My amendment would save the taxpayers about $360 million next year and every year after that.

It's not just arms control groups that support this departure from Cold War thinking. It also includes General James Cartwright, who until last year was the commander of the United States' nuclear forces. General Cartwright published a report in May that concluded that zero intercontinental ballistic missiles are necessary for our nuclear deterrent or defense. The former commander of U.S. nuclear forces doesn't think we need ICBMs at all.

So reducing the number from 450 to 300 still leaves more than enough missiles for an effective nuclear deterrent. That's still more than enough missiles to annihilate any of our enemies over and over. It not only will turn our enemies into rubble, but it will make that rubble bounce and bounce and bounce again. That's how many nuclear weapons we would still have in reserve.

That is a real savings, and that savings can be used for the NIH budget. The entire budget to find the cure for Alzheimer's—5 million Americans have it—is $450 million a year. If we would just cut out these ICBMs—and that leaves plenty left over—it would give us enough money to almost double the budget to find a cure for something that really is going to kill Americans, that really does terrify them in their homes.

So I pray that the House will accept this amendment and send us in the correct direction in which we should be heading in terms of really protecting the American public.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to compliment the gentleman on listening to what we discussed in the last go-around and then taking a hard look at land-based ICBMs, which I believe have always been the most vulnerable part of the triad. The most invulnerable part, of course, is our ballistic missile submarine—and bombers are second—but the land-based ICBMs are vulnerable. There is no question about that, and I do believe we can reduce the amount of money we are spending on strategic forces. I think the focus should be, as General Cartwright has suggested, on reducing the ICBMs.

So this is a way to start this debate, and I am going to support the gentleman's amendment today.

Mr. MARKEY. I just want to note here that the gentleman from Washington State did pioneering work in the 1980s in identifying the vulnerability of the land-based ICBM fleet. That discussion continues even today out here on the House floor.

Mr. DICKS. I recall—and you might remember—that we had a great discussion about synergism, about the synergy of the three legs of the triad giving some protection to the land-based missiles.

I agree with the gentleman's overall premise that we don't need as many nuclear weapons. I can remember John Lehman—famous for his 600-ship Navy—always saying to me, if you want to cut something, cut the submarines, and go ahead with the aircraft carriers and more airplanes because they're conventional weapons and, therefore, more usable.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's point of order is withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, normally the committee is given the courtesy of seeing amendments that come to the floor. This is the third time today, I believe, the gentleman from Massachusetts has shown a lack of courtesy in letting the committee have copies of his amendments.

Let me say, as a Nation, we still believe in a nuclear deterrent. The last time I checked, there was bipartisan support for that. Both Mr. VISCLOSKY and I serve on the Energy and Water Subcommittee, and part of our jurisdiction is to make sure that the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, verifies that we have nuclear capabilities. The last time I checked, the administration was conducting what we call a Nuclear Posture Review relative to what our position should be in negotiations with other nuclear powers in terms of the type of weapons that are so critical to the nuclear triad.

So, with all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who referred to a lot of what we said as the

fantasy land of our bill, it would be good, actually, for the Members of Congress to have some facts from the Nuclear Posture Review before we consider something here which might put our Nation at risk.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

□ 2010

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $293,900,000.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, whenever we debate the Defense appropriations bill, I feel like I'm living in an alternative universe, because the other 51 weeks of the year all I hear from my Republican colleagues is that the sky is falling and we have to rein in a deficit that is wildly out of control. When it comes to the military budget, that rhetoric is nowhere to be heard and my friends in the majority become the biggest spenders of all. If cutting spending is a matter of such great urgency, then I believe the Pentagon, which has been generously funded over the years, can pitch in its share.

Why do the programs that Americans depend on for basic needs have to take the budget hit? For example, under the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, the title X program is not just trimmed but completely zeroed out. For more than 40 years, title X has been a lifesaving source of family planning services and preventive health care for millions and millions of low-income women. PAP tests, breast exams, early detection of cervical cancer—uninsured women depend on title X in order to receive these vital services at clinics nationwide. The proposed elimination of funding would be devastating to these women and to their families.

It's critical to point out, Mr. Chairman, by law, not a single penny of title X money is used to perform an abortion. If, however, you want to reduce unintended pregnancies, as the other side says it does, then there is no more effective program than title X.

