United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2013 No. 106

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TAX REFORM AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the groundwork that is being carefully laid by Senate Finance Chair BAUCUS and Ways and Means Committee Chair CAMP. It's absolutely essential that we reform a tax code that is hopelessly complex, unfair, and often counterproductive. The system is reaching the point of breakdown. The complex patchwork is difficult to administer, invites tax engineering, if not outright evasion, and is hugely expensive for those who are just trying to meet their obligations.

Through mistake and evasion, we lose approximately $365 billion of revenue each year that should be paid to the Treasury—$1 billion a day—and the estimated cost of compliance is $168 billion. With simplification and careful enforcement, we could easily gain tens of billions of dollars of revenue and allow individual taxpayers and businesses to shift resources away from compliance and tax engineering to growing the economy and providing for our families.

While we all may disagree with some fundamentals, it would be a mistake to begin with our areas of disagreement. I commend the chairmen for working to build common understanding on a path forward.

There is one area that has not been part of the tax reform discussion but is every bit as critical as solving our budget deficit, and that's to deal with our infrastructure deficit. Every day brings more stories of a Nation slowly falling apart and falling behind other nations that are modernizing their infrastructure, like Japan, China, India, and the European Union, all of whom spend more of their economy on infrastructure than does the United States.

Last week's potential water emergency in Prince George's County underscores a point made by my friend, Representative DON YOUNG from Alaska: we leak more water than we drink; 1.9 trillion gallons of water is lost due to inadequate infrastructure underground. It is water, sewer, the electrical grid, transit, roads and bridges—the American Society of Civil Engineers has estimated we need to spend $2.3 trillion in the next 5 years just to maintain basic standards.

Transportation reauthorization finance is under the committee's jurisdiction, and it's fast approaching, with a highway trust fund unable to meet even current inadequate requirements. This resource gap prevented us from being able to enact a full 6-year reauthorization last Congress, hence, we're facing it again next year.

In the 20 years since the gas tax was last increased, the purchasing power of the fund has eroded dramatically due to inflation and increased fuel economy, so that the average motorist is only paying about half as much per mile as they did in 1993.

The failure to meet the revenue needs has required increased borrowing from the general fund, adding $55 billion to the deficit just to meet the current inadequate levels. At the same time, we've seen a collapse in the construction industry, costing hundreds of thousands of family wage jobs and slowing our economic recovery.

Resources have become increasingly inadequate to meet basic transportation needs, but at the same time the consensus among key road users in support of an increase has grown ever stronger.

A vast coalition has emerged in support of raising the fuel tax, which includes business, the professions, organized labor, nongovernmental organizations, the truckers, transit, and cyclists. The list of supporters is as long as it is varied.

Allowing an inflationary increase for the highway trust fund was part of the Clinton deficit reduction plan back when we had balanced budgets. More recently, it was included in the recommendation of the chairs of the President's deficit reduction committee, Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles. Making infrastructure a part of the larger tax reform proposal will meet a critical and growing need for our economy. It will help satisfy the concerns of those who were insisting on more revenue, but do so in a manner that's supported by a broad, diverse, and powerful coalition of interests.

We all have a stake in funding to rebuild and renew America. It's not just the quickest way to put people back to work but also to make our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure. And it just might be the smoothest path to tax reform as well.

SIXTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, with only six legislative days left before the Congress departs for August recess, I am increasingly concerned that we will not learn the answers to any of the questions I have raised over the past week before the one year anniversary of the attack on Benghazi, if ever. This is due, in large part, to the secretive nature of the investigation to date. Most of the key hearings into what happened that night in Benghazi have happened behind closed doors and in classified settings, including a June hearing with General Carter Ham, who was the head of the U.S. Forces in Africa the night of the attack.

That is why I was surprised to hear comments made by General Ham at the Aspen Security Forum last week where he spoke freely about the U.S. response to the attack.

Does it bother any of my colleagues that General Ham can publicly speak about the military's response at a forum in Aspen, Colorado, where the tickets were $1,200? The American people should not have to pay $1,200, and yet, his testimony before Congress was behind closed doors.

According to a CNN report, General Ham told the Aspen audience that by the time an American drone arrived above the U.S. consulate ''the attack on the mission was winding down.'' By that time Ham knew Ambassador Stevens was missing and believed he could have been possibly kidnapped.

General Ham was then quoted as saying:

> In my mind, at that point we were no longer in a response to an attack. We were in a recovery. And, frankly, I thought we were in a potential hostage rescue situation.

The article continued:

> Ham said although he had authority to scramble a jet to the scene, he decided there was ''not necessity and there was not a clear purpose in doing so.''
>
> ''To do what?'' Ham asked. ''It was a very, very uncertain situation.''

It was a very uncertain situation, indeed.

Uncertain as to whether the terrorists held our ambassador as hostage? Uncertain as to whether the terrorists would target the annex, as they did? Uncertain as to whether this situation would last hours, days, weeks, or months? Or years?

Which raises the question: If his command required no additional authority to respond to what he then believed to be a hostage rescue situation, why did it take another 7 hours before AFRICOM ordered a C–17 aircraft in Germany to deploy to Libya to evacuate Americans? And why did that plane not leave Germany for another 8 hours after that?

If the situation appeared to be deteriorating throughout the night at the annex, why wasn't there any additional effort to accelerate air support or even planes to evacuate American personnel directly from Benghazi?

And given the betrayal of our supposed allied Libyan militia forces when calls to defend the consulate went unheeded, why would the Pentagon not move even faster to ensure there was a reliable evacuation and hostage response force to assist the Americans in Benghazi?

And given that no American plane arrived in Benghazi to support the evacuation, just what planes were used to evacuate the Americans on the morning of September 12?

The State Department's Accountability Review Board said two planes were used to transport Americans from Benghazi to Tripoli. We know that one was a Libyan Air Force C–130 that brought back the bodies of Ambassador Stevens, Sean Smith, Ty Woods, and Glen Doherty. But the first to depart was a private chartered jet that took off at 7:40 a.m. with evacuees, including all wounded personnel, according to an unclassified version of the report. But just who owned that jet? Was it the same jet that brought in the seven-person response team from Tripoli earlier that night? Was it really chartered or was it commandeered? How many wounded were evacuated on that jet? Of the wounded, how many were State Department employees, CIA employees, or security contractors?

The ARB said when the first plane arrived in Tripoli, wounded personnel were transferred to a local hospital, in exemplary coordination that helped save the lives of two severely injured Americans.

Despite my letter I sent to Secretary Kerry, I have never received a full accounting of how many Americans were injured in the attack. Are any of the wounded still receiving care in military hospitals or other medical facilities? Will we ever officially learn their names and the heroic actions that night that resulted in their serious injuries?

I think we can all agree that it would be constructive for those that were in the chain of command that night to publicly testify and answer these questions.

The American people are losing confidence in their government. How will history judge the actions or inaction of the Obama administration and the response of the Congress to the Benghazi attack?

BURDENING FUTURE GENERATIONS WITH DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, CBO's May report shows the deficit has dropped another $220 billion. The Federal deficit continues to fall faster now than it has since post-World War II demobilization in the late forties and early fifties.

Earlier this month, OMB released its mid-session review that estimates deficits will be reduced to below 3 percent of GDP by 2017, and will continue to fall, reaching 2 percent by 2023. This recent good news hasn't eliminated the need to address our long-term fiscal crisis, but it has created some breathing space for us to renew our investments in America.

We're now 5 years removed from the financial crisis, and have yet to demonstrate an ability to balance competing needs between the long-term deficit reduction need and investments in the future that made America great. House Republicans have been obsessed by the debt, but struggle to recognize any need for investment in education, R&D, and infrastructure.

A few weeks ago, Larry Summers best summarized our predicament when he said:

> Just as you burden future generations when you accumulate debt, you also burden future generations when you defer maintenance.

Given the current market, we're refusing to maintain our infrastructure at a time when investors are literally throwing money at us. To be clear, yields on the 5-, 7-, and 10-year Treasuries have been negative for the past 2 years. This past month, we've witnessed a rate jump as markets fret about QE3, yet real Treasury yields still remain below 1 percent. When accounting for inflation, rates have not been this low for many, many decades.

Republicans look the other way when it comes to this question, and I'm shocked that my colleagues who persistently say we ought to run the government like a business have so little interest in taking advantage of one of our generation's great opportunities in financing investment for the future. This is a far cry from the party of Lincoln that invested in the Homestead Act, invested in the Transcontinental Railroad, or Eisenhower's interstate highway system.

Unfortunately, Congress continues to fiddle while Rome burns. Two months ago, the I–5 bridge collapsed in the State of Washington. It was a miracle nobody died considering that 71,000 vehicles a day use that critical connection, the main route connecting Seattle to British Columbia.

□ 1015

According to the U.S. Federal Highway Administration, my own State of Virginia has 3,500, nearly one in four

bridges, that are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; and we're not unique in America.

In addition, many of the country's water mains and pipes are more than 100 years old. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates it will take $298 billion over the next 20 years to fix this situation. Otherwise, many Americans are going to get wastewater when they turn on their faucets.

More than 100,000 residents of the National Capital region learned this the hard way just a week ago when, because of lack of infrastructure, lack of infrastructure maintenance, they almost went without water.

Our choices not to invest in maintaining the critical infrastructure and the backbone of our economy is putting America at a competitive disadvantage in the next century. The Panama Canal, for example, its expansion will be completed in 2015, radically altering global trade capacity throughout the world. Yet the east coast will have only four ports capable of receiving the new post-Panamax ships.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reports these new ships will make up 62 percent of total container ship capacity in the world by 2030. Right now, China and Korea not only surpass the United States in this capacity; they lead in terms of container traffic as well. This didn't happen by accident. They invested.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that leaving our grandchildren with unsustainable debt is irresponsible. But what are they to think when they look back and realize we left them with a Nation of potholes, contaminated water, and crumbling bridges?

Our global competitors aren't waiting around for things to pick up here in America. They're actively investing in infrastructure to gain ground in the hopes of overtaking us in global competition. The Chinese spend billions on ports, rail, and highways; and they're not alone.

It's time to turn our attention back to the seemingly unglamorous, but critical, business of fixing America's infrastructure—our roads, our ports, our airports, our bridges and our water systems—to ensure for future generations America stays strong.

THE SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue that, unfortunately, hasn't gotten as much attention lately as it should.

I'm a veteran of Iraq and Afghanistan, spent most of my time in Iraq; but I remember I was in a nation outside of Afghanistan getting ready to fly an airplane one day, this was back in the mid-2000s, and, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader from the other Chamber basically got on television and said, the war in Iraq is lost. He said, it's lost, it's done, it's over. I remember that because I was on a treadmill getting ready to go fly a mission into Afghanistan when I heard that.

The interesting thing about that is, I guarantee you, our enemy in Iraq probably cheered loudly at the moment they saw the majority leader from the Senate say those words.

We know that something very courageous happened. The President of the United States at the time said, not only is the war not lost, we're sending more troops and we're going to win this thing, and we did. We saw the enemy realize that America could never be defeated on the battlefield, it could only be defeated by its will, and President Bush sent a very strong and loud message that America's will will not be defeated.

This is a situation we face in Afghanistan today. Look, as a Member of Congress, as a politician, the easiest thing for me to do is to stand up here and say the war in Afghanistan is lost and we need to just go home.

And I tell you, you look at the polling, and with the lack of a President leading this country on the public opinion side of what we're doing in Afghanistan, I'd probably get a lot of people sending Facebook messages and emails saying, go get 'em; it's time to leave Afghanistan.

But you know what? If I did that, I wouldn't be able to look at myself in the mirror and say that I did the right thing, because the right thing is generations of people that have lived under oppression and have lived for years under the Taliban regime. They stood up. They kicked the Taliban out of their nation, and they've looked at the United States and said, it took you decades at your inception to get your democracy right. Help us get our democracy right.

What's at stake here?

I look over here at this picture, and I see a couple of things. I see, number one, a girl by the name of Bibi; and if you could look closely at that picture, you would see that she does not have a nose or ears. They were actually cut off by the Taliban. They were cut off by swift justice because somebody in her family committed a crime, sold her into marriage at the age of 14 years old.

And at 15 years old she left her abusive husband, went to her uncle's house, who turned his back on her, and eventually she was captured and apprehended by the Taliban, as they forced her family to cut her nose and ears off as justice for running away from a terrible situation.

She eventually escaped and went to an American forward operating base and was saved. And then you see in this other picture, as she lives in the United States, she has a prosthetic nose today and is living as close to a normal life as possible, despite the trauma that she suffered.

On the bottom down here, you'll see a number of girls in school right now, learning and being educated. You know, before we went into Afghanistan, there was something like 800,000 people in school. Today it's over 6 million.

In fact, did you know that 60 percent of the Afghan population is under the age of 20?

And there's this movement in Afghanistan called the Civil Society in which they stand up and say it's time for freedom and it's time to take our country back.

Are you also aware, Mr. Speaker, that every province is now under control of Afghanistan, and the United States has reverted to a training mission and a counterterrorism mission. These are all huge victories for the Afghan people that we ought to be celebrating.

But, instead, I wake up the other day and I look in the paper, and the President of the United States, the leader of the free world, is saying we are exploring an option after 2014 to take all troops out of Afghanistan.

Now, let me ask you a question: Do you think that made the Taliban frightened, or do you think they cheered when they saw the President of the United States say, I'm considering all troops gone after 2014?

The whole year of 2014 was pulled out of the hat for political reasons. When you say that we're surging in Afghanistan, but as the last troop goes in, the first troop's coming out from the surge, it's not very effective.

You know, the Taliban have a saying, actually, that says, America may have the watches, but we have the time.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of a clear victory in Afghanistan for the Afghan people. The biggest mistake we can make today is to let politics come into play and to withdraw and leave zero troops after 2014. In 50 years, history will judge us for that.

SUPPORT GLASS-STEAGALL AND A RETURN TO A SOUND BANKING SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in 1999, Congress, sadly, repealed the Glass-Steagall Act. That law had protected our Nation for over seven decades against wild speculation by Wall Street investment houses and financial giants.

When the floodgates were removed between prudent banking and speculative abandon, again, Wall Street gambled with the money of the American consumers. Look where it took us, into the worst recession since the Great Depression, into a world where we've had the largest transfer in American history of wealth from Main Street to Wall Street; and the flood continues.

Now, your savings deposits and certificates of deposits earn almost no interest. Guess who's making money off your money?

In commemoration of the 80th anniversary of enactment of the Glass-Steagall Act, Congress must adopt the Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2013, H.R. 129. I invite all Members to cosponsor our bipartisan bill to reinstall the floodgates that protected the public from Wall Street greed.

The Glass-Steagall Act, or Banking Act of 1933, was signed into law during the Great Depression in an effort to restore order and stability to the banking system. Representative Henry Steagall and Senator Carter Glass wrote the law and, through its passage, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created. The law prevented commercial banks from trading securities with deposits from their clients.

After its repeal in 1999, the Wall Street banks, true to form, again created false money with abandon. They used that false money to purchase more mortgage-backed securities, which were packaged into collateralized debt obligations.

Most Americans couldn't even define what these instruments were, but Wall Street giants ended up fleecing them by gobbling up an average of 20 percent of the value of their home equity.

Lack of regulation allowed Wall Street to gorge themselves past sustainable ratios. They manipulated consumer mutual funds and pension accounts of American workers, thus ensuring that Americans were on the hook for when the housing bubble burst.

Sandy Weill, who helped invent these mad practices, as the former chairman and CEO of Citigroup, in a major reversal, stated on CNBC, in support of restoring Glass-Steagall, ''What we should probably do,'' he said, ''is go and split up the investment banking from regular banking, have banks be deposit takers, have banks do something that's not going to risk taxpayer dollars.''

Boy, I wish he'd thought about that before he did it.

Wall Street turned our strong banking system into a haven for speculators. They threw caution to the wind, displacing prudence with greed. These money men gained massive profits for the bank. By and large, the American public was unaware of their backroom dealing. But Wall Street took hard-earned Americans' dollars to gamble on complex and risky instruments like derivatives, and then filled the gap with the lost equity of the American people's homes.

We now see enormous accumulation of banking assets and vast financial power in a handful of powerful institutions like JPMorgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, BlackRock. They are making enormous profits, larger than ever, as a result of the American people having bailed them out. Indeed, they are yielding the highest profits in our Nation, in addition to the oil companies.

Fifteen years ago, the assets of these six largest banks were approximately 17 percent of gross domestic product. Today, estimates for their assets are over half of GDP. So six institutions control an enormous and growing percentage of our banking system and economy. And in turn, our Nation's future is placed at their doorstep.

This is too much power in too few hands. The American people are feeling it in the restriction of credit, the sluggishness of the housing market and its depreciated values, the lack of interest paid on savings deposits and certificates of deposits, in the economy's sluggish growth, and the lack of competitive capital opportunities. In effect, the American people are subsidizing them.

In 2012, JPMorgan Chase reported record net revenue of $21.3 billion, compared to the $19 billion they made in the previous year. For the third consecutive year, the banking giant recorded a record net income.

Total revenue for JPMorgan Chase in 2012 was nearly $100 billion. That would fully fund the Department of Transportation, NASA, the National Science Foundation, and even bail out Detroit.

Yes, let's look at Detroit. This weekend we saw the city of Detroit file for bankruptcy. The news stories report Detroit is $18 billion short, about a third of it in its pension funds.

Well, look at what the financial crisis took from the citizens of Michigan, over $180 billion, 10 times more than the debt that the city of Detroit is juggling, $180 billion in lost property value in Michigan alone.

Who should pay Detroiters in Michigan back for what was taken from them? And what was taken is the value of the value of their property. Now there's a math problem for you.

I would say to my colleagues, please join us in sponsorship of H.R. 129. Let's put prudence back into banking, and keep the speculators out.

NATURAL GAS REGULATED AT THE STATE LEVEL IS WORKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, the Washington Times reported, and I quote:

> The leading Federal research effort into the controversial drilling method known as fracking has turned up no evidence so far linking the process to water contamination, a connection continually drawn by many environmentalist critics, along with some Democrats in Congress.

The report continues, stating:

> The Department of Energy research being conducted at a Marcellus shale natural gas well in western Pennsylvania thus far has shown that chemicals used in the hydraulic fracturing practice have stayed thousands of feet below drinking water supplies.