Title X was signed into law by President Nixon and has historically enjoyed broad bipartisan support, at least until the Republican Congress decided to launch a war on women. Now they want to eliminate funding for the program completely. We spent just under $294 million on title X last fiscal year. To put things in perspective, Mr. Chairman, that's less than what we spend on any given day to continue a failed military occupation of Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, if we're going to ask poor women to give up all the benefits they receive from title X, then I think we can ask the Pentagon to give up the exact same amount: $293 million. It's just so big, it makes my head spin. If we did that, we would be saving the misguided elimination of title X. That's what my amendment does, because I believe women need to access lifesaving health care at least as much as the military needs another $293 million. In fact, if my Republican colleagues truly believe that the Federal deficit represents a moral crisis demanding sacrifice from everyone, then I'm confident they're going to support my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how many times that I have said this on this floor and in the committee and to anyone that would listen: You cannot make your decisions on national defense based on politics. You can't make your decision based on national defense just on a number. And this number, by the way, on this similar amendment, has changed. Where is the commitment?

The policies and the investment in our national defense must be based on the real threat to our own security, to the security of the United States, to the security of our troops, and to the security of our allies and our interests, whatever they might be. Stop and think. The threat has not diminished. The threat has not gone away.

Did anybody happen to watch Iran's exercises last week where they fired short-range missiles, medium-range missiles, and long-range missiles? Iran is moving to make itself a strong military capability nation. That is a threat. Their commentaries about the United States and to the United States, that's a threat. We have got to be careful.

China is expanding its military, expanding its technology, and expanding its work in cyber. The threat is growing, and so this is not the time to reduce our capability, to reduce our readiness, to reduce our training, to reduce in preparing our troops for whatever is required to defend the Nation that we love so much.

This amendment just can't go, and I strongly ask Members to oppose this amendment and the message that it would send around the world that we don't care about the threat. We do care about the threat, and we are aware of the threat, and we know what it could mean to us.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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. LOBIONDO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate an unmanned aircraft system except in accordance with the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, the Fourth Amendment is unequivocal that ''the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches, shall not be violated.'' I'm a firm believer in this. I'm also a firm believer in article I, section 8 of the Constitution that Congress shall have the right to provide for the common defense of the United States. Therefore, I offer my amendment to ensure that no funding will be used to operate unmanned aerial systems, except those operations that are in accordance with the Fourth Amendment.

We need to make sure our citizens explicitly understand that while funding for these platforms is critical for our Nation's intelligence activities, these normal operations will not conflict with our constitutional protections against unreasonable searches.

This language would ensure that there is no misperception about the Department's use of these technologies, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LOBIONDO. With that, Mr. Chairman, 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. LOBIONDO).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2020

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract for UH–60 Leak Proof Drip Pans using procedures other than competitive procedures (as defined in section 2302(2) of title 10, United States Code).

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLAKE. This bill would prohibit the use of funds in the bill to enter into a contract with a company for leakproof drip pans unless the contract is awarded using competitive procedures as defined by statute.

A recent article by The New York Times highlights the story of a sole-source contract being awarded to a for-profit company to produce leak pans used in Black Hawk helicopters operated by the U.S. Army. These pans, according to The New York Times, cost $17,000 apiece, and in the last 3 years the Army has purchased $6.5 million of them.

An Army spokesman is quoted in the article, saying, ''Congress mandated a leakproof transmission drip pan,'' and that the contract was awarded without competitive bids.

I think that we can all agree that any contract administered by the Army or any other Federal agency should be awarded based on competitive procedures, which are already codified in statute.

While there are no line items for these pans included in the bill before us or the accompanying report, the Times reports that the Army has indicated that it ''might get more pans if financing is approved.''

The Department of Defense is already in the process of slashing its budget. They are learning to do more with less as Americans all over the country have had to do in the past several years. If a competitor exists who will produce these pans for less than $17,000 apiece, we ought to make sure that they compete for the project.

The amendment before us now would not prohibit the procurement of these pans even if it is determined that there is one company that can supply the Army with them—now, if there is only one company—but it would ensure that any purchase of these pans is done in a manner consistent with competitive procedures, putting to rest any notion that Congress has mandated sole-source contracts for private companies. This is a good governance, commonsense amendment.

I urge my colleagues to adopt it, and I look forward, if there is any objection—I think it's a good government amendment, but I would love to be able—I can't reserve my time, but I would like to have a dialogue if somebody has an issue with this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. So what you are saying is you have got to have a competitive procedure.

Mr. FLAKE. That's correct.

Mr. DICKS. This is, I think, what we tried to do a few years ago on defense-related—with private companies is to have a competitive procedure, which I agree with. I think the gentleman is right on this. I appreciate his amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. It has been a long-standing practice put in place by appropriations legislation years ago that the contracts for these pans must be awarded under a competitive process. In fact, the FY 2010 DOD appropriations bill required that the contract be competitive, and every year the Army holds an open competition where it asks all qualified companies to place a bid.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the amendment is necessary, but I do agree with what it does, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman, and I know that we have made efforts in the past to make sure that these are all competitively bid.

The reason I am bringing this amendment is that the Army stated in this case that this contract was not competitively bid. We just want to make sure, and that's why I appreciate the gentleman accepting the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We do understand that the law does exist that requires it, so we're with you.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. (a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any account of the Department of Defense (other than accounts excluded by subsection (b)) in excess of the amount made available for such account for fiscal year 2008, unless the financial statements of the Department for fiscal year 2013 are validated as ready for audit within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ACCOUNTS EXCLUDED.—The following accounts are excluded from the prohibition in subsection (a):

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

(c) VALIDATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''validation'', with respect to the auditability of financial statements, means a determination, following an examination, that the financial statements comply with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable laws and regulations and reflect reliable internal controls.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) with respect to a component or program of the Department if the President certifies that applying the subsection to that component or program would harm national security or members of the Armed Forces who are in combat.

Ms. LEE of California (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. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlelady's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I join with my esteemed colleague, Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois, in offering an amendment which hits really at the heart of the issue of fiscal responsibility.

My amendment is short and to the point. If enacted, it would freeze Department of Defense programs at fiscal year 2008 levels unless the financial statements of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 are validated as ready for audit within 6 months of enactment of this act.

This amendment would exempt military personnel, Reserve and National Guard personnel accounts, as well as the Defense Health Program accounts from this potential funding freeze. It also contains a waiver for any potential harm to national security or combat forces.

Now, some of my colleagues may make the argument that the Department of Defense is making progress on this issue in response to congressional engagement. They might reference language in recent Defense authorization bills requiring DOD to develop and implement plans to achieve audit readiness by September 30, 2017.

But let me just say, Mr. Chairman, this is wholly unacceptable that we are still just developing plans for the Department of Defense to have much its fiscal house in order 5 years from now. This problem is not newly discovered and further delay is really an abandonment of our congressional duty, given the enormous and increasing proportion of Federal dollars going towards the defense budget. In the 1990s, Congress was promised that these financial deficiencies would be solved by 1997. This timeline then was delayed to 2007 in the early 2000s. Given the Pentagon's past failures to meet deadlines, why should we believe the 2017 timeline will be honored?

Nearly 60 cents of every Federal discretionary dollar now goes towards defense spending, and by the Pentagon's own admission, they cannot properly account for how the money is spent.

Can you imagine? We have nonprofit organizations that get shut down behind a few thousand dollars in unaccountable funds.

There is no doubt that these circumstances have contributed to instances of waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon, including more than $300 billion in major weapons cost overruns identified by the Government Accountability Office.

It's time to finally do away with the culture of unlimited spending and no accountability at the Pentagon. Being strong on defense does not mean handing a free pass to irresponsible spending. I believe it's critical that the Department of Defense be not only prepared and validated as ready for an audit, but actually pass an audit.

Today I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and take a first step toward compelling the Department of Defense to act with urgency on this matter. The financial reforms necessary to abide by basic accounting standards, laws, and regulations at the Department of Defense cannot wait.

I deeply regret that my colleagues would invoke a point of order on an issue of such vital importance to Congress' charge to conduct responsible oversight on Federal expenditures. I wish that the Pentagon would be held to the same standards as nonprofit organizations and those in business and other entities responsible for responsibly spending Federal dollars.

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 grants new authority.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes a new duty on the Secretary to validate certain data as ready for audit. 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.

□ 2030

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. This amendment directs that none of the funds made available in this act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure, or BRAC, round. During the House Armed Services Committee markup of H.R. 4310 on May 9, a similar amendment passed with overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 44–18, with 14 of 27 Democrats voting in favor of a similar amendment.

On February 27, 2012, I joined 41 fellow Members of Congress in signing a bipartisan letter to President Obama expressing our concerns over his administration's announcement of the intent to request two new rounds of BRACs. Six House Armed Services Subcommittee chairmen signed this letter also.