Additionally, in April, a determination made by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection found that fracking is not to blame for high methane levels in drinking water in communities in northern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the United States oil and gas producers would pay an additional $345 million a year, or an average of $96,913 per well, under the United States Bureau of Land Management's amended proposed Federal onshore hydraulic fracturing regulations.

According to the report, the amended proposal's estimated cost still exceeds the $100 million threshold requiring an economic assessment by the Bureau of Land Management.

Now, while changes the Department of the Interior made following comments from producers, environmental organizations and other stakeholders included elimination of the requirement to regulate well maintenance, much more consideration must be given to these burdensome regulations.

□ 1030

Local scientists and regulators know the geology where natural gas extraction occurs. They know the industry. They know how to balance good science and manage the industry's expansion—without thwarting innovation, growth, and affordable, reliable energy. Local economies, including many in my district, are booming due to the natural gas industry. The model that is making this possible is based on stringent regulations at the State level, not the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, later this week, the bipartisan Congressional Natural Gas Caucus will convene a field hearing, entitled, ''The Economic Impacts of Shale Production.'' This will be done at Penn College in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. The caucus will receive testimony from local officials and community leaders concerning the economic impacts of natural gas production.

We must promote best practices, sound science, and do our very best as communities to manage this rapid growth and promote this industry that is offering prosperity to so many Americans.

DEFENDING FREEDOM WITH PURSE STRINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this has been a summer of alarming revelations that suggest that our government is drifting far from the principles of individual liberty and constitutionally limited government that defined the American founding and that produced the most free and prosperous Republic in the history of mankind.

These developments include:

The use of the IRS and other government agencies to single out ordinary Americans because of their political beliefs, with the apparent intent to discourage and intimidate them out of participating in the public policy debate;

The use of the Department of Justice to target reporters who were asking embarrassing questions of the administration, in one case, with the threat of prosecution under the Espionage Act;

The warrantless seizure of the private records of millions of Americans by the National Security Agency;

The increasingly menacing militarization of domestic police agencies;

The shakedown of health care providers to fund advocacy and promotion of ObamaCare;

Frequent assertions by the President of authority to nullify laws that he deems objectionable or inconvenient, despite his clear constitutional mandate to see that the laws are faithfully executed;

The executive's usurpation of the legislative powers of Congress by using the regulatory bureaucracies to impose laws that the elected Congress has specifically refused to enact;

Continued suggestions that the executive may order military operations against other governments without provocation and without congressional authorization.

This week, we are beginning to learn details of the so-called Federal Data Hub, including an excellent article by John Fund of the National Review. According to Fund:

> The Department of Health and Human Services is about to hire an army of ''patient navigators'' to inform Americans about the subsidized insurance promised by ObamaCare and assist them in enrolling. These organizers will be guided by the new Federal Data Hub, which will give them access to reams of personal information compiled by Federal agencies, ranging from the IRS to the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are slowly beginning to realize the threat to individual freedom, personal privacy, and fundamental constitutional principles that these developments pose. Some very bright constitutional lines have been crossed. And my constituents keep asking: What is Congress going to do?

The House has taken the first steps to restore our constitutional checks and balances by focusing its investigatory attention on the unfolding IRS scandal. It is of critical importance that the facts of the case be fully laid out, those responsible identified and removed from positions of trust or authority, and safeguards enacted to ensure that this sort of abuse never happens again.

The House Rules Committee took an important step yesterday by allowing amendments to the Defense Appropriations Act to stop the warrantless seizure of Americans' phone and Internet records by the NSA and to reassert the essential principle with respect to Syria that Congress alone has the prerogative to declare war.

The House is in a position to resist many of these abuses and usurpations through its power to appropriate, but it has often been reluctant to fully assert that authority. The conventional wisdom is that the appropriations process will shortly stall and a continuing resolution will be agreed to. That would be a tragic mistake if it leads to the continued funding of these increasingly unconstitutional and authoritarian measures.

All appropriations must start in the House, which means that a simple majority of this body by itself could arrest many of these disturbing developments simply by marshalling the courage and determination to just say ''no'' by pulling the purse strings shut. If we fail to do so, I believe that we are allowing our Nation to drift dangerously toward a constitutional crisis with grave implications to the rule of law and to the survival of American liberty.

HONORING HABERSHAM ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come from the Ninth District of Georgia, where it's a pleasure to go back there to see the mountains and the rural nature of our district and also the many businesses that make up its economic engine, from agriculture to industries. They are the backbone of the Ninth District.

This morning, I rise to honor one of those backbones of our economic development, Habersham EMC, as it approaches an important milestone. This week, they mark the 75th anniversary of providing clean, reliable, affordable energy to homes and businesses in northeast Georgia.

The Habersham EMC serves Hall, Lumpkin, White, Stephens, and Rabun Counties, as well as its namesake, Habersham County. Habersham EMC is a member-owned cooperative that provides power to more than 33,000 members and maintains approximately 3,700 miles of line.

I had the pleasure of stopping by the Habersham EMC a few months ago to speak with the leadership of this great organization. Todd Pealock, his staff, and the board of directors are wonderful examples of servant leadership that provides an invaluable service to their community.

While I'm sorry to miss the 75th anniversary celebration, I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all the Habersham employees and members. I hope the next 75 years will bring even more innovation and continued success in providing the affordable energy needed to fuel our economy.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Shane Alexander, Northcrest Church of Christ, Mexia, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Your name in all the Earth. When we consider Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, who are we that You are mindful of us? What is this country that it might know Your blessings?

Yet You have blessed this land and this government for the people and by the people.

For these Representatives who exercise the people's will, may they be also representatives of Your will. May they speak their consciences and convictions and stand up for what they and their constituents believe.

But give them courage also to speak truth to power and to seek justice for the victims of violence, oppression, and poverty.

Please bless the proceedings of this legislative body today, that through them Your will might be exercised here on Earth as it is in Heaven.

May Your unfailing love be with us, Lord, now and forevermore.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TITUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. SHANE ALEXANDER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States House of Representatives

is honored today to have Dr. Shane Alexander of Mexia, Texas, as the Guest Chaplain. Dr. Alexander is the minister of the North Crest Church of Christ in Mexia, Texas, and has previously preached in other Texas cities. He has been a resident chaplain in Louisville, Kentucky, as well.

He and his wife, Kara, met at Abilene Christian University where both received numerous degrees. Shane has a B.A., a master's, and a Doctor of Ministry from Abilene Christian University.

They have three children: Elizabeth, Peyton, and Levi. They're all here today, along with Shane's parents, Karen and Barry, and my wife, Carol.

Dr. Alexander is active in Mexia and its community, from coaching the girls softball team and boys T-ball, to furthering the spiritual growth of central Texas.

Dr. Alexander enhanced his life by marrying Kara, also Dr. Alexander, who is a professor at Baylor University. I say ''enhanced his life'' because his wife, Kara, is one of my four children, and Shane is my son-in-law.

We welcome them all to the United States House of Representatives today.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair will now entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the White House, this week, is dusting off the old talking points on jobs and the economy. Hopefully, they will undergo a few revisions.

The President should strike all references to stimulus because that certainly hasn't worked to create jobs. Tax increases, EPA regulations, and any claims that ObamaCare will spur job growth should also be removed. Practical experience tells us those strategies are as empty as the promises used to sell them.

Today's Washington Post includes a sobering indictment of the President's economic handling thus far:

> The only part of the Obama economy that has flourished because of Obama policy is Wall Street.

What about Main Street?

What about small businesses?

What about working families?

Working families want affordable health care. Working families don't want the government regulating their jobs out of existence just because Washington looks down on their industry.

House Republicans have a plan for the economy that defends working families. The White House should consider our ideas.

MARKING THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ILLEGAL TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness today to mark the 39th anniversary of the illegal Turkish invasion of Cyprus. On July 20, 1974, Turkish troops invaded and began an unjust occupation of areas in northern Cyprus.

Thousands of Cypriots were forced to leave homes where their families had lived for hundreds of years; and within just a few weeks, the Turks had uprooted centuries of culture, religion, and community. Over the years since then, the Turkish forces have committed unspeakable atrocities and destroyed priceless relics, acts which have been condemned by the European Commission for Human Rights.

So I'm proud to stand today with my fellow Hellenic Caucus members as we join together almost four decades after the illegal and immoral occupation of Cyprus to call, once again, on Turkey to act now and end the occupation.

LIVE WITHIN YOUR MEANS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, last week's $19 billion bankruptcy by the city of Detroit should serve as a wakeup call for every American. Chicago, with a reported $19 billion unfunded pension liability, and Los Angeles, with an estimated $30 billion in debt, may not be far behind.

Each of these communities practiced the failed tax-and-spend policies of President Obama and the Left. While many progressive policies sound great in theory, both history and current events show these policies don't work in practice.

As Margaret Thatcher said decades ago:

> The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money.

We do it better in Indiana. It's not always easy, but Hoosier leaders balance budgets and live within their means. To build a better future, our country needs to follow that example and not Detroit's.

KEEP STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES LOW

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I note that the gallery is filled with students and their families. Due to this House's failure to produce realistic bipartisan legislation, the interest rate of college loans has doubled from 3.4 to 6.8 percent for more than 7.4 million students.

We know investing in education is an investment in our Nation's future and in our Nation's economic strength. Not acting takes $1,000 per year out of graduates' pockets—$1,000 not going to savings, not going to buying new cars, not going to buying new homes.

And at this time of historically low interest rates, it just doesn't make any sense for us to further burden our youth.

I call on Congress to keep our rates low so today's youth can prosper like their parents and their grandparents did as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to not make reference to occupants of the gallery.

CREATING JOBS IS OUR PRIORITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President will venture back on the campaign trail to explain his failed economic policies. For months, we have heard the President talk about infringing upon our Second Amendment rights, defending his administration from scandals, and promoting his unworkable, unaffordable care act.

A crucial issue has not been addressed: creating jobs. As more dismal reports expose the sad reality of our weak economy, it is clear he is attempting damage control.

House Republicans have been focused on growing our economy for years. Last Congress we passed over 40 job-creating pieces of legislation. This year we voted to repeal ObamaCare and approve the Keystone pipeline, which would create jobs and give small businesses the certainty to begin hiring.

I appreciate TeaParty.net promoting the truth. Actions speak louder than words. It's time for the President to work with House Republicans to put American families back to work.

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

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Lillian Kawasaki, a veteran public servant and tireless environmental advocate who passed away, sadly, at the age of 62 last week.

I had the honor of working with Lillian during my time on the Los Angeles City Council on our Nation's port, ensuring that it grew green and helped to prove that we can have clean air and good jobs at the same time.

An environmental scientist by training, she was the first Asian American to head the Los Angeles Department of

Environmental Affairs and successfully led the Water Replenishment District of Southern California in its efforts to protect our air and water quality from pollution and contamination.

Her devoted leadership and unyielding commitment to public service and the people who live and work in Los Angeles were simply remarkable and will be sorely missed.

We have lost a dear friend. She was my colleague. She was a gracious, tireless woman who was a role model to all of us who truly strive to make a difference in this Earth as long as we live.

We'll miss you, Lillian.

FIGHTING TO PROTECT MONTANANS FROM EPA OVERREACH

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, Montanans tell me every day how the EPA's ever-changing rules are preventing them from hiring new workers or forcing them to foot the bill for unreasonable compliance costs. In fact, one Montanan said, you know, the EPA must stand for the Employment Prevention Agency.

The EPA's out-of-control regulatory overreach costs hardworking American taxpayers billions of dollars and thousands of jobs every year and all-too-often is put into place with a lack of oversight or public input.

The Energy Consumers Relief Act is an important step in making the EPA accountable to the American people. This bill blocks the implementation of rules that harm the economy and ensures that before the EPA finalizes any rule costing more than $1 billion, it informs Congress of the rule's impact on the economy and on energy prices.

Another important bill, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, brings much-needed regulatory certainty to job creators and helps keep energy costs low by taking the power out of the EPA's hands and returning it to the States where it belongs.

These commonsense proposals will help keep energy costs low for American families, protect thousands of good-paying jobs, and ultimately ensure that the EPA's accountable to the American people.

WE'RE IN THIS TOGETHER

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, good afternoon. We're in this together. We're not on our own. We're in this together. That's how Americans think: we're in this together.

Except that the Tea Party ideology that's running the Republican majority would have us revert to some time before the Civil War, when we're on our own, we're not in this together. They'd love to turn the clock back as far as it can go.

Example: let's have interest rates rise on our students. Forget about making sure that the best investment we could do in our students is to keep those interest rates low.

Let's talk about the farm bill. Couldn't get it passed, except let's jettison a whole bunch of people whose nutrition is serious to all of us. Forget about food stamps. People have gotten rich overnight. Let's get rid of those things.

Energy and the environment. Let's forget about the environment and let's forget about the sun, the wind and biofuels. Just focus only on gas and coal. Those have got to be part of it, but let's forget about things that have happened newly.

We're in this together. Abraham Lincoln said, of the people, by the people, for the people. We're working for the people. We need to remember we're all in this together.

□ 1215

HONORING MR. ROBERT DAVIES

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a brave Arizonan. Robert Davies, from Golden Valley, Arizona, truly met the definition of ''hero'' by coming to the aid of his elderly neighbor. Mr. Davies and his fellow neighbor, Paul Bissonette, responded to a neighbor whose home was on fire, saving the 92-year-old woman stuck inside. Mr. Davies risked his own safety by jumping through a broken window into the smoke and pulling the woman into position near the window where she could breathe. Receiving help from an off-duty fireman who arrived on the scene, Mr. Davies was able to lift the woman through the window to safety seconds before the building was taken by the flames.

Mr. Davies says this was something that anybody else would have done. But he actually did it. While I appreciate his humility, I thank him for his display of bravery and courage in the face of danger. I am pleased to recognize Mr. Robert Davies today, before this great body, for his act of heroism.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus, I want to urge my colleagues not to bury their heads in the sand. Wake up. Climate change is real, and it's already affecting the Earth in profound ways.

The scientific consensus is clear: human activity is causing our planet to warm to dangerous levels.

Scientists agree that higher temperatures are raising sea levels and driving severe weather patterns that threaten our economy and our way of life. Unpredictable and destructive weather patterns are making it harder for farmers to grow crops, while rising sea levels threaten our coastal cities and beaches from sea to shining sea.

Here in Congress, the majority refuses to even acknowledge that we have a problem, while the rest of the world seems to understand that it's the moral imperative of our time.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside, listen to the science, and come together and begin to help prevent the worst effects of climate change.

PROTECT SMALL BUSINESS JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, for the 89 percent of employers in America with fewer than 20 employees, there's an ever-present fear that they may be sanctioned or even put out of business for a violation of any one of the seemingly endless array of Federal regulations.

The Protect Small Business Jobs Act offers a simple correction: if found to be in violation of a Federal regulation, a business is given a 6-month grace period to correct the problem. If the problem is corrected at the end of the grace period, the sanction is waived. This way, no business is permitted to ignore regulations on an ongoing basis, but small companies are given a chance to become compliant without being hit by devastating fines.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense approach to regulatory relief and pass the Protect Small Business Jobs Act.

RELEASE ALL PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, across the world, people of certain faiths live in fear of government persecution every day.

Saied Rezaei, a leader of the Baha'i religion, used to advocate for gender equality and universal education in Iran. In 2008, he was arrested on false charges for propaganda against the Iranian regime and illegally establishing a Baha'i school. When Saied completes his 20-year sentence, his 16-year-old son will be a 31-year-old man.

That same year, Alimujiang Yimiti, also a husband and father, had his business shut down after Chinese officials accused him of preaching Christianity. He now faces 15 years in a Chinese prison and can only speak to his wife every couple months.

State-sponsored religious persecution will not be tolerated by the international community. Today, I join the

Defending Freedoms Project to call for the release of all prisoners of conscience.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an American hero, a true public servant in every sense of the word, and a man with whom Kansans are proud to share the Sunflower State as home.

Senator Bob Dole, a Russell, Kansas, native and proud Jayhawk, celebrated his 90th birthday yesterday, and has spent his entire life giving to make his country a better place for future generations. After courageously serving his country in World War II, Senator Dole continued to fight for the future of his country by serving in Congress, the Senate, and as a Republican Presidential nominee.

Like many Americans, I've been inspired by his exceptional leadership, his encouraging and positive personality, his quick wit, and his endless and selfless giving for his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, as we wish Senator Bob Dole happy birthday, we look ahead toward many happy and healthy years with our great friend, and to a bright future in America because of the work of Senator Dole and the values and ideals he has personified and the qualities he has instilled in so many of us.

CELEBRATING SENATOR DOLE'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleague, Mr. YODER, in honoring Senator Bob Dole on his 90th birthday.

I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that Senator Dole is really quite an extraordinary man and quite a legislator. He understood the importance of bipartisanship. He reached across the aisle and worked with Senator George McGovern on strengthening our antihunger social safety net. They made Food Stamps a better program. They championed WIC and school meals.

At a time when some of my colleagues are talking about destroying that bipartisan consensus on making sure that we combat hunger in this country, it is important to remember Senator Dole led, in a bipartisan way, to help the least among us.

I want to wish him a happy birthday and many, many more.

U.S. ENERGY EQUALS JOBS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the need for more homegrown American energy has never been greater. At home, our economy is still in a state of stagnation. Nearly 12 million of our fellow Americans are out of work. It's even higher among returning veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq. Abroad, volatile situations continue to erupt around the world.

We need an all-of-the-above, all-American energy strategy, not more red tape out of Washington, D.C. More American energy means lower energy costs for Americans and for all people in the United States, and that means more money left in your pocket. More American energy means a stronger economy as our energy sector is allowed to grow and expand. Simply put, more American energy means more American jobs, period.

Mr. Speaker, if we take care of ourselves, we can make Middle Eastern politics turmoil, and energy irrelevant.

And that's just the way it is.

COLLEGE COSTS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. The National Journal today noted that borrowing accounts for 18 percent of how the average family pays for college. They also noted that majors vary considerably in terms of their cost, such as social science being about $28,000 and engineering around $25,000.

What's notable is the starting salaries for a number of majors is so low that students cannot pay back their loans.

What is also noteworthy is the cost of the actual tuition itself. Since the 1970s, when data first began to be gathered, college tuition costs have gone up 1,120 percent, while inflation itself has gone up a little over 200 percent.

As we're talking about the cost of college, it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that we also call upon colleges themselves to be responsible for trimming costs and for guidance counselors and colleges to also look at how they are advising students to move forward in their careers. An important part of this argument is how students are saddled with a great deal of debt that they can't repay because they simply are not in a major in which they can earn money, and how colleges spend so much on a number of amenities that have little to do with education.