The 2005 BRAC is estimated to cost $36 billion, and the taxpayers will not realize that net savings until 2018, at the earliest. Congress has robustly funded the military construction accounts over the past 3 years to accommodate the growing Army and Marine Corps. Proposed new rounds of military base closures by the President will require additional expenses in a time of military spending reductions. More BRAC rounds will cost more than it saves in the near-term and negate the value of deficit reduction. More BRAC rounds will cost billions of dollars and thousands of jobs.

According to the GAO in a study that was concluded in March 2012, DOD's fiscal year 2012 budget submission to Congress on BRAC 2005 shows that costs to implement the BRAC recommendations grew from $21 billion originally estimated by the BRAC Commission in 2005 dollars to about $35.1 billion in current dollars, an increase of about $14.1 billion, or 67 percent. In constant 2005 dollars, costs increased to $32.2 billion, an increase of 53 percent.

In 2005, the Commission estimated net annual recurring savings of $4.2 billion and a 20-year net present value savings by 2025 of $36 billion. GAO's analysis shows annual recurring savings are now about $3.8 billion, a decrease of 9.5 percent, while the 20-year net present value savings are now about $9.9 billion, a decrease of 73 percent. As such, DOD will not recoup its up-front costs until at least 2018.

Implementation of the 2005 BRAC round was officially completed on September 15, 2011. This took 6 years to fully execute. Strategically, as we draw down from over 10 years of combat operations in the Middle East and shift our focus to balancing the Middle East threat with the emerging security issues and presence of forces in the Asia-Pacific, additional rounds of BRAC at this time cannot be justified. After 10 years of war and a substantial 2005 BRAC round, we now have a well-trained, battle-hardened, combat-tested, efficient, streamlined all-volunteer force that is now more joint than ever. This is simply not the time for an additional BRAC round.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. WITTMAN. He is right on. And I just want to emphasize how strongly I agree with what he has to say, and I strongly support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by $1,700,000,000.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, the Republican majority passed their budget blueprint which, unbelievably, called for the complete elimination, over 10 years' time, of funding for the Social Services Block Grant. This program is designed to help people in desperate straits, people who have fallen on hard times, people who need a hand up from their government in their hour of need. But the majority said, Sorry, we can't afford that.

The country, they say, just can't afford day care for children and adults, special services for people with disabilities, substance abuse assistance, low-income housing, home-delivered meals, employment services, and other support that people need when they have fallen on hard times and what people need when they're working very hard to become self-sufficient. That kind of compassion is too expensive, apparently.

But this week, when we're deciding how much to spend on our war machines and our Department of Defense bureaucracy, the sky is the limit. Money is no object. Well, those aren't the values I was taught. That's not the kind of country I want to live in.

The Pentagon has received more than its fair share of taxpayer dollars over the years. And, frankly, they haven't always been the most careful stewards of the people's money. They haven't always had the best accountability and oversight. They haven't always delivered the best bang for the buck, Mr. Chairman.

Recent polling indicates that Americans overwhelmingly want defense cuts, but instead we've got a defense spending bill that is larger than last year's and larger than what the President requested. I say it's time that the Pentagon contribute its fair share. My amendment calls for a $1.7 billion cut to Defense appropriations—an amount equal to the cut we have asked of the Social Services Block Grant program for next year.

If you believe that human dignity and basic compassion are more important than throwing money at wasteful weapons, then I hope that you will support my 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 want to compliment the gentlelady. She is certainly determined. This is the third or fourth amendment on the same subject, just by changing the numbers. I'm not going to make the same arguments about the threat and about the need to defend our country. Again, you have heard that many, many times. But it is serious. It is serious.

The numbers keep changing. I don't know why they keep changing, but the fact that they keep changing indicates to me that there's not really a real determination here on the number. But there is a determination on my side and from my viewpoint and, that is, the threat cannot be ignored, the threat is growing, and this is not a good amendment and I ask that our Members oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. 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.

□ 2040

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:

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

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided in title IX of this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' and the amount under that heading for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military and other support by $650,000,000, respectively.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the Chair.

I thank the chairman, and his staff especially, for working with me on this amendment, which I would like to associate my previous remarks in a previous amendment on Pakistan to this amendment. Basically the intent is to cut half of the money that goes to Pakistan under title IX in this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman for working with us. As we discussed earlier during our debate, we would work together to find a solution that would be acceptable. You have done that, I congratulate you, and I support your amendment.

Mr. POE of Texas. 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 amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with Chairman YOUNG.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, as you well know, 40-millimeter cartridges provide sustained coverage for our ground troops and have played a significant role in providing protection for our troops in Afghanistan. They are produced in a joint effort between the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, which I represent, and facilities in Florida, Wisconsin, and several other States.

In Iowa, 75 employees work on a state-of-the-art production line to load, assemble, and pack the 40-millimeter ammunition. This state-of-the-art equipment allows this work to be done safely, at a high-quality rate, and in a cost-effective way for the taxpayers and the Army.

The Army's budget request included 40-millimeter funding levels that are considered the minimum level necessary to sustain our capability and the highly skilled workforce needed to produce them. A reduction in funding could result in a break in work that would result in lost capabilities, lost jobs, and delays and quality concerns when the line is restarted.

Mr. Chairman, I know we share a commitment to maintaining the workforce, capabilities, and lines that produce the 40-millimeter ammunition, and I very much appreciate your and Ranking Member DICKS' work with me over the last several weeks. I look forward to continuing to work with you to address this matter going forward so that we can ensure the final 2013 defense bill supports the 40-millimeter ammunition workforce and supply chain.

I thank you for the cooperation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his work on this important issue.

The gentleman is correct. Our Nation's ability to produce the 40-millimeter ammunition is a critical readiness issue. I am very proud of the work that is done in Florida and other States to support production of this ammunition. This is a matter of importance to the readiness of the Army, and the readiness of all of our Armed Forces is a matter of top priority to me and it is a matter of great importance to both of our districts.

I'm committed to ensuring that the funding necessary for production of 40-millimeter ammunition in 2013 is available and that the supply chain and workforce associated with the 40-millimeter ammunition remains strong.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Iowa to ensure that the final bill reflects that priority.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BILBRAY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove any portion of the Mount Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It just says you will not use Federal funds to tear down the war memorial on Mount Soledad. It is very simple. It is basically a war memorial that was originally built in honor of the veterans of Korea.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a young teenager, a young child, I still remember as my father and I drove up the coast from San Diego, he would point up at this memorial and say that is the only war memorial to Korea. At the time, I believed him. As far as I know, at that time, it was. Since then, the war memorial has been surrounded by over 3,000 plaques; many show the Star of David, many show crescents, and many show crosses. But there are those that have taken offense to the fact that this war memorial happened to be a cross, the universal sign of memorial.

All I have to say is that if we don't support this amendment not to tear down this one memorial, then I ask this body to be serious about the fact that in the United States, we have over 4 million crosses as memorials in this country. We have over 455,000 emblems that may be interpreted any way you want. We have 40,000 Stars of David as memorials on veteran property. In fact, in Normandy, England, Mexico City, and Panama, we have 130,000 crosses or other symbols that might be projected as being religious.

Sadly, what we've got going on in San Diego is those who claim, in the name of religious tolerance, to want to destroy war memorials if anyone takes offense to this. All this says is we're not going to tear down the 4 million crosses on our veterans' memorials across this country and we're not going to tear down or use any funds from this budget to tear down the war memorial that stands on top of Mount Soledad at La Jolla, San Diego, California. It's very simple and very clear.

I hope that my colleagues can say, in the spirit of tolerance, no one means to go out and be so intolerant as to tear down war memorials just because somebody may claim that it may have a religious connotation. God knows we don't want to start tearing down those 4 million crosses that exist today or those thousands of Stars of David that proudly sit today on veterans' and Federal property.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We are happy to support your amendment.

Mr. BILBRAY. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the minority's consideration.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), appropriations made in title IX of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $20,843,869,000.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to the following accounts in title IX:

(1) ''Defense Health Program''.

(2) ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense''.

(3) ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund''.

(4) ''Office of the Inspector General''.

Ms. LEE of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, once again, is very straightforward. It reduces the overseas contingency operations account, which is currently funded at $85 billion, by $21 billion.

□ 2050

That leaves $64 billion in reserves, more than enough funds for the safe and swift withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan.

This amendment allows Congress the opportunity to stand squarely with the war-weary American people who want to bring our troops home. It is clear that the American people have been far ahead of Congress in supporting an end to the war in Afghanistan. The call has been growing across this land to bring this war to an end, and it is past time for the Congress to answer that call here today.

I want to thank all of the cosponsors of this bipartisan amendment and all of my colleagues who have worked on this issue throughout the year and supported my legislation, H.R. 780, to responsibly end the war in Afghanistan.

Our brave troops have done everything that was asked of them and more. Asking our troops to remain in Afghanistan for another 2 years when there is no indication that circumstances on the ground will change is unconscionable.