So I hope that universities, themselves, look at how they can trim their costs instead of continuing to raise tuition on the students, who then are faced with a lifelong burden.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2610, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 312 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 312

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 157, line 2. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, the amendment described in section 2 of this resolution, and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution. All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules and against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 2. After disposition of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer an amendment reducing funding levels in the bill.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an

amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, there shall be in order a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 5. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Mr. NUGENT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 provides for House consideration of two separate pieces of legislation. The first of these bills is H.R. 2610, which is the appropriations bill to fund the Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies. The second bill is H.R. 2397, which is the bill that funds our military and our national security programs for the next year. In perfect honesty, I don't think this is a perfect rule, but I know that it's the right rule for what we're doing today.

When I came to the Rules Committee as a freshman a little over 2½ years ago, one of our promises not only to the House but also to the American people was that we were going to return to regular order. We were going to make sure the House worked in an open and transparent process.

We promised the American people they would see what was happening in the House and read bills before they came to the floor for a vote. We promised that all Members would have the opportunity to amend and improve legislation. We also said we were going to have an open amendment process on appropriations bills.

The rule provides for a true open rule on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill. However, we're also taking up the Defense funding bill under a structured rule. While that may not be ideal, when I look at the alternatives, I know that this structured rule is the best way forward.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we have a duty to fulfill our core mission of the Federal Government. I can't think of a single function of government more inherently Federal in nature than providing for the common defense of this great Nation.

At a time when our troops are stretched too thin, the Department of Defense has been cut repeatedly in the last few years, and the Pentagon is now facing sequestration head on. We cannot let the new fiscal year begin without passing a Defense appropriations bill.

There isn't anybody in this House who is more concerned about our Nation's involvement in Egypt and Syria or more upset about the allegations of the NSA spying on American citizens than I am. However, we cannot let these issues prevent us from beginning to debate on a bill that ensures our military has the funds it needs to get their job done. So if the choice is between a structured rule and never getting the Defense appropriations bill passed, or a structured rule versus passing a Defense appropriations bill that actually makes our Nation less safe than we are today, then I will vote for a structured rule every time. That doesn't mean I think it's a perfect process, but the alternative is unconscionable.

The Department of Defense already is bearing the burden of half of the sequestration cuts, which, in conjunction with cuts they've already sustained, will completely hollow out our military. We need this Defense appropriations bill if we're going to restore flexibility to our military. And that's an issue that must come to the floor, even if it's under a structured process. So I come here today with a compromise.

Far and away, the vast majority of the amendments offered to the Rules Committee on H.R. 2397 will be allowed on the House floor. Our philosophy when considering amendments really is as simple as this: if it would have been allowed under an open rule, it will be allowed under this rule.

There are only three exceptions to that general rule of thumb. Those exceptions were amendments dealing with Egypt, Syria, and the NSA. And even then, these issues are in no way being swept under the rug. I wouldn't stand for that. I wouldn't allow it.

The rule provides for extended debate time on amendments dealing with both Egypt and Syria. Additionally, the rule provides debate on two amendments getting at the issue of NSA—including one amendment that I personally offered. My amendment would strike a balance between making sure our government has all the necessary tools to keep our citizens safe and protecting American civil liberties. Both of the NSA amendments will get extended debate time.

In total, this structured rule allows for debate on 100 amendments. In comparison, the Defense Appropriations Act of fiscal year 2010 also came up under a structured rule. Back then, however, only 16 amendments made it to the House floor.

As I said, it's not a perfect world. I wish we didn't need to deal with choosing between an unlimited debate on these issues and making sure that our troops have the tools they need to protect themselves and our Nation. But that's the nature of the world we live in today. And when it comes down to it, the Defense appropriations bill isn't the right place to be having some of these debates.

I am downright furious over what NSA has been doing. And the more I learn about the programs, the more outraged I get as it relates to trampling on our rights as citizens of this great Nation. But to try to change these programs on the DOD appropriations bill, where we can't legislate, isn't the right way to go about fixing something that's broken.

I'll be the first one to say that we need to have a long and serious discussion and debate about the current law as it stands. Frankly, it seems to me that we need to fix that law—clearly. That's why I'm a cosponsor of standalone legislation to do just that. The fact is that it's impossible to make the real, substantive changes by amending this bill.

Appropriation amendments are blunt tools. If there ever was an issue that needed thoughtfulness and finesse, it's when we're looking at programs that are used to keep our Nation and its citizens safe. So today, I offer you an open rule—the rule for the Transportation appropriations bill—and one

that is as close to open as we could get while still ensuring that the House votes on and hopefully passes a bill this week that keeps our troops funded, our Pentagon open, and our citizens safe from harm. It's not perfect, but it's as good as we can get in an imperfect world, and I'm proud to bring it today to the floor of this House.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we're here today to consider one rule for two appropriations bills, the Department of Defense appropriations bill and the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill.

While the T-HUD bill will be considered under an open rule—that is, if it's ever considered in this House at all—the Defense appropriations bill is another story. That's because the FY 2014 Defense appropriations bill is not an open rule. This bill is structured. Many good amendments were denied. The Rules Committee cherry-picked amendments that could be considered and prevented many germane amendments from being considered today. In fact, Mr. Speaker, last month, Speaker BOEHNER touted Republican use of open rules for appropriations bills. But now, just 1 month later, this Tea Party-run House is limiting debate on the Defense bill just to avoid taking some tough votes.

My colleague said that they made exceptions and limited amendments with regard to Egypt, Syria, and the NSA. Those were the only three areas, he said, that they purposefully made exceptions. Well, those are the three most important areas before us. Those are the things that our constituents want to make sure that we are debating and deliberating on.

Let me note another area where this structured rule inhibits having a robust debate on a critical issue, namely, the debate on the need for greater transparency and oversight of NSA collection of telephone and email records from people who are not under any suspicion or investigation whatsoever.

I'm grateful that a couple of amendments were made in order on this subject, but they were only given 15 minutes of debate apiece. That's it. This is a pretty big issue. We all want to provide our law enforcement officials with the tools they need to safeguard our country from potential terrorist attacks. But we also want to protect the basic rights and liberties guaranteed to all Americans from unwanted and unwarranted searches and invasion of privacy by government agencies.

Issues of transparency, accountability and oversight are critical duties and responsibilities not just of the executive branch but of Congress. Who is providing the necessary oversight of all of this massive data collection? Who is watching the watchers? Isn't it time for Congress to take a serious review of how the law is being implemented, how it is touching and affecting all Americans, and whether any of those laws and their implementation now require changes? I, for one, welcome such a debate, which I hope will occur at least in a limited fashion on the amendments that were made in order under this structured rule.

I believe a far better debate would have occurred under an open rule, where all Members could have voiced their concerns and outlined proposals for change. Regrettably, this will not happen under the time restrictions of this structured rule.

Turning to the T-HUD appropriations bill, I am disappointed and concerned with the committee's proposed funding level for the Community Development Block Grant program, known as CDBG. The bill cuts CDBG from $3.071 billion in FY13 to $1.637 billion in FY14, almost halving the program and bringing it to a historic low in terms of funding. CDBG funds are working in neighborhoods throughout our country, and this proposed reduction will negatively impact local economies and economic development projects all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a bipartisan letter signed by 101 Members of the House of Representatives expressing support for effective CDBG funding levels. If this bill is actually considered by this body before the end of the fiscal year, I hope there will be an attempt to restore funding for this critically important program.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2013.

Hon. TOM LATHAM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, Washington, DC.

Hon. ED PASTOR,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Transportation Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LATHAM AND RANKING MEMBER PASTOR: We write to share our concern about the impact the proposed funding levels for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program in House Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee-passed bill would have on redevelopment authorities and local municipalities. While we understand the difficult fiscal decisions we must make in Washington, the proposed bill reduces CDBG formula grants by nearly 50 percent, from $3.071 billion in FY2013 to $1.637 billion in FY2014. This proposed funding level also marks an historic low since the program's beginnings in the 1970s.

As you know, 144 Members signed a bipartisan letter in April for your review in developing FY2014 legislation. The letter supported maintaining the funding levels that the subcommittee recommended last year. The now proposed, substantial reduction—essentially halving the program—would impact local economies, threaten the program's national scope, curtail on-the-ground lead-abatement projects helping to revitalize our older cities, and reduce ongoing capabilities to aid veterans and other workforce training services.

We are concerned about the implications of this reduction, especially as the program's funds have already fallen substantially—by nearly $1 billion since FY2010. As you know, CDBG is largely managed by local municipalities, providing flexibility and tailored needs in our local economies and remains a lifeline for families and communities. For example, HUD reports that between FY2007 and FY2011, CDBG helped over 174,000 businesses expand economic opportunities and over the last decade, CDBG programs have rehabilitated more than 1.4 million homes for low- and moderate-income homeowners and renters. As a proven program with an effective track record, it serves an ongoing, continual need that not only impacts lives, but provides a documented return on its investment to leverage local dollars: Every $1.00 of CDBG leverages an additional $3.55 in non-CDBG funding, according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The pressing need in the current economy for these funds remains critical. We look forward to working with you to maintain effective funding levels for this work. If we can provide any further information, please contact Kate Ostrander, Legislative Director of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition, at 6–6106 or kate.ostrander@mail.house.gov. Thank you for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Mike Kelly; Michael R. Turner; Robert A. Brady; Lou Barletta; Peter T. King; David B. McKinley; James P. McGovern; Chaka Fattah; Christopher P. Gibson; Emanuel Cleaver; Niki Tsongas; Jim Gerlach; Stevan Pearce; Marcia L. Fudge; Peter Welch; Elijah E. Cummings; John K. Delaney; Tony Cárdenas; Matt A. Cartwright; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan.

Colleen W. Hanabusa; Nick J. Rahall, II; Wm. Lacy Clay; John D. Dingell; Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.; Chris Van Hollen; Juan Vargas; Mark Takano; Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott; Mike Doyle; Ann M. Kuster; William R. Keating; Danny K. Davis; Jim Matheson; Bobby L. Rush; Carolyn McCarthy; Alcee L. Hastings; Janice D. Schakowsky; Linda T. Sánchez; Doris O. Matsui.

Brian Higgins; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Eliot L. Engel; Rubén Hinojosa; Albio Sires; Yvette D. Clarke; Charles B. Rangel; Diana DeGette; John Conyers, Jr.; Richard M. Nolan; Paul Tonko; Gene Green; James A. Himes; Anna G. Eshoo; Suzan K. DelBene; Sander M. Levin; Ron Kind; David Loebsack; Grace F. Napolitano; Michael H. Michaud.

Corrine Brown; John F. Tierney; Lloyd Doggett; Bradley S. Schneider; Joyce Beatty; Steven A. Horsford; Judy Chu; Carol Shea-Porter; Gloria Negrete McLeod; Jerrold Nadler; Louis Capps, Gwen Moore; Tammy Duckworth; David N. Cicilline; John A. Yarmuth; Cedric L. Richmond; Pete P. Gallego; Suzanne Bonamici; Theodore E. Deutch; Loretta Sanchez.

Michael E. Capuano; Donna M. Christensen; Debbie Wasserman Schultz; Ann Kirpatrick; Janice Hahn; Gerald E. Connolly; Filemon Vela; Julia Brownley; Timothy J. Walz; Jim Costa; Joe Garcia; Raúl M. Grijalva; Stephen F. Lynch; Earl Blumenauer; Jared Huffman; Xavier Becerra; Maxine Waters; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Jared Polis; Patrick Murphy.

Now, as for the Department of Defense appropriations bill, everyone in this House on both sides of the aisle supports our men and women in uniform. We want to make sure that they have the equipment, the training, and

the logistical support they need to carry out their duties and missions, and that they have peace of mind that their families are being taken care of when they're deployed to perilous places abroad.

We want the most effective and efficient modern military in the world. There is no argument and no debate over these priorities in this House. However, that doesn't mean we should just throw money at the Pentagon, which is infamous for wasting tens of billions of taxpayer dollars each and every year for as long as I can remember.

In these tough budget times, we need to be smart with our money, and that includes with our defense dollars. I strongly believe that we could make better choices if the Republican majority would recognize that we need to negotiate a balanced approach to our national budget in order to get rid of the harsh and indiscriminate cuts caused by sequestration and I appeal to them to appoint conferees so that we can begin negotiations with the Senate on the budget. Now, I thought that was a priority for the House Republican leadership, but clearly I was wrong, as they have let budget negotiations languish for months.

Now, in the absence of a balanced approach to the budget, which would have provided greater clarity to our defense priorities, I have several concerns about the fiscal year 2014 Defense appropriations bill.

First, the bill neither reflects the current levels of defense spending that are the result of the current sequestration, nor does it reflect the next round of potential sequestration cuts that will go into effect for FY 2014. This would be easier to understand if the Republican majority showed any inclination to go to conference with the Senate on the budget resolution or return to serious negotiations with the White House on an overarching budget agreement. But the Republican leadership has stated clearly, time and again, that it will not negotiate a balanced and comprehensive solution to resolve our overall budget spending, revenue and deficit issues.

While critical domestic priorities are facing deep cuts in other appropriations bills, and the Appropriations Committee is demanding sequestration cuts be included in these bills, the Defense bill sails on through relatively untouched. In reality, it's those painful and draconian cuts in the other appropriations bills that allow this Defense bill to emerge relatively unscathed.

So let me share with my House colleagues a few words from the Statement of Administration Policy on the Defense appropriations bill:

Enacting H.R. 2397—while adhering to the overall spending limits in the House budget's top-line discretionary level for fiscal year 2014—would hurt our economy and require draconian cuts to middle class priorities. These cuts could result in hundreds of thousands of low-income children losing access to Head Start programs, tens of thousands of children with disabilities losing Federal funding for their special education teachers and aides, thousands of Federal agents who cannot enforce drug laws, combat violent crime, or apprehend fugitives, and thousands of scientists without medical grants, which would slow research that could lead to new treatments and cures for diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's, and hurt America's economic competitiveness.

□ 1245

The statement goes on to say:

Unless this bill passes the Congress in the context of an overall budget framework that supports our recovery and enables sufficient investments in education, infrastructure, innovation, and national security for our economy to compete in the future, the President's senior advisers would recommend that he veto H.R. 2397 and any other legislation that implements the House Republican Budget framework.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2397.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 22, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2397—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2014

(Rep. Rogers, R–KY)

The President is committed to our national defense and funding other important priorities within a budget framework that strengthens our economy and advances middle-class priorities. The Administration believes H.R. 2397, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, funds critical priorities, and looks forward to working on its provisions as part of an acceptable budget framework.

However, enacting H.R. 2397, while adhering to the overall spending limits in the House Budget's topline discretionary level for fiscal year (FY) 2014, would hurt our economy and require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities. These cuts could result in hundreds of thousands of low-income children losing access to Head Start programs, tens of thousands of children with disabilities losing Federal funding for their special education teachers and aides, thousands of Federal agents who cannot enforce drug laws, combat violent crime or apprehend fugitives, and thousands of scientists without medical grants, which would slow research that could lead to new treatments and cures for diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's, and hurt America's economic competitiveness.

More than three months have passed since the deadline for action and the Congress has yet to appoint conferees and agree on a budget resolution. Prior to consideration of appropriations bills the Congress should complete an appropriate framework for all the appropriations bills.

Unless this bill passes the Congress in the context of an overall budget framework that supports our recovery and enables sufficient investments in education, infrastructure, innovation and national security for our economy to compete in the future, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto H.R. 2397 and any other legislation that implements the House Republican Budget framework.

The Administration would like to take this opportunity to share additional views regarding the Committee's version of the bill.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response. The Administration appreciates the support of the Committee in working to eliminate the threat that sexual assault in the military presents to our Service members and our national security.

Detainee Matters. The Administration strongly objects to the provisions of sections 8107 and 8108 that limit the use of funds to transfer detainees and otherwise restrict detainee transfers, which, in certain circumstances, would violate constitutional separation of powers principles. Section 8107 undermines national security and this unnecessarily constrains the Nation's counterterrorism efforts, particularly where Federal courts are the best—or even the only—option for incapacitating dangerous terrorists. For decades, presidents of both political parties have leveraged the flexibility and strength of this country's Federal courts to incapacitate dangerous terrorists and gather critical intelligence. The continued prosecution of terrorists in Federal court is an essential element of counterterrorism efforts—a powerful tool that must remain an available option. Additionally, the restrictions in section 8108 on the transfer of detainees to the United States and to the custody or effective control of foreign countries or entities in the context of an ongoing armed conflict may interfere with the Executive Branch's ability to determine the appropriate disposition of detainees and to make important foreign policy and national security determinations regarding whether and under what circumstances such transfers should occur.

In addition, the Administration strongly opposes section 8109, which would prohibit the use of funds to construct, acquire, or modify a detention facility in the United States to house individuals held in the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. This would constrain the flexibility that the Nation's Armed Forces and counterterrorism professionals need to deal with evolving threats, intruding upon the Executive Branch's ability to carry out its mission.

Topline Funding Levels. The Administration strongly objects to unrequested Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding in the bill and the reduction of base budget funding relative to the President's request. The FY 2014 Budget carefully aligns program priorities and resources based on the President's strategic guidance, and it fully funds OCO requirements.

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). The Administration strongly urges the Congress to provide BRAC authorization and funding as requested so that the Department of Defense (DOD) can right-size its infrastructure while providing appropriate transition assistance to affected communities. Without a new round of BRAC, DOD cannot properly align the military's infrastructure with the needs of its evolving force structure, a critical tool for ensuring that limited resources are available to the highest priorities of the warfighter and national security.

TRICARE Fees and Co-Payments. The Administration strongly urges the Congress to support its proposed TRICARE fee increases, because military retirees deserve an excellent, sustainable health care benefit. The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has consistently failed to support requested TRICARE fee initiatives that seek to control DOD's spiraling health care costs while keeping retired beneficiaries' share of these costs well below the levels experienced when the TRICARE program was implemented in the mid-1990s. While the bill restores the projected FY 2014 TRICARE savings associated with the initiatives, the Department will be forced to make deeper reductions to troop levels, readiness and modernization accounts in order to offset higher health care costs of over $8 billion through FY 2018.

Military Pay. The Administration strongly urges the Congress to include the proposal to set the military pay raise growth at 1.0 percent in FY 2014. Consistent with the views of the uniformed military leadership, the President's Budget requests a 1.0 percent increase to basic pay, a 4.2 percent increase in the Basic Allowance for Housing, and a 3.4 percent increase in Basic Allowance for Subsistence. This total compensation level recognizes the sacrifices made by the men and women in our Armed Forces, while adhering to the current budget constraints faced by DOD. The bill provides $580 million in additional appropriations to fund the pay raise in FY 2014, but it would increase costs by a total of $3.5 billion from FY 2014 through FY 2018. After FY 2014, these future costs would need to be offset by deeper reductions to troop levels, readiness and modernization accounts at a time when statutory spending caps require defense reductions.

Building Partner Capacity. The Administration strongly objects to reductions in funds for programs to build partner capacity, which would limit the Department's ability to address current and emerging threats to our national security. The bill provides $83 million less than the $358 million requested for the Global Train and Equip program and does not fund the request for $75 million for the Global Security Contingency Fund.

National Intelligence Program Consolidation. The Administration strongly objects to section 8105 because the provision's prohibitions would impinge on the President's prerogatives to seek efficient budget structures and unduly constrain the President in future budget decisions.

Unrequested Funding. The Administration is concerned about the billions of dollars provided for items DOD did not request and does not need, such as Light Utility Helicopters, National Guard High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV), additional medical research, and the modernization of seven cruisers and two amphibious ships. The Administration is also concerned that the bill makes spending on these and other unnecessary items statutorily required, diverting scarce resources from more important defense programs and limiting the Secretary's flexibility to manage the Department efficiently.

C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (C–130 AMP). The Administration objects to the $47 million in unrequested funding provided for the C–130 AMP, which would start initial production of C–130 AMP kits for the modernization of earlier generation C–130 airlift aircraft. The President's FY 2013 Budget canceled the C–130 AMP because of its high total program cost of $2.7 billion, and because the aircraft would still be able to perform their missions with less expensive upgrades. In addition, as required by the FY 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, DOD is conducting an independent cost-benefit analysis of the C–130 AMP, and it would be premature to reinstate the program before that study is complete.

Advanced Innovative Technologies. The Administration objects to the $115 million cut for Advanced Innovative Technologies, an 88 percent reduction from the President's request, which funds on-going research and development efforts that support the new Defense Strategy and the rebalance to the Asia Pacific. Specifically, this program supports initiatives that would provide cost-effective and cost-imposing capabilities that are critical for meeting the Combatant Commander's objectives in the region. This capability is needed to address real world threats and full funding is required to research, develop and test performance of the Electromagnetic Railgun system.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (JUONF). The Administration objects to the elimination of funding requested for the JUONF. This funding is critical to DOD's ability to quickly respond to urgent operational needs of Combatant Commanders. Elimination of funding may delay fielding of important capabilities that help accomplish critical missions.

Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Programs. The Administration objects to the restoration of funding for the STARBASE program, which would perpetuate the Federal Government's fragmented approach to STEM education, whereby more than 220 programs are scattered across 13 agencies. The Administration's proposed reorganization of STEM programs would improve STEM education quality and outcomes across the Federal Government.

Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF). The Administration opposes the reduction of $205 million from the FY 2014 Budget request for the DAWDF. Failure to provide the full request would require DOD to collect the shortfall between the appropriation and the statutory minimum for DAWDF from other budget accounts. In addition, the Administration opposes appropriations language that would not allow use of prior year expired funds for the FY 2014 DAWDF collection. Components should be allowed to use these funds per the authority provided in current law.

Civilian Pay Raise. The Administration urges the Congress to support the proposed 1.0 percent pay increase for Federal civilian employees. As the President stated in his FY 2014 Budget, a permanent pay freeze is neither sustainable nor desirable.

Missile Defense. The Administration appreciates the support for DOD's air and missile defense programs, as well as support for the government of Israel's Iron Dome rocket system.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. The Administration appreciates the Committee's continued strong support for U.S. efforts to build and develop the security forces of Afghanistan. However, the Administration strongly urges the Congress to make $2.6 billion of the $7.7 billion request contingent upon pending policy decisions and the progress made by the Afghan National Security Forces during FY 2014, as requested in the President's Budget.

Limitation on Funds Available to Procure Equipment. The Administration appreciates the support of the Committee for a responsive and flexible program to train and equip the security forces of Afghanistan. However, the Administration is concerned that some of the limitations proposed in section 8119 will prevent the Department from meeting critical equipment requirements and delivery timelines for the Afghan National Security Forces and will unnecessarily increase costs for the U.S. taxpayer. The Administration urges the Congress to work with the Department to develop an alternative approach.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the FY 2014 appropriations process moves forward.

Finally, and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill not only continues funding for the war in Afghanistan; it also increases the Overseas Contingency Operations account, adding $5 billion more above the Pentagon's request, for a total of $85.8 billion.

Now, let me see if I understand this correctly, Mr. Speaker. During the time period when the United States is significantly reducing the size of our forces in Afghanistan, and when we are withdrawing from the war, this bill actually adds $5.1 billion to the OCO account above and beyond what the Pentagon asked for.

That is simply crazy, Mr. Speaker. Maybe those extra billions will pay the $70-plus million exit tax that Afghanistan is demanding of the United States to pull out our military equipment. That's not fuzzy math, Mr. Speaker. The word for that is ''extortion.''

My colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) had an amendment that simply said that the American taxpayers aren't going to pay this extortion tax that Mr. Karzai is demanding. His amendment wasn't even made in order. It was germane, but it wasn't even made in order.

While I appreciate the language in the bill that none of these funds can be used for President Karzai's personal benefit, since we found out earlier this year that he was lining his pockets from a U.S. taxpayer-dollar slush fund, it certainly won't stop Karzai's government from squeezing every last dollar it can from the United States to carry out the military drawdown over the next 15 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and I am tired of asking our brave servicemen and -women to fight and die for this corrupt government. While I hope to be surprised, I really have little faith that next year's parliamentary and presidential elections in Afghanistan will be free and fair, let alone usher in a new order committed to eliminating corruption and cronyism.

I am sick and tired of U.S. tax dollars being wasted in Afghanistan on military headquarters that will never be used, only to see them built and torn down.

I am sick and tired of building roads to nowhere or having our convoys pay a tax to transport troops and much-needed supplies to provinces outside of Kabul.

In brief, just like the overwhelming majority of the American people, I want to see this war brought to an end and our troops safely home, reunited with their families and loved ones, and contributing to home communities right here in the United States.

Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker: the $85.8 billion total for the OCO account is still designated ''emergency funding.'' That means it is all put on the national credit card. Not a penny of the hundreds of billions of dollars for this war has ever been paid for or offset or balanced with revenues from someplace else in the national budget.

We certainly do not need to add even more billions to the OCO account. What we need to do is to end this war as quickly as possible and bring our troops home.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and rise in support of his rule and the underlying Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014.

First of all, I congratulate my chairman, Mr. ROGERS, and also Defense chairman, Mr. YOUNG, as well as Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mrs. LOWEY, for their hard work and leadership getting this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, as we are all keenly aware, the budget of the Department of Defense is under severe stress. We are already seeing the effects of the President's budget cuts and the sequester on military readiness.

To fight effectively, our Armed Forces must be staffed, equipped, and trained to operate under dangerous, complex, and uncertain conditions, often with little or no warning. They require the right personnel using the right equipment and the right training.

But if history teaches us anything, it teaches us that the future is highly unpredictable. Unanticipated events often catch us by surprise. We constantly ask our military to be prepared for any contingency. Yet today we have burdened them with new levels of budgetary uncertainty hampering modernization, planning, and training.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in uniform need this Defense appropriations process to move forward. We should not force them to contemplate another inefficient continuing resolution on top of additional crippling sequester cuts. That is what will happen if this House cannot find a way to pass this important legislation: more delay, more uncertainty, diminished readiness, more risk for the men and women we ask to go into harm's way.

Is this a perfect rule, this structured rule? Absolutely not. The committee always prefers open rules and regular order.

At the same time, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill so that we can work with the Senate to fulfill our most basic mission under the constitutional duty—to provide for the common defense.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues again why these are tough budgetary times. This Defense bill is being treated differently than appropriations bills that actually fund needs right here in the United States.

I would remind my colleagues that national defense also includes what happens here in the United States—whether people have housing, whether people have food, whether or not people have good health care, whether or not we have good roads and good bridges, whether or not we have jobs. All these domestic needs are being ignored. In fact, they are being obliterated by the Republican numbers in the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. I also thank my colleague from Florida. I appreciate the courtesy that the Rules Committee extended to Mr. GIBSON and me last evening when we offered our amendment on Syria.

Mr. Speaker, my moment here is to discuss this fundamental question about whether America is going to be taking military action in Syria without any congressional debate. We have a responsibility under the Constitution.

Article I, section 8, clause 11 gives Congress the power to declare war and raise and support the Armed Forces. My colleague from Florida rightly said that we have an obligation to support the military men and women. They will do anything that we ask them to do.

But this is the moment when we face our responsibility or shirk it—to give them a policy worthy of their willingness to sacrifice. The idea that we would take military action, and arming the Syrian rebels is military action, it is intended very specifically to take down the Government of Syria—and I want Assad to go, and we all do—but I don't want this Congress to back into a policy, stumble ahead, where we find ourselves engaged in military conflict where we haven't even met our basic responsibility to have a debate about it.

We have to decide: Are we going to be men and women of Congress, are we going to do our jobs, are we going to be Congressmen and -women, or are we going to be cowards? It is the coward's path to avoid taking responsibility for a momentous decision that we know at this moment is upon us.

Vote ''yes'' or vote ''no.'' But to have no debate, to actually once again stumble into a military action, have we learned nothing from Iraq and Afghanistan? Iraq right now is supporting Assad; it is supporting Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. Afghanistan is now, after 11 years, ripping us off as we try to bring our material home. Does anybody on the either side of the aisle support this? Why don't we have a debate?

I admire Speaker BOEHNER for saying he wants to have this House work its will. But I say to Speaker BOEHNER: give us a vote, let us debate, let us meet our responsibility. There will be men and women that will go into harm's way, stumble ahead, because we did not stand up and take responsibility. We are accountable to the people who elect us.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on both the Armed Services Committee, as well as the House Depot Caucus. Our U.S. military has its own defense, repair, and sustainment capabilities, precisely because the government needs to guarantee that soldiers in the field will be sustained and supported in times of war. They will guarantee that needed equipment will be there in working order when and where it is needed because their lives and our freedom depend on it.

That is why I object to the current furlough policy of some of our DOD civilian workers. I have great sympathy for the Department of Defense. Unlike every other budget of the Federal Government, they did not receive an increase of appropriations before sequestration. In fact, the military is the only area where in this administration they received two cuts in their funding before sequestration hit, which was the third cut. Our defense has been hit disproportionately because of sequestration.

The Department of Defense's approach is to have everyone sharing in the burden or the pain of it. That is actually a political decision, and I don't use that in a pejorative sense. But Congresses have understood the work of our sustainment sector for decades, passing title I, sections 129 and 2472, which deal with working capital funds, and we have five such working capital funds.

These are revolving funds that are self-sustaining, which means by law if you have a workload and you have the funds, then these employees should not be thrown under the bus with a furlough. It is silly to think that the workload would be there. The funds are actually there, but the workload will be sitting in depots and the technicians and mechanics working on those will be forced to take off days without pay. It will increase our delay; it will increase our cost. The furlough working fund that funds employees does not save the government any kind of money, but it hurts delay.

The gentleman from Oklahoma will have an amendment, which I hope the House will take seriously, which will look at these working capital funds, and realize the unique situation they have within our system and will hopefully solve this problem going forward in the future.

It has been said that we have a foreign policy which we will fund. Actually, the book I read said, ''The foreign policy for which we will pay for.'' I just didn't want to end in a preposition.

Our foreign policy is funded here in the Defense Department appropriations. This is what gives us the flexibility diplomatically to do things not now, but 5 years from now and 10 years from now and 15 years from now.

We are truly looking at our future with this particular fund, and it must be taken seriously. We are living since the Cold War ended in a much less secure world than we were while we were in the Cold War, not just because of what is being done by our traditional adversaries in Russia and China, but in the Rim countries, Third World counties, which have used new technology to create what is called ''technological claustrophobia,'' as their efforts are now compressed together and we are having to respond to that.

There are many issues in this particular bill which help us move forward, not only in defense of our military, but in our foreign policy opportunities. There are a few amendments out there that actually do harm to that. I hope we look at it very carefully. It is a well-crafted rule with a whole lot of amendments—perhaps far too many amendments made in order—and it will provide for a logical debate. I hope when we come out of it, we realize the significance of this, not just funding our military, but also funding our diplomatic future.

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

I want to build on something that Mr. WELCH of Vermont said here on the House floor about the lack of debate on Syria. As somebody who was here when the Afghanistan war began and when the Iraq war began, I believe that both of those wars were unnecessary. We ended up getting Osama bin Laden not in Afghanistan with 100,000 troops, but with a small well-trained group of Navy SEALs in Pakistan.

This notion that somehow our strength can only be measured by the number of troops we have overseas or the number of weapons that we send overseas I think is just crazy. I think the amount that we have spent on these wars that have been added to our debt have weakened our security. I think the fact that we have lost so many incredibly brave men and women to these conflicts is a tragedy.

What the gentleman from Vermont raised was the issue that I think is on a lot of our constituents' minds, and that is what is going to happen in Syria. The real problem with this rule, Mr. Speaker, can be seen in the debate surrounding Syria. There is a real split when it comes to Syria. There are some who don't believe we should get involved at all; and there are others, like Senator MCCAIN, leading the Republicans over in the Senate, saying we ought to do more, we ought to get more involved in Syria.

□ 1300

Yet this rule denies any real substantive debate on one of the most important issues facing our military. The Republicans, despite making 100 amendments in order, ducked this issue entirely. The rule makes in order one amendment on Syria, and that amendment simply reiterates current law. Despite the sheer number of amendments made in order, the Republican leadership has ducked a real important debate when it comes to Syria, and I hope that a few years down the road we don't look back on the fact that we avoided a debate on Syria and express regret that somehow we got sucked into this war without a real debate. I mean, that's what we're here for.

So, when people say, ''Oh, these are tough issues,'' I'm sorry. We can't duck every tough issue. Maybe that has been the problem with a lot of our overseas policies—that we haven't talked about what needs to be done, that we haven't debated these issues. Sometimes we've gotten involved in wars that we've found are more complicated than originally thought. There is nothing wrong with debate, and it is incredibly important. In the people's House of Representatives, we ought to have a debate on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding to me.

I want to also thank our ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), as well as to thank our mutual friend and colleague from Florida, Chairman BILL YOUNG, for their hard work on this bill, which will benefit our Nation, our men and women in uniform, our Armed Forces, and all of those who are touched by what is contained in this legislation.

Within the limits provided and despite severe cuts, this bill has been written in a bipartisan way by our subcommittee. I thank the members for working so collaboratively together. It is a model for this House and our committee 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 conditions—the signature wounds of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill also includes $544 million for cancer research, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, ovarian cancer, and lung cancer research, which are endured at a much higher percentage among our troops than among the population at large.

The bill also contains continuing support for our NATO responsibilities, including continuing joint operations related to the Newly Independent States. The bill includes the requested amount in the budget for the Iron Dome missile defense partnership with Israel.

The bill also includes $1.5 billion above the request for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment account to fund equipment requirements of the National Guard and Reserve components. During the last decade of war, our National Guard and Reserve units have proven themselves as the strategic partners for our Nation. Our subcommittee continues to provide the funding necessary for our Guard and Reserve units to continue their missions, which they do extremely well and much more cost-effectively than in the active forces.

This legislation also continues the military's commitment to lead our Nation toward energy independence. The Pentagon, which is the largest petroleum user in the world, must lead our Nation forward toward energy independence. No challenge could be more vital to our national security and economic security than energy independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congressman MCGOVERN.

High fuel costs are an enormous burden on America's families and our military. It is also a burden on every branch of the service in which it costs us $400 a gallon to deliver 1 gallon of gasoline—fully costed—to the troops at the front line.

Thank you again to Chairman BILL YOUNG and to Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership and to our ranking member on the full committee, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and to the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for working with all of our members in order to meet the needs of our Nation and of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—those who serve the American people every day so nobly.

Mr. NUGENT. As to the thoughts of the gentlelady from Ohio, I appreciate her comments and her support for the military.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge people to vote ''no'' on the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Van Hollen resolution, which calls on Speaker BOEHNER to proceed to a conference on the budget. It is time for the majority to follow regular order by immediately appointing conferees to negotiate the 2014 budget conference agreement with the Senate.

To discuss that proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. WELCH regarding the importance of this body's having a debate and a vote on whether or not we should be sending U.S. taxpayer dollars to engage and support the rebels in the civil war in Syria. After all, this budget supports the Defense Department, and it also supports the intelligence agency. So this is the time and place to have the debate about taxpayer dollars going to a civil war in Syria.

It is also the time and high time that we get on with passing a Federal budget. We've heard a lot of talk on the floor today about the importance of supporting our military—absolutely

true—but this legislation does nothing to turn off the sequester. So, unless the Congress comes together on a bipartisan and a bicameral basis to resolve the budget, this Defense appropriations bill is going to be cut by about $48 billion, just as the non-defense parts of the budget will be cut as a result of sequestration.

I don't think the American people recognize that as of today—even though we're working on these spending bills—that the United States Congress has not passed a budget. There is no Federal budget in place today.

Now, we've heard a lot from our Republican colleagues over the last couple of years about how the Senate was derelict in its duty for not having a budget. Guess what? The Senate passed a budget. It passed a budget 122 days ago. Ever since that time, we've said to our Republican colleagues, Let's take the next step in the process—let's have a conference. Senate, House, let's get together to work out those differences.

In fact, Senator MURRAY, who is the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, has asked now 17 times for unanimous consent in the Senate to begin negotiations. We have called upon the Speaker of the House to appoint conferees to negotiate on the budget. He has refused. This motion is very simple. I'm just going to read the Resolved clause:

> It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should follow regular House procedure and immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to negotiate the fiscal year 2014 budget resolution.

Very simple. It's calling for exactly what our Republican colleagues have called for for the last 3 years. We've heard from you many times ''no budget, no pay.'' We don't have a budget, but Members of Congress are getting paid.