As we send our men and women in uniform back into danger on multiple tours, they are bearing an overwhelming and unfair burden of sacrifice while so many of us go on with our daily lives. An alarming number of troops are coming back home with post-traumatic stress disorder, suicide cases are rampant, and sadly, each day we continue to hear more and more about our veterans and the terrible toll this has taken on their lives.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of this war are unacceptable, particularly when we ask what the added benefit is of keeping our troops in Afghanistan through 2014. The war in Afghanistan has already taken the lives of over 2,000 soldiers, injured tens of thousands more, and drained our treasury of over $500 billion. And those costs will only go up as we spend trillions of dollars on long-term care for our veterans, which of course we must and we should do.

Instead of spending over $85 billion in Afghanistan this next year, we should restrict funding to the safe and responsible withdrawal of all of our troops and use the tens of billions of dollars in savings right here at home, investing in jobs and education and health care and mental health care.

The situation on the ground in Afghanistan, whether we leave in 2013, 2014, or 2020, whether 100 more United States troops die or 1,000, let me just say, not an extra dollar should be spent extending the decade-long war in Afghanistan. We have the power of the purse strings in this House. For those who believe that enough is enough, they should vote for this amendment.

As the daughter of a military veteran, I know firsthand the sacrifices and the commitment involved with defending our Nation. But the truth is that our troops have been put in an impossible situation; there is no military solution. It's past time to end the war and bring our troops home. And quite frankly, it is time to use these tax dollars from ending the war to create jobs here at home and economic security for the American people. It's time to rebuild America, and also to provide for health care and, of course, as I said earlier, the economic security of our troops.

Today, once again, we have the opportunity to stand with 7 out of 10 Americans who oppose the war in Afghanistan. The American people have made it clear that the war is no longer worth fighting. And I'll say it again, not an extra day, not an extra dollar should be spent extending the decade-long war in Afghanistan.

I knew 10 years ago that this would be a war without end. I could not support it then. More Members of Congress are beginning to see that this was a blank check to wage war forever unless we end it now. So after 11 years, yes, we should bring our troops home. We can do that responsibly by voting ''yes'' on the Lee amendment today.

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, in working with the administration, the Department of Defense, and our commanders in the field in Afghanistan, we have come to a proper amount to be funded for this purpose. It's already included in this bill. I think to change the formula now from one that has been agreed upon by the administration, the Defense Department, and the commanders in the field who have the responsibility for operating this entire Afghan operation, I just oppose this amendment. I think it's the wrong thing to do.

It's very balanced. It's agreed to by the parties that have the responsibility. I just hope the Members will vote ''no.''

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'm proud to cosponsor the amendment offered by my friend from California.

If approved, this amendment would accomplish two goals: One, to end this war, and two, to save the taxpayers $21 billion, something I think both sides of the aisle could agree on.

Let's be clear about what this amendment really does. It fully funds a safe and responsible redeployment of our troops from Afghanistan. It's not cut and run; it's funding redeployment.

The Afghan people do not want us there. The American people don't want us there. Yet, we are spending $10 billion a month for a decade-long war that's failing to advance our national security objectives.

Why would we want to continue down this road, especially at such a great cost in blood and treasure? More than 2,000 servicemembers have been killed, and $548 billion in taxpayer money has been spent.

This amendment provides sufficient funding to ensure that every man and woman in uniform leaves Afghanistan safely. At that point, we can look away from defense spending to a national security policy based on the other two Ds: diplomacy and development. We can turn away from military force and toward SMART Security, an agenda that keeps America safe by alleviating human need and investing in human capital in Afghanistan and around the developing world.

Since 2004, Mr. Chairman, I have come to the House floor 437 times during Special Orders to call for an end to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Since I am retiring at the end of this term, this will be my last debate and last vote on defense spending. I hope it can be my legacy and yours to finally reorder our national security priorities and put an end to the war in Afghanistan. We owe it to the next generation, and we owe it to Americans in Afghanistan, together.

Let's bring our troops home in a safe and responsible way. Let's vote ''yes'' on Congresswoman LEE's 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 of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer the wage-rate requirements of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, with respect to any project or program funded by this Act.

Mr. KING of Iowa (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 gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. DICKS. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue reading.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is the Davis-Bacon limitation amendment that I believe most Members of this Congress have seen that applies to this appropriations bill.