Now, Senator MCCAIN and a lot of Republican Senators have made the point that it's insane not to go to conference on the budget. Here is what he said, Senator MCCAIN:

> I think it's insane for Republicans who complain for 4 years about Harry Reid not having a budget, and now we're not going to agree to conferees? That is beyond comprehension for me.

That sentiment was seconded by lots of other Republican Senators. In fact, I think my colleagues know that I've heard, quietly, from a lot of our House Republican colleagues, saying, frankly, that they're embarrassed at the fact that the House Republicans have refused to appoint conferees and take the next step in the budget process.

Why is it important? We've got to get our economy moving in full gear. The Congressional Budget Office has told us that, as a result of the sequester, we're going to have 700,000 fewer jobs in this country by the end of this calendar year and that it's going to reduce our economic growth by one-third. The budget conference is where we work out our differences and try and remove the uncertainty in the economy.

By not going to budget conference, let's be clear what our Republican colleagues are doing. They want to take us right up to the cliff of a government shutdown in the beginning of October, the next fiscal year. They are talking about, once again, rolling the dice and playing a game of chicken as to whether or not the United States pays its bills on time. That is no way for the Federal Government to conduct itself.

I would ask my colleagues to put aside all of the gamesmanship and to simply, today, appoint conferees so that we can begin to work out these issues on the budget. Right now, as we head into the next school year, the kids of our soldiers who are at Fort Bragg are going to miss 5 days of school this fall because their teachers are going to be sequestered. Because of the sequester, they are going to be furloughed for 5 days this fall. These are the kids of men and women who are fighting to defend this country. That is wrong.

Let's get on with replacing the sequester in a smart way, but we can't do that unless we get on with the budget conference. So I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can go to conference.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it's always great to hear from Mr. VAN HOLLEN. He has been in front of the Rules Committee, I think, a half a dozen times on this particular issue, but that's not the issue we're talking about today. Today, we are talking about a rule to bring forward two bills. One is the appropriations bill for the defense of this country.

I appreciate his comments, but he also forgets to mention that, in the last Congress, this House passed two pieces of legislation to actually do what he was talking about doing. And guess what? It went over to that place where they have rocking chairs—where they do nothing. They didn't discuss it; they didn't debate it; they didn't even send it back to us, because they just didn't have the time to do it in their busy schedule, and I understand that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I would be glad to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Look, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman notes, we're in a new Congress right now. In the new Congress, the law requires that we pass a Federal budget by April 15. We are obviously way overdue. It is indisputable that the Senate has passed a budget. Why not go to conference?

Mr. NUGENT. In reclaiming my time, regarding shutting the government down, those are the gentleman's words, not ours. I don't think you've heard that at all from this side. It's not about shutting the government down; it's about passing 12 appropriations bills. That's really what we are supposed to be doing, and we are committed to doing that. We don't want to see a government shutdown, and I think our bringing appropriations bills to this House floor shows, in fact, that that's not the intent and that that's not the desire.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just to build on what my colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN was talking about, the reason we are so frustrated over here is that it seems that the Republican leadership is hell-bent on doing nothing—on stopping everything. We have 16 legislative days left until the end of the fiscal year.

You've only passed three appropriations bills. Notwithstanding the fact that the House passed a budget and the Senate passed a budget, there has been no conference on the budget. We have a debt limit looming, and I hear rumors that you're trying to figure out what pound of flesh you can obtain in order to avoid our defaulting on our financial obligations. This is not the way to run a government.

I would just plead with my colleagues on the other side that you need to get serious about sitting down and negotiating our differences. One of the things about a conference is you don't get everything you want, and they don't get everything they want.

As to these appropriations bills that you are bringing to the floor, their allocations are so low that they are unamendable on the House floor, and they would do great damage to our economy. This THUD bill I don't think will ever see the light of day any more than I think the Ag approps bill, which we gave a rule to, will ever see the light of day. Within that THUD bill are cuts in the Community Development Block Grants, which you cut in half. The devastation on cities all across this country and communities all across this country would be so bad. People are going to lose jobs. The gentleman from Maryland talked about the furloughs and about people losing their jobs because of the sequester, and you sit back and say, Oh, it's not our fault.

This is the body that voted for it. I mean, the people of this House voted for it. I didn't, but the majority of my friends on the other side voted for sequester. It is now the law of the land. That's part of what Congress did. Congress has to change the law so we get our economy back on the right track, and one way to begin is to do what you're supposed to do and go to conference with the Senate on the budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all the Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause I of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. May ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. NUGENT. I have none.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 16 minutes remaining.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don't have a problem with what's in this rule; I have a problem with what's being left out of the rule.

We have some serious issues to discuss: the NSA surveillance program, limited debate in this rule. We need to talk about Syria and whether we're going to get sucked into another war. Multiple amendments were offered. All of them were denied, except one that basically reinstates current law.

There are issues about Egypt that ought to be discussed on the floor. And when I hear my colleagues say these are sensitive issues, we shouldn't talk about them on the floor, then where should we talk about them? This is the appropriate bill to talk about those things; yet many of these amendments were not made in order. That's why an open rule would have been more appropriate.

In terms of debate, I don't know why we have to limit debate on the NSA down to 15 minutes a piece. Everybody is concerned about this.

I will just close, Mr. Speaker, by again urging my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can offer an amendment to allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's language to be made in order that the Republican leadership agree to go to conference with the Senate over the budget.

This sequester and these budget numbers that you are bringing to the floor on these various appropriation bills are destructive. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are hurting this economy. This gamesmanship that my friends on the other side are playing is doing great damage to this country.

We have to stop this. We have to be grownups here and do what we're supposed to do. The most important thing that can happen right now, given the fact there's only 16 legislative days left to the end of this fiscal year, is for my friends on the other side of the aisle to go to conference on the budget and work out a deal so that we don't have these devastating cuts that will impact every city and town in this country, that will throw tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of people out of work, that will do further damage to our infrastructure.

National security means the quality of life that people have here in the United States. It means whether they can have good health care or good education, whether they have good and safe roads to drive on. It means whether they have a job. National security begins right here at home; and the numbers that my Republican friends have been bringing to the floor, in terms of allocations for these appropriation bills on domestic spending, would be devastating to this economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule. We should have an open rule where we can talk about all these major issues that are confronting our Nation and the world.

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

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

I do appreciate the comments my friend from Massachusetts has made in a lot of areas, particularly as it relates to the open rule.

I do want to remind him—and I wasn't here in 2010—but the Rules Committee that my good friend sat on made a determination in regards to a structured rule, and that structured rule only allowed for 16 amendments to come to the House floor. That structured rule locked out a lot of folks' ideas in regards to how to better the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense 2011 fiscal year.

I agree with my good friend that this rule is not perfect, but I do want to point out that it does make over 100 amendments in order that are going to be debated here on this floor: an amendment on Syria; an amendment on Egypt; two amendments on the NSA, which are appropriate to have a debate here. And as we talk about authorization, particularly as we look at the NSA, that debate is going to come up in a very robust way because I truly believe that we need to have that.

As it relates to Syria, I have three sons that currently serve in the United States military. The last thing I want to do is see us arm rebels where my sons may have to face those arms at some point in time. I've had sons deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan; and as a Member of this House, there are very few of us that have served in the military in the same way as it relates to having our family members serve in harm's way. So I take it right to heart that we want to make sure that we don't put our sons or daughters in any jeopardy, particularly as it relates to arming those that we have no idea who they are.

I think I've said enough, but my position on arming the Syrian rebels, those that we don't even know who they are or what we're doing in Egypt or what's going on within the NSA as it relates to our civil liberties here in the United States as American citizens, we certainly are going to address those issues as we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I encourage my colleagues to do so, as well. As a father of three sons in the military, I'm disappointed that we've gotten to this point where ideological factions have divided this House so deeply that we're forced to put a structured rule in place in order to simply consider a bill that funds our Department of Defense.

Just to note, 2 years ago when we were having this discussion, I got a call from one of my sons who was deployed to Iraq, worried that his troopers were not going to get paid because that's what they were being told, because of actions of this House.

The last thing is that when our sons and daughters go off to fight, the last thing they should have to worry about is how they're going to take care of the car payment or feed their children back here at home. They should have one focus, and that's the fight ahead of them and returning back to their families and loved ones in the best possible condition they can be.

To me it's about as pathetic as it gets when these men and women are putting their lives on the line each day and we're playing politics with our national defense and we can't put differences aside long enough not to even agree to a funding bill, but just to agree that we should debate the funding bill at all.

I wish we could have an open rule on both of these appropriation measures. You know I do. But when it comes to funding the Pentagon and when it comes to funding our military, the issue at hand is too important to leave this subject to the political whims of select Members who could tie up the debate for days and end with irresponsible amendments that might ultimately put this Nation and its citizens at risk. That's why we're here. That's why we've taken the three most hot-button politicized issues and selected specific amendments to address each of these concerns while still making in order every other amendment that would not otherwise be subject to a point of order.

I welcome debate on how we need to change the laws of this land. I'm an active proponent in having it. Millions of Americans, including me, are questioning many of the laws right now, especially when it comes to the use of military force and the powers given to the NSA under the PATRIOT Act. It's clear that those are conversations that must happen in this forum here, but we can't let it derail the basic funding of our troops. That's what it comes down to.

This bill cannot possibly give the issues at hand the justice they deserve. It's an imperfect tool, and with only 10 minutes per debate per amendment, it would cut short the conversations that we have. That is why, although it is a departure from the normal appropriation process, this resolution brings up H.R. 2397 under a structured rule.

That said, the second half of House Resolution 312 is proof that this House is still dedicated to the open process. We fulfill our promise to both our constituents and ourselves by providing an open rule on Transportation and Housing appropriations. It's a reminder to us that the Defense bill is an example

of extraordinary times calling for extraordinary measures. At the end of the day, what's most important is that we fulfill our core mission. As anybody in the military will tell you, sometimes we have to adapt.

It's not perfect, but we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, especially when we're talking about keeping our troops and our citizens safe. For that reason, I'm proud to support the rule, and I encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

When the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 113–170) to accompany House Resolution 312 the summary of amendment numbered 43 was inadvertently omitted. The summary of amendments should have included the following:

43. COLE (OK), KILMER (WA), MCCARTHY, KEVIN (CA), BISHOP, ROB (UT), JONES (NC), LOEBSACK (IA), MCCOLLUM (MN), SCOTT, AUSTIN (GA): Provides that none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to implement a furlough of Department of Defense federal employees who are paid from the Working Capital Fund (WCF) Account, which is a revolving fund and does not receive direct funding from Congressional appropriations to finance its operations. (10 minutes)

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 312 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 174) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Speaker should immediately request a conference and appoint conferees to complete work on a fiscal year 2014 budget resolution with the Senate. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of consideration of the resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the resolution.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the resolution specified in section 7 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 312; and adoption of House Resolution 312, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2610, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 312) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 190, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bachmann	Barr
Alexander	Bachus	Barton
Amash	Barber	Benishek
Amodei	Barletta	Bentivolio

Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Coble
DeGette
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Keating
Kuster
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Schweikert
Tsongas
Yarmuth

□ 1406

Mr. PITTS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 377, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Coble
DeGette
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Joyce
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Neugebauer
Tsongas
Yarmuth

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

□ 1414

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2787, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. WOLF, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–171) on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON H.R. 2786, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–172) on the bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1012

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1012, a bill originally introduced by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

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 include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 2397, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 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. 2397.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1418

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. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER 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 Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the subcommittee has produced this bill after months of bipartisan cooperation, months of hearings, and months of classified briefings. We present a bill today that includes a base funding of $512.5 billion—$3.4 billion below the CBO estimate of the President's request and approximately $28.1 billion above the estimated fiscal year 2013 sequestration level. For Overseas Contingencies Operations, OCO, the bill includes $85.8 billion, which is $1.5 billion below last year's level.

We have worked closely with all parties. Mr. VISCLOSKY has been involved in every step of the way on producing this legislation. Our committee staff is unrivaled anywhere in this Congress, and they have done a tremendous job for the subcommittee.

These are some highlights of the bill:

There is $580 million to fully fund the authorized military pay raise; $536 million to fully fund the anticipated fuel costs; $950 million to fully fund the 2nd *Virginia* class submarine; $922 million to restore Facility Sustainment, Modernization and Restoration funding; and $692 million for military medical research, including $246 million for cancer research and $125 million for traumatic brain injury research.

During the next couple of days we are going to consider 100 amendments. So everybody be prepared: it's going to be a long day and a long night. And Madam Chair, to get us started off on the right track, I'm going to reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army	40,199,263	41,037,790	40,908,919	+709,656	-128,871
Military Personnel, Navy	26,902,346	27,824,444	27,671,555	+769,209	-152,889
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	12,531,549	12,905,216	12,826,857	+295,308	-78,359
Military Personnel, Air Force	28,052,826	28,519,877	28,382,963	+330,137	-136,914
Reserve Personnel, Army	4,456,823	4,565,261	4,483,343	+26,520	-81,918
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,874,023	1,891,936	1,875,536	+1,513	-16,400
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	658,251	677,499	665,499	+7,248	-12,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	1,722,425	1,758,629	1,745,579	+23,154	-13,050
National Guard Personnel, Army	7,981,577	8,041,268	7,958,568	-23,009	-82,700
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	3,153,990	3,177,961	3,130,361	-23,629	-47,600
Total, Title I, Military Personnel	127,533,073	130,399,881	129,649,180	+2,116,107	-750,701
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	35,409,260	35,073,077	35,183,796	-225,464	+110,719
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	41,614,453	39,945,237	40,127,402	-1,487,051	+182,165
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	6,034,963	6,254,650	6,298,757	+263,794	+44,107
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	34,780,406	37,270,842	37,438,701	+2,658,295	+167,859
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,862,980	32,997,693	32,301,685	+438,705	-696,008
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,182,923	3,095,036	3,199,151	+16,228	+104,115
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,256,347	1,197,752	1,200,283	-56,064	+2,531
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	277,377	263,317	266,561	-10,816	+3,244
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,261,324	3,164,607	3,149,046	-112,278	-15,561
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	7,154,161	7,054,196	7,102,113	-52,048	+47,917
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,494,326	6,566,004	6,675,999	+181,673	+109,995
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Account	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,516	13,606	13,606	+90	---
Environmental Restoration, Army	335,921	298,815	298,815	-37,106	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy	310,594	316,103	316,103	+5,509	---
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	529,263	439,820	439,820	-89,443	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	11,133	10,757	10,757	-376	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	287,543	237,443	262,443	-25,100	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	108,759	109,500	109,500	+741	---
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account	519,111	528,455	528,455	+9,344	---
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	50,198	256,031	51,031	+833	-205,000
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance	173,494,558	175,097,941	174,974,024	+1,479,466	-123,917

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	6,028,754	5,024,387	5,236,653	-792,101	+212,266
Missile Procurement, Army	1,535,433	1,334,083	1,628,083	+92,650	+294,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,857,823	1,597,267	1,545,560	-312,263	-51,707
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,641,306	1,540,437	1,465,937	-175,369	-74,500
Other Procurement, Army	5,741,664	6,465,218	6,467,751	+726,087	+2,533
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,382,152	17,927,651	17,092,784	-289,368	-834,867
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,036,871	3,122,193	3,017,646	-19,225	-104,547
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	659,897	589,267	544,116	-115,781	-45,151
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	15,584,212	14,077,804	15,000,704	-583,508	+922,900
Advanced appropriation FY 2015	---	952,739	---	---	-952,739
Other Procurement, Navy	5,955,078	6,310,257	6,824,824	+869,746	+514,567
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,411,411	1,343,511	1,271,311	-140,100	-72,200
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,774,019	11,398,901	10,860,606	-913,413	-538,295
Coast Guard (by transfer)	---	---	---	---	---
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,962,376	5,343,286	5,267,119	+304,743	-76,167
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	594,694	759,442	743,442	+148,748	-16,000
Other Procurement, Air Force	17,082,508	16,760,581	16,791,497	-291,011	+30,916
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,878,985	4,534,083	4,522,990	-355,995	-11,093
Defense Production Act Purchases	223,531	25,135	75,135	-148,396	+50,000
Total, Title III, Procurement	100,350,714	99,106,242	98,356,158	-1,994,556	-750,084
FY 2014	(100,350,714)	(98,153,503)	(98,356,158)	(-1,994,556)	(+202,655)
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	8,676,627	7,989,102	7,961,486	-715,141	-27,616
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	16,963,398	15,974,780	15,368,352	-1,595,046	-606,428
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	25,432,738	25,702,946	24,947,354	-485,384	-755,592
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	18,631,946	17,667,108	17,885,538	-746,408	+218,430
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	223,768	186,300	246,800	+23,032	+60,500
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	69,928,477	67,520,236	66,409,530	-3,518,947	-1,110,706

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,516,184	1,545,827	1,545,827	+29,643	---
National Defense Sealift Fund	697,840	730,700	595,700	-102,140	-135,000
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds	2,214,024	2,276,527	2,141,527	-72,497	-135,000
Blended CBO Outlay Rates for House Latest:					
CSBA Line 6300 Shipbuilding: $626M is set aside for prior year programs at 65.5%; all other 10% rate					
CSBA Line 8700 DE WCFs: $1,413M set aside for commissary salaries at 85%; all other 75% rate					
CSBA Line 8850 Natl Sealift Fund: $299M set aside for Ready Reserve Force at 90%; all other at 66% rate.					
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance	30,885,165	31,653,734	31,566,688	+681,523	-87,046
Procurement	521,762	671,181	671,181	+149,419	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	1,308,377	729,613	1,335,713	+27,336	+606,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/	32,715,304	33,054,528	33,573,582	+858,278	+519,054
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance	635,843	451,572	451,572	-184,271	---
Procurement	18,592	1,368	1,368	-17,224	---
Research, development, test and evaluation	647,351	604,183	604,183	-43,168	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/	1,301,786	1,057,123	1,057,123	-244,663	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	1,159,263	938,545	1,007,762	-151,501	+69,217
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	---	98,800	---	---	-98,800
Office of the Inspector General 1/	350,321	312,131	347,000	-3,321	+34,869
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	35,526,674	35,461,127	35,985,467	+458,793	+524,340
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA)	534,421	568,271	552,535	+18,114	-15,736
Total, Title VII, Related agencies	1,048,421	1,082,271	1,066,535	+18,114	-15,736

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	---	---
Indian Financing Act incentives (Sec.8019)	15,000	---	15,000	---	+15,000
FFRDC (Sec.8023)	---	---	-40,000	-40,000	-40,000
Rescissions (Sec.8040)	-2,142,447	---	-3,043,571	-901,124	-3,043,571
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8051)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
O&M, Army transfer authority	(133,381)	---	---	(-133,381)	---
Global Security Contingency Fund (O&M, Defense-wide transfer) (Sec.8068)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	---	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8069)	4,000	---	4,000	---	+4,000
National grants (Sec.8077)	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
Shipbuilding & conversion funds, Navy (Sec.8082)	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
ICMA transfer authority (Sec.8088)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Fisher House transfer authority (Sec.8093)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8098)	(139,204)	(143,087)	(143,087)	(+3,883)	---
Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund	2,382,100	---	---	-2,382,100	---
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec.8102)	270,000	---	---	-270,000	---
(transfer authority)	---	(273,300)	(146,568)	(+146,568)	(-126,732)
Civilian pay reduction (Sec.8116)	-72,718	---	-437,000	-364,282	-437,000
Special Victims Program implementation (Sec.8122)	---	---	25,000	+25,000	+25,000
A-12 Aircraft litigation in-kind settlement	---	150,000	---	---	-150,000
Military pay raise (Sec. 8126)	---	---	580,000	+580,000	+580,000
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions	507,935	158,000	-2,844,571	-3,352,506	-3,002,571
TITLE IX					
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (OCO) 3/					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (OCO)	9,790,082	6,747,515	6,703,006	-3,087,076	-44,509
Military Personnel, Navy (OCO)	774,225	558,344	558,344	-215,881	---
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (OCO)	1,425,156	1,019,322	1,019,322	-405,834	---
Military Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	1,286,783	867,087	867,087	-419,696	---
Reserve Personnel, Army (OCO)	156,893	40,952	40,952	-115,941	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (OCO)	39,335	20,238	20,238	-19,097	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (OCO)	24,722	15,134	15,134	-9,588	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	25,348	20,432	20,432	-4,916	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (OCO)	583,804	393,364	393,364	-190,440	---
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (OCO)	10,473	6,919	6,919	-3,554	---
Total, Military Personnel	14,116,821	9,689,307	9,644,798	-4,472,023	-44,509

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (OCO)	28,452,018	29,279,633	30,929,633	+2,477,615	+1,650,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (OCO)	5,839,934	6,067,993	6,255,993	+416,059	+188,000
Coast Guard (by transfer) (OCO)	---	(227,033)	(227,033)	(+227,033)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (OCO)	4,116,340	2,669,815	2,669,815	-1,446,525	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (OCO)	9,249,736	10,005,224	10,605,224	+1,355,488	+600,000
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (OCO)	7,714,079	6,435,078	6,240,437	-1,473,642	-194,641
Coalition support funds (OCO)	(1,650,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(-150,000)	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (OCO)	157,887	42,935	42,935	-114,952	---
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OCO)	55,924	55,700	55,700	-224	---
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (OCO)	25,477	12,534	12,534	-12,943	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OCO)	60,618	32,849	32,849	-27,769	---
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (OCO)	392,448	199,371	199,371	-193,077	---
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (OCO)	34,500	22,200	22,200	-12,300	---
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (OCO)	582,884	---	1,073,800	+490,916	+1,073,800
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	56,681,845	54,823,332	58,140,491	+1,458,646	+3,317,159
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (OCO)	325,000	279,000	279,000	-46,000	---
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (OCO)	5,124,167	7,726,720	7,726,720	+2,602,553	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance	62,131,012	62,829,052	66,146,211	+4,015,199	+3,317,159
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (OCO)	550,700	771,788	771,788	+221,088	---
Missile Procurement, Army (OCO)	67,951	128,645	154,532	+86,581	+25,887
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (OCO)	15,422	---	15,422	---	+15,422
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (OCO)	338,493	180,900	190,382	-148,111	+9,482
Other Procurement, Army (OCO)	1,740,157	603,123	909,825	-830,332	+306,702
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (OCO)	215,698	240,696	240,696	+24,998	---
Weapons Procurement, Navy (OCO)	22,500	86,500	86,500	+64,000	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (OCO)	283,059	206,821	169,362	-113,697	-37,459
Other Procurement, Navy (OCO)	98,882	17,968	17,968	-80,914	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (OCO)	822,054	129,584	125,984	-696,070	-3,600
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	305,600	115,668	188,868	-116,732	+73,200
Missile Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	34,350	24,200	24,200	-10,150	---
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (OCO)	116,203	159,965	137,826	+21,623	-22,139
Other Procurement, Air Force (OCO)	2,680,270	2,574,846	2,524,846	-155,424	-50,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide (OCO)	188,099	111,275	128,947	-59,152	+17,672
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (OCO)	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	+1,500,000
Total, Procurement	8,979,438	5,351,979	7,187,146	-1,792,292	+1,835,167

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (OCO)	29,660	7,000	7,000	-22,660	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (OCO)	52,519	34,426	34,426	-18,093	---
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (OCO)	53,150	9,000	9,000	-44,150	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (OCO)	112,387	66,208	66,208	-46,179	---
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	247,716	116,634	116,634	-131,082	---
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (OCO)	243,600	264,910	264,910	+21,310	---
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (OCO)	993,898	904,201	904,201	-89,697	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (OCO)	469,025	376,305	376,305	-92,720	---
Joint IED Defeat Fund (OCO) 2/	1,622,614	1,000,000	1,000,000	-622,614	---
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (OCO)	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Office of the Inspector General (OCO)	10,766	10,766	10,766	---	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	3,096,303	2,306,272	2,291,272	-805,031	-15,000
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (OCO) (Sec.9002)	(3,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(+500,000)	---
Rescissions (OCO) (Sec.9013)	-1,860,052	-1,279,252	-46,022	+1,814,030	+1,233,230
Total, General Provisions	-1,860,052	-1,279,252	-46,022	+1,814,030	+1,233,230
Total, Title IX	86,954,838	79,278,902	85,604,949	-1,349,889	+6,326,047
Total for the bill (net)	597,558,714	590,381,127	591,342,799	-6,215,915	+961,672
Less appropriations for subsequent years	---	-952,739	---	---	+952,739
Total for the bill (net)	597,558,714	589,428,388	591,342,799	-6,215,915	+1,914,411

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013					
Operation and Maintenance (emergency)	62,825	---	---	-62,825	---
Procurement (emergency)	1,310	---	---	-1,310	---
Defense working capital funds (emergency)	24,200	---	---	-24,200	---
Total, FY 2013 Disaster Relief (PL 113-2)	88,335	---	---	-88,335	---
Total, Other Appropriations	88,335	---	---	-88,335	---
Net grand total	597,647,049	589,428,388	591,342,799	-6,304,250	+1,914,411
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent)	22,000	30,000	30,000	+8,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent)	9,000	10,000	10,000	+1,000	---
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	-143,087	-143,087	-3,883	---
Non-defense function	139,204	143,087	143,087	+3,883	---
O&M, Defense-wide transfer to Department of State:					
Defense function	-100,000	-50,000	-50,000	+50,000	---
Non-defense function	100,000	50,000	50,000	-50,000	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 4/	8,026,000	7,258,000	7,258,000	-768,000	---
(OCO) 3/	271,000	164,000	164,000	-107,000	---
Title IX rescissions (CBO adjustment)	---	257,681	---	---	-257,681
OCO appropriations	---	1,021,571	---	---	-1,021,571
Base appropriations	---	-1,021,571	---	---	+1,021,571
Less emergency appropriations	-88,335	---	---	+88,335	---
ATB security (DivD Sec3001) (CBO adjustment)	-515,000	---	---	+515,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	7,724,665	7,719,681	7,462,000	-262,665	-257,681
Adjusted total (includ. scorekeeping adjustments)	605,371,714	597,148,069	598,804,799	-6,566,915	+1,656,730
Appropriations	(607,514,161)	(598,169,640)	(601,848,370)	(-5,665,791)	(+3,678,730)
Rescissions	(-2,142,447)	(-1,021,571)	(-3,043,571)	(-901,124)	(-2,022,000)
Total mandatory and discretionary	605,371,714	597,148,069	598,804,799	-6,566,915	+1,656,730

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2397)
(Amounts in thousands)
*Enacted level does not include the 251A sequester or Sec. 3004 OMB ATB

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	127,533,073	130,399,881	129,649,180	+2,116,107	-750,701
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	173,494,558	175,097,941	174,974,024	+1,479,466	-123,917
Title III - Procurement	100,350,714	99,106,242	98,356,158	-1,994,556	-750,084
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	69,928,477	67,520,236	66,409,530	-3,518,947	-1,110,706
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,214,024	2,276,527	2,141,527	-72,497	-135,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	35,526,674	35,461,127	35,985,467	+458,793	+524,340
Title VII - Related Agencies	1,048,421	1,082,271	1,066,535	+18,114	-15,736
Title VIII - General Provisions (net)	507,935	158,000	-2,844,571	-3,352,506	-3,002,571
Title IX - Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO)	86,954,838	79,278,902	85,604,949	-1,349,889	+6,326,047
Total, Department of Defense	597,558,714	590,381,127	591,342,799	-6,215,915	+961,672
Scorekeeping adjustments	7,724,665	7,719,681	7,462,000	-262,665	-257,681
Less appropriations for subsequent years	---	-952,739	---	---	+952,739
Total mandatory and discretionary	605,371,714	597,148,069	598,804,799	-6,566,915	+1,656,730

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) permanent appropriations.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to Chairman YOUNG, and to congratulate him on the bipartisan and transparent manner in which he has crafted the fiscal year 2014 Defense bill.

I also want to express my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and all of the members of the Defense Subcommittee for their efforts. We would not be here today but for their outstanding effort.

I would also note that this will be the last Defense appropriations bill we bring to the floor with the membership of Mr. BONNER from Alabama. With his leaving this institution, we are losing a very serious and thoughtful Member who has worked assiduously every day to leave the world better, and I certainly want to recognize his individual contribution.

The bill also could not have been written without the dedication, hard work, and sound judgment of the staff that Mr. YOUNG has already referenced. I do want to thank Tom McLemore, Sherry Young, Tim Prince, Jennifer Miller, Walter Hearne, Paul Terry, BG Wright, Brooke Boyer, Ann Reese, Adrienne Ramsey, Megan Rosenbusch, Maureen Holohan, Paul Juola, Rebecca Leggieri, Kent Clark, Michael Rigney, and Joe DeVooght.

The bill at hand is fundamentally aimed at restoring readiness and training for the services to areas that have suffered greatly in the budgetary upset of the current year.

While Chairman YOUNG has noted that the bill's $212 billion in funding is approximately $28 billion more than the fiscal year 2013 post-sequestration level, it does contain a number of significant reductions. The bill cuts $617.8 million from the Joint Strike Fighter program to address unjustified cost growth and unjustified concurrency estimates for the program. It cuts another $112 million due to an overstatement of Army travel requirements. The bill rescinds $443 million for C–27–J aircraft.

The bill and report contain a significant amount of language and robust funding for initiatives to respond to sexual assault in the armed services. Sexual assault in any circumstance is unacceptable and maddening. The fact that it is prevalent within the military is even more so because of the standard to which our men and women in uniform hold themselves. These are individuals who are committed to give their ''last full measure of devotion'' to our Nation, who, in order to be effective, need to unconditionally trust each other. Sexual assault undermines all of this.

Though I strongly support the efforts contained in this bill, they are aimed mainly at offender accountability and caring for victims. Even though the comprehensive solution to this issue lies outside the services, it is imperative that the proper attitudes and training start during the recruitment process for the officers and enlisted and continue throughout each servicemembers' career.

I would also note that the bill includes $20 million above the request for suicide prevention and outreach, consistent with the funding level of the past 2 years. Suicides are another disheartening problem within the services, especially given the emphasis that the Department and Congress have placed on the issue over the past few years. But money is not the only solution. We need to spend the appropriated dollars as wisely and as effectively as possible.

I was taken aback in a hearing earlier this year to learn that the Navy has a collection of 123 programs aimed at addressing suicide and resiliency. While I am sure that each one of these programs is well-intentioned, the sheer number spreads resources too thin and creates confusion. To their credit, the Navy is in the process of implementing task force recommendations to dedicate more resources to the programs that truly work.

Additionally, I would like to express my support for a solution that benefits all future users of the Integrated Electronic Health Record program. I am proud of the efforts of our subcommittee and of the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Subcommittee to effectuate this long-awaited improvement to medical care for our still-serving military members and our veterans. Additionally, the cooperation between our subcommittees and with our corresponding authorization committees demonstrates the importance Congress places on the issue.

I am pleased that the bill report contains provisions that enhance oversight at the Department. The Office of the Inspector General is funded at $347 million, which is nearly $35 million above the administration's request. This office plays a vital role in moving the Department towards auditable financial statements, which are long overdue and which I attach great importance to.

Also, while the committee increased funding relative to the budget request for environmental cleanup at Formerly Used Defense Sites, this increase is accompanied by additional reporting requirements. In the same vein as my prior comments, the money in this program must be spent more effectively going forward to ensure that we complete cleanup projects, not just continue them.

Regarding missile defense, the bill increases advance procurement funding for additional Ground-Based Interceptors. This funding is accompanied by a requirement to document the adequacy of the testing plan for the Ground-Based Interceptors.

In light of the program's recent test failure, I continue to be very concerned about the concurrency of this program. I believe it is essential to maintain rigorous standards to ensure that the weapons we pursue are fully developed before we begin fielding them, and once fielded, that these weapons effectively perform their missions.

Further, should the review to determine the cause of the latest test failure reveal significant problems, and if we understand that this program needs to be changed, we should reevaluate our position in conference.

While I support the bill, there are a few provisions that I have concerns with, in particular, the three general provisions regarding detainees at Guantanamo Bay.

I believe that the continued operation of Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material. I do regret that this bill and other relevant appropriations bills continue to thwart any attempts to close Guantanamo by prohibiting viable alternatives.

Further, I am concerned that the bill essentially prohibits a pay raise for civilian employees at the Department of Defense. We rely on the Department of Defense civilians working side by side with our military personnel to provide medical care for our troops, to perform vital logistics, maintenance and acquisition services, and to provide many other essential services within the Department. Even a modest raise that maintains pay equity between civilian and military personnel sends a critical message of support to these employees.

Looking ahead, I am concerned that if the shadows of the future remain unaltered, we will experience serious problems ensuring the continued defense of our Nation.

□ 1430

As Todd Harrison of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments has noted:

> Rather than getting larger and more expensive over the past decade, the military just grew more expensive.

This reality makes our future choices even more difficult, and it is imperative that Congress join with the Department in working through these decisions at arm's length and also as a partner.

The Department of Defense did recommend some very difficult reductions in the budget submitted to us earlier this year, as they have done in previous years. We, as legislators, can no longer afford to reflexively reject those recommendations because they affect a specific company, a specific region of the country, or are simply not the most politic of choices to be made.

Our military is at a familiar crossroad, one they have been at before as the end of combat operations nears. The additions and subtractions to Defense funding made today must be carried out with an eye to the future, with a sense of the strategic impact on America's future ability to muster a force of successfully defending and protecting our country.

In closing, I again want to reiterate my appreciation to Chairman YOUNG for his cooperation and assistance in addressing the interests we have expressed. He and his staff have ensured that the subcommittee continues its long tradition of operating collaboratively and effectively and transparently. I am pleased that we are finally considering this bill on the floor and look forward to the debate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, first, I would like to thank Mr. VISCLOSKY for his much more detailed description of this legislation.

I would now yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, who has strongly committed to making sure that we pass all of our appropriations bills, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this, the DOD appropriations bill.

This bill provides more than $512 billion in base funding for our national security and military efforts, and $85.8 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations war funding. This is a base funding decrease of $5.1 billion below fiscal 2013, but is about $28.1 billion above the current level caused by automatic sequestration spending cuts.

This total reflects an appropriate, thorough analysis of what is needed to keep this country safe. Freedom isn't free. Our liberties, our rights, our property are preserved by our national defense, but at a cost.

Sufficient funding for the Pentagon and our military is of the utmost importance to the continued prosperity of the United States of America. It is, and should be, our top priority.

We have already seen the distressing toll that the heavy-handed, indiscriminate cuts of sequestration have taken on our military—from grounded planes, to reduced training time, to postponed maintenance—all of which contribute to the loss of readiness of our troops.

As we saw all this month as Department of Defense civilian furloughs began, our economy is also taking a significant hit.

The funding level in this bill strikes a balance between fiscal responsibility and sufficient support for our military. Within this total, we prioritize funding to advance our missions abroad, to prepare and equip our troops, and to ensure the readiness and effectiveness of our military. This includes adequate funding to purchase the equipment, weapons, and vehicles needed to keep our military protected, at the ready, and able to conduct successful operations.

The bill also provides funding for ongoing operations and maintenance of military facilities, equipment, and bases—fundamental to the successful missions of our Armed Forces. Essential funding is proposed to develop new defense technologies, to advance the success of current military operations, and to plan for whatever new threats may arise in the future.

A well-equipped military is not as effective without strong and well-prepared troops. This funding supports readiness programs that prepare our troops for both combat and peacetime missions, giving them flight time and battle training.

In addition, the bill funds the authorized 1.8 percent pay raise for the military—above the 1 percent the President requested. To keep our troops healthy before and after battle, the Defense Health Program receives an increase above last year's level, funding medical facility upgrades, traumatic brain injury and psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach.

The bill also addresses what has been a black mark on our military, Madam Chairman—the problem with sexual assault. The legislation fully funds Sexual Assault Prevention and Response programs and adds $25 million in funding for sexual assault victim assistance to preserve trust in our military and ensure that members of our Armed Forces are not sacrificing more than they already have to serve this Nation.

But a balanced budget—one that does not put us into massive debt to other governments or threaten our economic stability—is also paramount to our national security. Even these critical national security programs cannot spend precious tax dollars unchecked.

The bill has implemented commonsense reductions wherever possible, including rescinding unused, prior-year funding, nixing a proposed civilian pay raise, and saving $1 billion in anticipated excess funding. We have also prohibited funding to modify facilities in the U.S. to house Guantanamo detainees or to allow their transfer into the U.S. or its territories.

When all is said and done, this bill cuts more than $5 billion below last year's enacted level; but I must emphasize that these reductions will in no way harm or negatively affect our national defense or the troops that fight to protect this great country.