We have an existing code called the Davis-Bacon Act. What it does is it requires that any construction projects that have Federal dollars in them—$2,000 or more—be constructed under what the bill says are prevailing wages. While prevailing wages in 1931 might have been a legitimate evaluation, today, it's a federally mandated union scale determined by a formerly smoke-filled room of people from the administrative side and the construction side of the industry.

I've spent my life in the construction business. I've been involved in the construction business since 1970, and I've worked on all sides of this that I can imagine. I've been a recipient of Davis-Bacon wages; I've paid Davis-Bacon wages; and I've done a fair amount of reporting of those wages into the bureaucrats.

This law is the last remaining Jim Crow law in the U.S. Code. It was written to protect union workers in New York City from the southern African Americans who were brought up to do a Federal building in that city back during the Depression.

□ 2100

And in 1931 there was a Senator James Davis of Pennsylvania and Representative Robert Bacon of New York, Long Island, who, I might add, decided that they wanted to protect the unions in that locale, and so they brought this legislation to Congress and passed it. It has long been union scale, not prevailing wage. And, yes, merit shop employers have an opportunity to introduce those wages that they actually pay, the earned wages they actually pay; but, in the end, it's a formerly smoke-filled room, people deciding it doesn't cost us anything, if it raises our bottom line, we all put our add of our margin on top of that. So we'd kind of like to be able to outcompete the rest of the industry for the opportunity to hire the workers that will receive the highest pay.

This is irresponsible on the part of a Congress that now we're finding ourselves nearly $16 trillion in national debt. We have a budget crunch like we've never seen. We've seen a President that's driven this national debt up about $1.33 trillion just in the last budget that the President offered. And we're looking at taxpayers that have had enough.

We need a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. We don't need irresponsible spending. We don't need wage protectionism.

By the way, Senator Davis and Representative Bacon were both Republicans. They were two of the more misguided Republicans in the history of this country, and I regret that I, as an Iowan, have to stand here and inform this body that it was Iowa President Herbert Hoover that signed the bill on March 3, 1931.

I'm pledged to undo this, to repeal Davis-Bacon in the end, because we believe in competition. We're a free and fair competition country that believes in free markets.

I have listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts in the past who has said that anytime that you have two consenting adults that are conducting any activity that doesn't hurt anyone else, they should be able to do so without Federal interference. If that's the case, tell me why I can't climb in the seat of my son's excavator and say, ''Just pay me 10 bucks an hour, Dave. That's enough. I need the therapy to get away from this insanity of this overspending government that we have here in this Congress.''

So I urge the adoption of this wage limitation so that we can build five bases, not four; five barracks, not four; five military hospitals, not four. We can do five of everything instead of four if we just let competition set the wages.

The quality will be there. The gentleman's about to tell you that it's not. I will tell you, if I spend my life in this, we meet specifications. The high quality of the work is there.

The other side of that's just an argument for union wage protectionism. We need to protect the taxpayers.

And the unions are fine. If they want to organize, I encourage them doing so. But they need to do so without Federal protection. Compete in the competitive world on low bid like the rest of us, where you have to meet the specifications and the quality of work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. The House has spoken on this issue repeatedly. There's been a very substantial majority in favor of retaining Davis-Bacon and opposing the gentleman's amendment.

Some Members continue to try to repeal Davis-Bacon, despite the House record of supporting the protection on labor standards. I have been a longtime supporter of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements. It helps ensure that local projects provide local jobs with affordable middle class wages.

The law protects the government from contractors trying to win Federal contracts by bidding too low to attract competent workers. And we have seen time and time again where you have prevailing wages. The State of Washington has its own prevailing wage standard in our State; and we find that on these projects, you get better work and the work is done at a higher quality.

So, again, I oppose this amendment. And as I said, we have had several votes on this this year, and every time it's been defeated. I hope that we can again defeat the King amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the recognition and would want to join with the ranking member, Mr. DICKS, in my strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

We had a similar debate during the consideration of the Energy and Water bill. And one observation I would make is we do have a disparity in this country, and it continues to grow, despite how hard the average American works.

The problem today for that average American is that for 1 hour's worth of work—it could be pushing paper, it could be waiting tables at a diner, it could be working at a steel mill, it could be laying brick, it could be a contractor, it could be a manager, it could be a CEO—is less for 1 hour's worth of human labor in the United States today than it was in 1977 when I came to Washington, D.C. on a congressional staff. That is not the country my parents left me.

I think it is wrong to offer an amendment to further suppress the wages hardworking Americans are trying to earn to make sure that they can buy a house, they can send their children to what are increasingly expensive public institutions because of the lack of State support for them, and who now hold retirement programs that are probably about 40 percent less in value than they were in 2007.

This is a bad amendment, and I strongly oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just say that I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Some Members here continue to try to repeal Davis-Bacon, despite the House being on record supporting the protection of labor standards.

All of us, or at least the majority of us, have been in support of prevailing wage requirements. It helps to ensure that local projects that provide local jobs have these jobs that have affordable, middle class wages with benefits. The law protects government from contractors trying to win Federal contracts by bidding too low to attract competent workers.

This amendment should be opposed. If we really want people to move toward achieving middle class standards, if we want to keep the middle class with good jobs, good-paying jobs with benefits, then there is no way we should repeal Davis-Bacon.

People are losing the American Dream quite quickly here in our own country, unfortunately. And here we go again trying to erode one of the basic protections of working men and women.

So I hope we oppose this amendment, maintain standards of prevailing wage for our workers, and ensure that they too have the opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

The first amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

The first amendment by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

An amendment by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

The second amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

The first amendment by Ms. WOOLSEY of California.

The second amendment by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

The second amendment by Ms. WOOLSEY of California.

The third amendment by Ms. WOOLSEY of California.

The second amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) 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 166, noes 250, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—166

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Campbell
Cantor
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Coffman (CO)
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Courtney
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keating
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Olver
Paul
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Sutton
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waxman
Webster
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Young (IN)

NOES—250

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Capuano

Carson (IN)
Carter
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stark
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Becerra
Boren
Cardoza
Conyers
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers
Welch

(2135)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Messrs. RANGEL and BACHUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Messrs. DOGGETT and SCHIFF changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LUETKEMEYER, WEBSTER, WALDEN, PRICE of North Carolina, SCHWEIKERT, COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. PELOSI, Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, RYAN of Wisconsin, YOUNG of Indiana, KEATING, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, GARRETT, HURT, GOODLATTE and ISRAEL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 472, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The 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 202, noes 216, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—202

Ackerman
Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garrett
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rehberg
Reichert
Ribble
Richmond
Roby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Waxman
Webster
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey

NOES—216

Adams
Aderholt
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Holden
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mack
Manzullo
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Scalise
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stutzman
Sullivan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Akin
Bachmann
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2140

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 473, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) 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 60, noes 359, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

AYES—60

Amash
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Campbell
Carson (IN)
Conyers
Cooper
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kucinich
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lowey
Lummis
Markey
McClintock
McCollum
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Napolitano
Paul
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ribble
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Speier
Stark
Tipton
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden

NOES—359

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2145

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 474, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 273, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—145

Altmire
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanna
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Serrano
Sherman
Sires

Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—273

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
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)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers
Sullivan

□ 2149

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 475, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 282, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

AYES—137

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Biggert
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Cravaack
DeFazio
Denham
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Speier
Stearns
Stutzman
Terry
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—282

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2154

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 476, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 268, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—150

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—268

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Visclosky
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2158

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 477, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—186

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner (OH)
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—233

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
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, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2201

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 478, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—228

Ackerman
Adams
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—191

Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Pompeo
Quayle
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

□ 2206

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 479, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 270, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—149

Ackerman
Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
DeFazio
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hurt
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Landry
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lummis
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Ross (FL)
Royal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—270

Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2209

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 480, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 302, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—114

Amash
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Buchanan
Campbell
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kucinich
Labrador
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Royal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—302

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
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
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchey
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Akin
Boren
Braley (IA)
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers
Turner (NY)
Visclosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2213

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 481, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 136, noes 283, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—136

Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—283

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 2216

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 482, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 106, noes 311, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

AYES—106

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kucinich
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—311

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
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
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
McCaul
Polis
Reyes
Rokita
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 483, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 483 on H.R. 5856, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the third amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 91, noes 328, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

AYES—91

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones
Keating
Kucinich
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Peters
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—328

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 484, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 312, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

AYES—107

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—312

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

□ 2225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 485, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 235, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

AYES—182

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—235

Ackerman
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck
Heinrich
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hultgren
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Akin
Boren
Cardoza
Filner
Hahn
Hirono
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Polis
Reyes
Sewell
Stivers

□ 2229

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 486, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5856) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 131

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 131.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 17 and today on account of funerals in the district.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 205. An act to amend the Act titled "An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases", approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.