Madam Chairman, some will complain that the bill breaks the cap placed on Defense spending under the sequester level for fiscal year 2014 put into place by the Budget Control Act. To this I say, of course it does.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The massive, irresponsible, dangerous reductions to Defense spending under the sequestration cap is completely beyond the pale.

For example, if nothing is done to cancel the next round of sequestration cuts that are scheduled to take effect when this Congress adjourns, this bill would be cut to a total of $468 billion.

Before I close, Madam Chairman, I would like to take this time to thank the venerable chairman of the subcommittee, BILL YOUNG. He is a national asset. He has shown again the skill that he has in putting together a great bill.

To Mr. VISCLOSKY, thank you for being a great partner to our chairman throughout this process.

To the staff and the entire subcommittee members, without your hard work we would not have this bill on the floor. I salute you and endorse this bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would yield such time as she may consume to the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, and Chairman ROGERS for working across the aisle on the bill before us today in keeping with the Defense Subcommittee's long bipartisan tradition. I also want to recognize and thank the Defense Subcommittee staff for working tirelessly on the nuts and bolts of this bill.

Sadly, however, the appropriations process has become a quandary that could easily have been avoided with good old-fashioned compromise. Instead, we have disparate House and Senate allocations. House bills follow the Ryan budget, which endorses sequestration and is unrealistic, unworkable, and economically misguided, while the Senate and White House budgets are based on the higher level agreed upon in the Budget Control Act. With only 18 days of session left in the House before the end of the fiscal year, we are racing toward a government shutdown that is irresponsible.

Assuming the sequester is turned off, this is a good bill. It includes additional funding and tougher penalties to address the epidemic of sexual assault plaguing our military, an increase for Active Duty pay by 1.8 percent, enhancements to embassy security by increasing the presence of Marine Corps security guards, substantial investments in health services and suicide prevention, maintenance of all the National Guard weapons of mass destruction/civil support teams, and continued support for the Israeli Cooperative Program.

However, the bill also contains serious shortcomings. On July 8, I was at Camp Smith in my district in New York where 48 of the more than 600,000 Defense civilian employees nationwide are being furloughed. Each will lose $2,706, a 20 percent reduction to their fourth-quarter earnings, on top of 3 years without a pay increase. Yet this bill does nothing to fix the pay freeze or furloughs resulting from the sequester.

In fact, the majority simply ignores sequestration when it suits their purpose, including in the spending allocations for MilCon-VA, Homeland Security, and Defense bills. While the Republicans are steadfast in sticking to the post-sequester overall discretionary allocation they included in the

Ryan budget, they are comfortable breaking the Budget Control Act's cap on Defense spending by $47.7 billion.

Of course, they may not tell you that, unless we end the sequester, on January 15 those funds will be lost, creating a gaping hole in the Defense budget. They don't have the courage of their convictions to admit that breaking the Defense cap further shortchanges vital domestic priorities like medical research, Head Start, teachers for military families, energy efficiency, disaster preparedness, and other vital investments, all of which create jobs.

We have already achieved $2.5 trillion in deficit reduction since 2011, including $1.5 trillion in discretionary cuts. It is time for Congress to buckle down to reach a bipartisan agreement to replace sequestration with a balanced approach that protects critical services and investments.

As I did for MilCon-VA and Homeland Security, I support the overall funding level in Defense because it was written as though Congress will turn off sequestration, as we should.

But on the remaining bills, as with the Energy and Water bill, I will not support slashing investments in our families and workforce. If we are to remain a global leader, we need a strong national defense and a strong economy.

I thank you again to the chairman and the ranking member, who have worked so hard in a bipartisan way, maintaining the tradition of this committee. As we move forward, I do hope that we can go to conference and work together with the Senate to come up with a bill that can really pass and sequestration be eliminated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to an important member of our subcommittee, the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of our Defense appropriations bill. Under Chairman YOUNG's leadership and collaboration and strong support from Mr. VISCLOSKY, our committee held a lengthy series of hearings examining varied topics: our operations in Afghanistan, the so-called pivot to the Asia-Pacific, the Army and Air Force's need for modernization, Navy shipbuilding, marine end strength, military health care, acquisition reform, sexual assaults, among other important issues, and, of course, the impact of the sequester, the negative impact.

□ 1445

Most of our hearings related to reducing risk in the defense budget and the new strategic guidance from the Department of Defense—protecting our gains as well as preparing for current and future threats—China's growing military capability; continued uncertainty in North Korea and that peninsula; the destabilizing civil war in Syria; Iran's race to develop a nuclear weapons capability and their threat to close the Straits of Hormuz, among others.

Our goal throughout this bill is to provide the resources to support our warfighters now and in the future, whenever the next crisis arises.

Madam Chairman, our subcommittee, like other Appropriations subcommittees, clearly recognizes the Nation's debt and deficit and found areas and programs where reductions are possible without adversely impacting our Armed Forces and our modernization efforts. Frankly, it is important that we find savings without harming readiness or increasing the risks incurred by our warfighters.

Under Chairman YOUNG's leadership, our committee has had a close examination of military needs and very necessary oversight, so our legislation before us includes funding for critical national security and intelligence needs based on a very strong hearing process. In addition, the bill provides essential funding for health and quality of life programs for all of our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—and their families. They deserve nothing less.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership, and I strongly support the bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chairman, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and the gentleman from Indiana on an issue regarding timeliness, accuracy, and the review of security clearance processing.

As the chairman is aware, security clearances are necessary to protect our national security and are required for thousands of jobs. However, the length of time it takes to conduct the investigations, the quality of the investigations, and the continuous review of approved security clearances are three areas that could be improved. I believe that there is a solution to all three of these concerns, and it involves the leveraging of automated investigation tools already in existence.

The Defense Department has within its subordinate activities the Defense Personnel Security Research Center, known as PERSEREC. It has researched and developed a number of automated toolsets that can reduce the time it takes to adjudicate investigations, to grade the quality of the investigations, to measure human error, and to provide a way to monitor and reaffirm granted clearances based on an analysis of human behavior.

These computer programs could dramatically increase the quality of the investigations while at the same time saving money and shortening the time it takes to both approve and reinvestigate security clearances. These tools are already available today, but they have not been leveraged. Instead, the majority of security clearances is being investigated by an antiquated analog adjudication process that just doesn't reflect the best research and development readily available to the Department of Defense by PERSEREC.

I greatly appreciate that the chairman and ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee have included report language encouraging the Department of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management to use these automated tools and systems readily available for the security clearance process.

Would my colleagues agree that the security clearance process should incorporate proven tools that ensure increased efficiency and quality?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would note to the gentleman from California that, with the recent concerns regarding security clearance processes for the Department of Defense and intelligence communities, I appreciate his bringing to our attention that the Department can increase the timeliness and quality of investigations and reinvestigations by using the Defense Personnel Security Research Center tools.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for his response.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I am aware of the gentleman from California's deep interest, and I appreciate his proposed solution in finding ways to address this issue.

Like my good friend from Indiana, I agree that we should work with our friend Mr. FARR to ensure that the Department of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence leverage the security clearance research at PERSEREC in order to improve the precision and speed of investigations, and that is exactly why we included it in our report.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. TURNER. I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to enter into a colloquy.

Madam Chair, I rise to speak about the Abrams tank. The Appropriations Committee has wisely included funding in the last 2 years for continuing to upgrade the Abrams tank. That action kept the Abrams production line warm and preserved a critical industrial capability. However, there is no funding, as I understand it, in the FY 2014 Defense appropriations bill for additional tank upgrades.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The administration's budget request for fiscal year 2014 includes no funds for the production of Abrams tanks, and the committee bill provides none. The Army is only now addressing the funds added for fiscal year '13, and production of the M1A2s will actually continue until December of 2014.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chair, in reclaiming my time, I understand that, earlier in the year, both the administration and others believed that foreign military sales alone may be sufficient to keep this production line running. Those sales have not yet materialized, and I remain concerned that we are risking a critical national asset based solely on the anticipation of foreign sales.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Foreign military sales have helped sustain a warm tank production line. Despite the delays and uncertainties in the FMS process, it is very likely that FMS sales will continue to play an important part in sustaining the tank line.

Mr. TURNER. In reclaiming my time, I understand that the committee intends to wait until the Army announces its force structure changes and then will assess the need for additional upgraded tanks. While I respect that position, I think that, with whatever changes the Army makes, we will still need to keep that smaller force as effective as possible. The way to ensure that is to provide all remaining Armored Brigade Combat Teams with M1A2 SEP tanks.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the points raised by my colleague.

We will continue to monitor the overall requirement for tanks in both the active Army and the Army National Guard. We intend to relook at the issue of additional Abrams upgrades as we move forward in the appropriations process. We will have the benefit of more complete information on foreign military sales and of the Army's force structure analysis. Protecting the industrial base will remain a critical issue.

Mr. TURNER. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his continued interest and for his support in this matter.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I know my friend from Florida shares my concerns regarding our Nation's nuclear deterrents and specifically in preserving the sea-based leg of the Nuclear Triad in the Trident II D5 submarine launched ballistic missiles, which are carried on the Ohio-class submarine.

The current fleet of ballistic missile submarines is planned for service through the year 2042, and the D5 missile they carry is expected to remain viable much longer and will see service on the replacement platform. I hope the chairman agrees.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I do agree and the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In reclaiming my time, the original design life of the D5 missile rocket motors was 25 years. Some of the currently deployed motors are reaching that age, and the missiles require a life extension to maintain viability.

Does the chairman agree that the life extension program for the D5 missile is critical to ensure the missile will remain the highest level of reliability for as long as our Nation requires it?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I will tell the gentleman that I do agree. I would add that the ending of the Space Shuttle Program has also exacerbated the hardships of the industrial base, and I agree that the Navy's D5 program is now the cornerstone of the Nation's solid rocket motor production.

I feel that it is essential that the Navy sustain a steady production rate of 12 rocket motors per year as the minimum level to ensure that replacement motors are available to replace aged-out motors as well as to keep this unique and highly skilled engineering and workforce viable into the future. The industrial base has done a Herculean effort in downsizing and in becoming more efficient in the face of the declining workload as enhanced by the attractive pricing they provided the Navy on a recent motor contract.

I will work to ensure that the Navy has sufficient funding to maintain at least the minimum production required to sustain this critical industrial base.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman and compliment him on his great work on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. As we have no further speakers, Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I am happy to 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, and the bill shall be considered read through page 157, line 2.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2397

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, 2014, 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, $40,908,919,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $27,671,555,000.

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, $12,826,857,000.

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, $28,382,963,000.

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, $4,483,343,000.

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, $1,875,536,000.

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, $665,499,000.

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, $1,745,579,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $7,958,568,000.

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, $3,130,361,000.

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, $35,183,796,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $15,055,000 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, $40,127,402,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $6,298,757,000.

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, $37,438,701,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $32,301,685,000: *Provided*, That not more than $25,000,000 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 $36,262,000 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 $8,721,000, 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.

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, $3,199,151,000.

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, $1,200,283,000.

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, $266,561,000.

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, $3,149,046,000.

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), $7,102,113,000.

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, $6,675,999,000.

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, $13,606,000, 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, $298,815,000, 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, $316,103,000, 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, $439,820,000, to remain available until transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $10,757,000, 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, $262,443,000, 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), $109,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

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, $528,455,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, $51,031,000.

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, $5,236,653,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $1,628,083,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $1,545,560,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $1,465,937,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $6,467,751,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $17,092,784,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $3,017,646,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $544,116,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

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

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $944,866,000;

Virginia Class Submarine, $3,880,704,000;

Virginia Class Submarine (AP), $2,354,612,000;

CVN Refuelings, $1,609,324,000;

CVN Refuelings (AP), $245,793,000;

DDG–1000 Program, $231,694,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer, $1,615,564,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer (AP), $388,551,000;

Littoral Combat Ship, $1,793,014,000;

Afloat Forward Staging Base (AP), $562,000,000;

Joint High Speed Vessel, $10,332,000;

Moored Training Ship, $207,300,000;

LCAC Service Life Extension Program, $80,987,000;

For Outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $450,163,000; and

For Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding Programs, $625,800,000.

In all: $15,000,704,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2018, 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, $6,824,824,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $1,271,311,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $10,860,606,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $5,267,119,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $743,442,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $16,791,497,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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, $4,522,990,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016.

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), $75,135,000, 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, $7,961,486,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $15,368,352,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: *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, $24,947,354,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

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, $17,885,538,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015: *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.

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, $246,800,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,545,827,000.

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, $595,700,000, 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, $33,573,582,000; of which $31,566,688,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed one percent shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015 and of which up to $15,969,816,000 may be available for contracts entered into under the TRICARE program; of which $671,181,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016, shall be for procurement; and of which $1,335,713,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2015, 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 made available under this Act for research, development, test and evaluation, procurement, or operation and maintenance for the Defense Health Agency, not more than 25 percent may be used until the date on which the program plan for the oversight and execution of the integrated electronic health record program required by subtitle C of title VII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 is submitted to Congress.

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, $1,057,123,000, of which $451,572,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, of which no less than $51,217,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, consisting of $21,489,000 for activities on military installations and $29,728,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, to assist State and local governments; $1,368,000 shall be for procurement, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which $1,368,000 shall be for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program to assist State and local governments; and $604,183,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be for research, development, test and evaluation, of which $584,238,000 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, $1,007,762,000: *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.

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, $347,000,000, of which $346,000,000 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 $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, 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, $552,535,000.

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 $4,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: *Provided further*, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section shall be made prior to June 30, 2014: *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 2014: *Provided*, That the report shall include—

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

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

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

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

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

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

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

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

E–2D Advanced Hawkeye, SSN 774 Virginia class submarine, KC-130J, C-130J, HC-130J, MC-130J, AC-130J aircraft, Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System Ground-Based

Interceptors, and government furnished equipment.

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 2014, 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 2015 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (c) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2015.

(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 in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter 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 $39,532,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which—

(1) $28,400,000 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) $10,200,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force''; and

(3) $932,000 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 2014 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 2014, 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 2015 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year and the associated budget estimates.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $40,000,000.

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 2014. 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 2015 budget request for the Department of Defense, as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2015 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 2015 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, 2015: *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 (50 U.S.C. 3093) shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

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.

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 the 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 accompanying 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.

(RESCISSIONS)

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

''National Defense Sealift Fund, 2011/XXXX'', $28,000,000;

''National Defense Sealift Fund, 2012/XXXX'', $14,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2012/2014'', $30,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $443,000,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2012/2014'', $10,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2013/2015'', $85,000,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2013/2015'', $5,000,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2013/2017'': CVN-71, $68,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy, 2013/2015'', $3,553,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps, 2013/2015'', $12,650,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2013/2015'', $60,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2013/2015'', $38,900,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide, 2013/2015'', $72,776,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2013/2014'', $380,861,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 2013/2014'', $49,331,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2013/2014'', $115,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, 2013/2014'', $213,000,000;

''Ship Modernization Operations and Sustainment Fund, 2013/2014'', $1,414,500,000.

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'', $108,725,800 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 2014.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8068. During the current fiscal year, not to exceed $200,000,000 from funds available under ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to the Department of State ''Global Security Contingency Fund'': *Provided*, 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 to the Department of State ''Global Security Contingency Fund'', notify the congressional defense committees in writing with the source of funds and a detailed justification, execution plan, and timeline for each proposed project.

SEC. 8069. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, $4,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, to remain available for obligation until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that it shall serve the national interest, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8070. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the headings ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' and ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $489,091,000 shall be for the Israeli Cooperative Programs: *Provided*, That of this amount, $220,309,000 shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats; $149,712,000 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; $74,707,000 shall be available for an upper-tier component to the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture, and $44,363,000 shall be available for the Arrow System Improvement Program including development of a long range, ground and airborne, detection suite: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SEC. 8071. (a) 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.

(b) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be obligated to modify command and control relationships to give United States Transportation Command operational and administrative control of C–130 and KC–135 forces assigned to the Pacific and European Air Force Commands.

(c) The command and control relationships in subsections (a) and (b) which existed on March 13, 2011, shall remain in force unless changes are specifically authorized in a subsequent Act.

(d) This subsection does not apply to administrative control of Navy Air and Missile Defense Command.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8072. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $625,800,000 shall be available until September 30, 2014, 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, 2007/2014'': LHA Replacement Program $37,700,000; and

(2) Under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2008/2014'': Carrier Replacement Program $588,100,000.

SEC. 8073. 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. 3094) during fiscal year 2014 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

SEC. 8074. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that creates or initiates a new program, project, or activity unless such program, project, or activity must be undertaken immediately in the interest of national security and only after written prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8075. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2015 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. 8076. 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. 8077. 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. 8078. 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. 8079. 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. 8080. (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. 8081. 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 provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8082. 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. 8083. (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 Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in order to support the Secretary of Defense in matters relating to the employment of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEC. 8084. 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. 8085. 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, 2015.

SEC. 8086. 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. 8087. (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 2014: *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.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8088. Of the funds appropriated in the Intelligence Community Management Account for the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment, $20,000,000 is available for transfer by the Director of National Intelligence to other departments and agencies for purposes of Government-wide information sharing activities: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget must approve any transfers made under this provision.

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. 3024(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. 3024(d)) that results in a cumulative increase or decrease of

the levels specified in the classified annex accompanying this 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 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 may be available for the purpose of making remittances and transfers 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 $143,087,000, 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, concluded cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds, to remain available until expended, to support critical existing and enduring military installation and missions on Guam, as well as any potential Department of Defense growth: (1) $133,700,000 for addressing the need for civilian water and wastewater improvements, and (2) $12,868,000 for construction of a regional public health laboratory: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating funds for either of the forgoing 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 2,500 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.

SEC. 8104. The Secretary of Defense shall report quarterly 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. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to study alternatives, plan, prepare, or otherwise take any action to—

(1) separate the budget, accounts, or disbursement system for the National Intelligence Program from the budget, accounts, or disbursement system for the Department of Defense; or

(2) consolidate the budget, accounts, or disbursement system for the National Intelligence Program within the budget, accounts, or disbursement system for the Department of Defense.

(b) The activities prohibited under subsection (a) include—

(1) the study, planning, preparation, or submission of a budget request that modifies the appropriations account structures as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act for any Department of Defense account containing funds for the National Intelligence Program;

(2) the establishment of a new appropriations account for part or all of the National Intelligence Program;

(3) the study or implementation of a funds disbursement system for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and

(4) any other action to study, prepare, or submit a budget request to Congress that includes any modifications prohibited by this section.

(c) In this section:

(1) The term ''account'' includes an appropriations account.

(2) The term ''disbursement system'' includes any system with accounting, cost accrual, fund distribution, or disbursement functions.

(3) The term ''National Intelligence Program'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(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, 2014.

SEC. 8107. 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, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8108. (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 Guantánamo 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 Guantánamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(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 Guantánamo 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 re-engage 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 Guantánamo 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, Guantánamo 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 Guantánamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(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 paragraph 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 paragraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) In assessing the risk that an individual detained at Guantánamo will engage in terrorist activity or other actions that could affect the security of the United States if released for the purpose of making a certification under subsection (b) or a waiver under subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may give favorable consideration to any such individual—

(1) who has substantially cooperated with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities, pursuant to a pre- trial agreement, while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(2) for whom agreements and effective mechanisms are in place, to the extent relevant and necessary, to provide for continued cooperation with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities.

(f) 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 Guantánamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantánamo 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, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

(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. 8109. (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, Guantánamo 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, Guantánamo 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, Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 8110. 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 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. 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 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. 8112. 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. 8113. 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 (Public Law 110–457; 22 U.S.C. 2370c–1), and except if such assistance is otherwise permitted under section 404 of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008.

SEC. 8114. 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. 8115. The Secretary of the Air Force shall obligate and expend funds previously appropriated for the procurement of RQ–4B Global Hawk aircraft for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated.

SEC. 8116. The total amount available in the Act for pay for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014 shall be the amount otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act for such pay reduced by $437,000,000.

SEC. 8117. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

SEC. 8118. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person or other entity listed in the Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)/System for Award Management (SAM) as having been convicted of fraud against the Federal Government.

SEC. 8119. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of Defense may be used for the purchase of any equipment from Rosoboronexport until the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge—

(1) Rosoboronexport is cooperating fully with the Defense Contract Audit Agency;

(2) Rosoboronexport has not delivered S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles to Syria; and

(3) no new contracts have been signed between the Bashar al Assad regime in Syria and Rosoboronexport since January 1, 2013.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that the waiver in order to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport is in national security interest of the United States.

(2) REPORT.—If the Secretary waives the limitation in subsection (a) pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 30 days before purchasing equipment from Rosoboronexport pursuant to the waiver, a report on the waiver. The report shall be submitted in classified or unclassified form, at the election of the Secretary. The report shall include the following:

(A) An explanation why it is in the national security interest of the United States to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport.

(B) An explanation why comparable equipment cannot be purchased from another corporation.

(C) An assessment of the cooperation of Rosoboronexport with the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

(D) An assessment of whether and how many S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles have been delivered to the Assad regime by Rosoboronexport.

(E) A list of the contracts that Rosoboronexport has signed with the Assad regime since January 1, 2013.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITIVELY BID CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall award any contract that will use United States funds for the procurement of helicopters for the Afghan Security Forces using competitive procedures based on requirements developed by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 8120. Section 8159(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107-117, 10 U.S.. 2401a note) is amended by striking paragraph (7).

SEC. 8121. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purchase or manufacture of a flag of the United States unless such flags are treated as covered items under section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8122. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act, $25,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer to the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, for purposes of implementation of a Sexual Assault Special Victims Program: *Provided*, That funds transferred under this provision are to be merged with and available for the same purposes and time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8123. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the amendments made to the Uniform Code of Military Justice in subtitle D of title V of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 regarding the discharge or dismissal of a member of the Armed Forces convicted of certain sex-related offenses, the required trial of such offenses by general courts-martial, and the limitations imposed on convening authority discretion regarding court-martial findings and sentence.

SEC. 8124. None of the funds appropriated in this, or any other Act, may be obligated or expended by the United States Government for the direct personal benefit of the President of Afghanistan.

SEC. 8125. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate or reduce funding for a program, project or activity as proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015 until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming or transfer provisions of this Act.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8126. In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act for pay for military personnel, including Reserve and National Guard personnel, $580,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and made available for transfer only to military personnel accounts.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army'', $6,703,006,000: *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, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', $558,344,000: *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'', $1,019,322,000: *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'', $867,087,000: *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'', $40,952,000: *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'', $20,238,000: *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'', $15,134,000: *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'', $20,432,000: *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'', $393,364,000: *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'', $6,919,000: *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'', $30,929,633,000: *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.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $6,255,993,000, of which up to $227,033,000 may be transferred to the Coast Guard ''Operating Expenses'' account notwithstanding section 2215 of title 10, United States Code: *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'', $2,669,815,000: *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'', $10,605,224,000: *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'', $6,240,437,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not to exceed $1,500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, 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, and post-operation Iraq border security related to the activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq, 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 to the appropriate congressional committees 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 of the funds provided under this heading, $35,000,000 shall be made available for support for foreign forces participating in operations to counter the Lord's Resistance Army efforts: *Provided further*, That such amount in this section 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 RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $42,935,000: *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 RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $55,700,000: *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'', $12,534,000: *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'', $32,849,000: *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'', $199,371,000: *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'', $22,200,000: *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 $1,073,800,000 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 2014 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'', $279,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *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.

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Afghanistan Security Forces Fund'', $7,726,720,000, 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 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 obligations: *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 the United States may accept equipment procured using funds provided under this heading in this or prior Acts that was transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan and returned by such forces to the United States: *Provided further*, That the equipment described in the previous proviso, as well as equipment not yet transferred to the security forces of Afghanistan when determined by the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to no longer be required for transfer to such forces, may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon written notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, not less than $47,300,000 shall be for recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces: *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.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $771,788,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $154,532,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $190,382,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $909,825,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $240,696,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $86,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $169,362,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $17,968,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $125,984,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $188,868,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $24,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $137,826,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $2,524,846,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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'', $128,947,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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 AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2016: *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 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'', $7,000,000, 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, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $34,426,000, 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, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $9,000,000, 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, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $66,208,000, 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.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for ''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $264,910,000: *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'', $904,201,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *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'', $376,305,000, 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.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the ''Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund'', $1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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.

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 2014.

(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 $4,000,000,000 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, 2014.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs and costs for design during construction 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 and costs for design during construction 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 $60,000,000 of the amount appropriated by this Act 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 $63,800,000 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 by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' up to $209,000,000 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, and site closeout activities prior to returning sites to the Government of Iraq: *Provided*, That to the extent authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the operations and activities that may be carried out by the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, include non-operational training activities in support of Iraqi Ministry of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days following the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for transitioning any such training activities that they determine are needed after the end of fiscal year 2013, to existing or new contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services consistent with the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notification containing a detailed justification and timeline for the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq at each site where such operations and activities will be conducted during fiscal year 2013.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9013.

Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following account in the specified amount: *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, 2009/XXXX'', $46,022,000.

SEC. 9014. (a) 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) implementing policies to protect judicial independence and due process of law;

(6) issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan; and

(7) providing humanitarian organizations access to detainees, internally displaced persons, and other Pakistani civilians affected by the conflict.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction in paragraph (a) 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: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, exercises the authority of the previous proviso, the Secretaries shall report to the Committees on Appropriations on both the justification for the waiver and on the requirements of this section that the Government of Pakistan was not able to meet: *Provided further*,

That such report may be submitted in classified form if necessary.

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.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–170, the amendment described in section 2 of House Resolution 312, and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of that resolution.

Each amendment printed in House Report 113–170 may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

After disposition of amendments printed in House Report 113–170 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 312, it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer an amendment reducing funding levels in the bill.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in House Report 113–170 not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, there shall be in order a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1500

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chairman, in light of recent events in Benghazi and North Africa, the Pentagon approved the development of the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force for Crisis Response to function under United States African Command. This task force is specifically tailored for crisis response in Africa, and in April deployed to Spain and Italy.

The unit is capable of responding to a wide range of military operations and will provide limited defense crisis response in support of embassies, support non-combatant evacuation operations, provide humanitarian assistance, and assist with disaster relief operations, search and rescue, and other missions as directed.

As this force is ramping up, I believe we need to ensure that this valid and important mission is completely and adequately funded.

With the rise of Islamic militant groups in Mali, Nigeria and Somalia, and continued unrest in Egypt, Libya and Algeria, the threat is real and growing.

The committee has added funds for sustainment and follow-up deployments in fiscal year 2014, but there are substantial concerns that the need may be higher. Funding for this force was not requested in the President's budget, but was included in the House-passed NDAA. I'm hopeful that in establishing a funding source and signaling congressional willingness to support this mission, the Marine Corps will be better able to assess their needs and provide us with a more exact funding request.

To work towards a sure state of readiness, I'm offering this budget-neutral amendment to increase this funding by $10 million while reducing funding to the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account by $11 million. During consideration of the NDAA last month, an amendment was adopted by voice vote that would increase authorization for the crisis response force by a similar amount.

To provide an additional military response in case of another Benghazi-type situation, we must ensure that the special purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force, Crisis Response can properly respond to threats to our diplomatic posts in an expeditious manner.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, for the reasons that the gentleman has already outlined, the committee had already added $30 million for the special purpose MAGTF, Crisis Response teams, as well as an additional $35 million for the new Marine Corps Embassy Security program.

The gentleman is exactly right that we're not doing enough on this issue, and we are certainly in support of his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The 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 $25,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DELANEY. Madam Chairman, my amendment responds to a common dilemma facing our military families, a dilemma that is deeply unfortunate, but easily solvable.

When our warfighters and veterans head to the hospital, their families often face a choice between being there or paying their bills. This means that too often our military heroes are in the hospital alone without the support of their family. They deserve better.

This amendment will increase funding for Fisher Houses, which provides free housing for the families of patients receiving care at military and VA hospitals. This additional funding is offset by a corresponding reduction to the defense-wide operation and maintenance account.

Thanks to Fisher Houses, when our heroes are in the hospital, their families have a place to stay. Thanks to Fisher Houses, when our military families need our support, we lend them a helping hand, a home away from home.

This program is not only compassionate, but it's cost effective. Since 1990, over 180,000 families have been served by Fisher Houses, saving military families over $200 million. However, you can't put a price tag on the emotional, psychological, and spiritual value these homes provide.

After 2 years, we have seen resources strained and backlogs develop. We can't expect better results without improving our support structure. This amendment would lead to the construction of at least four new Fisher Houses next year. Four new homes means lodging for 2,000 military family members. That's 2,000 sons, daughters, wives, husbands, brothers, and sisters that

can be by the side of our military heroes during their most significant time of need.

No veteran, no servicemember should head to the hospital alone. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I claim the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the Fisher Houses program is a real success story. It was initially started by Mr. Zach Fisher. After his death, the family continued.

The need was so great at the military hospitals; but also at the VA hospitals, there were no Fisher Houses. So the program was expanded, and we increased our involvement. The Congress had not been involved up to this point. The Congress appropriated money, and we've been appropriating $4 million a year to add to the Fisher House Foundation for the purpose of the Fisher Houses. We also allow for $11 million for transfers to the Fisher House operations.

I say, again, it's a real success story; and while it's additional money, we're happy to support the gentleman's amendment and make sure that the Fisher Houses continue.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do not rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, but to cast a caution over the expenditure of the proposed funds. The bill contains $4 million, and this is a phenomenal program. I am not in any way suggesting otherwise.

But the gentleman's amendment is quadrupling funding in 1 year for this project from $4 million to $20 million. So I would hope that the people that are running this program understand that in a time of great fiscal constraint, they better very carefully, effectively, and wisely spend this additional money that I'm not objecting to, but I am very concerned about quadrupling $4 million that is already in a bill for a very good program.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Delaney amendment.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I understand the important role that Fisher Houses play in supporting members of our armed services, our Nation's veterans, and their families.

In southern Nevada, a brand new VA hospital opened recently to serve the 154,000 veterans who live in our area. Just north of the hospital, there is land that has already been dedicated to a brand new Fisher House. I support this amendment because it will allow Fisher House Foundation to build an extra four houses this year, including the one in Las Vegas, helping an extra 2,000 families.

The Fisher House Foundation received an A-plus rating from the American Institute of Philanthropy, so we know that our money is being used efficiently and effectively to make a meaningful difference in the lives of our heroes and their families.

I look forward to a day when members of the armed services and our veterans will all have their families close to them as they receive medical care at these facilities, including the new hospital in Las Vegas.

Mr. DELANEY. I appreciate the comments of my colleagues and the support of my colleagues.

As I have no other comments, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The 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 $104,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $104,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The U.S. Navy has acknowledged a growing problem that threatens its dominance at sea. It's strike reach is shrinking and aging, while potential enemies' attack reach is growing and modernizing. We recognize this most specifically within the Asia-Pacific region. It's because of this growing recognition that the Navy is exploring new weapons in order to successfully execute our strategic rebalance of military assets to the Asia-Pacific region.

A longstanding Navy urgent operational needs statement and related intelligence estimates detail a troubling capability and readiness gap that have compelled the Secretary of Defense to direct accelerated development of an over-the-horizon surface warfare missile that can be launched from aircraft or surface vessels and strike well-defended moving maritime targets.

Currently, surface-launched anti-ship missiles face the growing challenge of penetrating sophisticated enemy air defense systems from long range and present the potential for large no-go zones, which deny the Navy access in key conflict areas.

The military expects our adversaries will continue their development of increasingly sophisticated anti-access area denial capabilities that are able to jam or destroy GPS systems which guide our missiles. This clearly highlights the need for the offensive anti-surface warfare weapon, as well as the long-range anti-ship missile, which has a requirement of independently detecting and validating the target that it was shot at.

In authorizing the full request in the President's budget, the House Armed Services Committee noted the need for a new generation of anti-ship weapons capable of penetrating sophisticated enemy air defense systems from long range and said such a capability is even more relevant today and is critical to meeting national security objectives and rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. By providing these new capabilities, we allow our Navy to safely engage and destroy high-value targets well beyond the potential counterfire range of the adversaries that they may face.

I recently received a letter from Admiral Locklear, commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, who's at the forefront of this rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region, noting the importance of these two weapons. He expressed deep concern about the reductions proposed by the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee and said that such reductions will derail the efforts of Pacific Command to outpace an expanding threat, increasingly degrade our regional response options, and potentially erode regional confidence in our commitment to the rebalance. We can and must do all that we can to correct the significant strategic and operational risks that these budget cuts present at this critical juncture.

I urge you to support the President's budget request, as well as the authorization that the House Armed Services Committee approved, in order to keep this essential element of our Asia-Pacific rebalance on track for fielding.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and ask for their support as I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I would like a clarification on the time issues.

Since the time is structured, is it possible for the person offering the amendment to reserve that time when they have completed their statement?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman may reserve.

□ 1515

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I claim the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, very simply, most of this

money would be taken from the Special Operations Command funding. It's not a good idea. We're using the Special Operators more and more, all the time. We are finding them involved in places where you might be surprised, and I just don't think it is wise for us to be taking this funding from Special Operations. Special Operations are the Navy SEALs and the Special teams that go into difficult places. We prefer not to put limitations that this amendment would cause.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. My understanding as well during subcommittee consideration is that the new START proposed—and this is a new START proposed for 2014—provide very little explanation or rationale, and that's from the Department of Defense. The committee recommendation was for a reduction because of the poor justification by the Department itself. I think I am correct in my understanding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, a couple of points I would like to clarify. This amendment proposes that the offset come from the O&M Defense-wide account, but makes up less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire amount requested in funding for that.

With regards to the justification for the timing of this issue, the letter from Admiral Locklear—the contents of that letter recognize the effectiveness and the necessity of these programs, and are looking really to bypass normal acquisition processes due to the urgent need that they have identified there within the region, which is why I am strongly asking my colleagues to consider supporting this amendment.

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

COMMANDER,
U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND,
Camp H.M. Smith, HI, July 18, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Chairman, Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) is at the forefront of executing key aspects of our strategic rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. The complexity of the operational environment and the pace of emerging potential threats in this theater demand a responsive and credible joint force to reassure our friends, dissuade adversaries, and defend our national interests. To that end, I want to ensure you are aware that proposed reductions in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 budget for Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare (OASuW) capability (PE 0604786N) introduces significant strategic and operational risk at a time-critical juncture in our rebalance.

Specifically, my FY 2015–2019 Integrated Priority List (IPL), a long-standing Navy OASuW Urgent Operational Needs Statement, and related intelligence estimates detail a particularly troubling capability and readiness gap that compelled the Deputy Secretary of Defense to direct accelerated (2018) fielding of the Long Range Anti-Ship Missile (LRASM). If enacted, the reductions proposed in the FY 2014 budget for OASuW/LRASM will derail our efforts to outpace an expanding threat, increasingly constrain our regional response options, and potentially erode regional confidence in our commitment to the rebalance.

I urge you to support the President's Budget request and reconsider the proposed OASuW/LRASM reductions in order to keep this vital program on track for FY 2018 fielding. Thank you for your continued support of USPACOM and this essential element of our Asia-Pacific rebalance.

Sincerely,

S.J. LOCKLEAR, III.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Page 34, line 15, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this amendment would increase the Defense health program account by $10 million in order to fund a cure for Gulf War illness. Currently, there is no cure for Gulf War illness, and it affects over a third of the veterans who served in the first Gulf War.

This amendment is identical to an amendment offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, this amendment actually will reduce total outlays by $1 million.

Veterans of the first Gulf War suffer from persistent symptoms, including chronic headaches, widespread pain, cognitive difficulties, debilitating fatigue, gastrointestinal problems, respiratory symptoms, and other abnormalities that are not explained by traditional medicine or psychiatric diagnoses.

Research shows that as veterans from the first Gulf War age, they are twice as likely to develop Lou Gehrig's disease as their nondeployed peers. There also may be connections to multiple sclerosis and Parkinson's disease. Sadly, there are no known treatments for the lifelong pain and affliction that these veterans must endure through this disease.

For decades, the Veterans Administration has downplayed any neurological basis for this disease, but recent research just this year has shown unequivocally that this disease is biological in nature. The time has come to right the wrong that our servicemen and -women have had to live with for over 20 years.

In this Department of Defense appropriations bill, we allocate more money for breast cancer, orthopedic, and prostate cancer research than we do for finding a cure for Gulf War illness. Equivalent funds are appropriated for ovarian cancer research.

Personally, I think if we are going to spend money on medical research within the Department of Defense, the Department must adequately fund research on those diseases that originate in war and wholly affect our servicemen and -women. Over a quarter of a million veterans display symptoms of this disease, and the time has come to find and fund a cure for it.

The offset for my amendment today comes from the $32 million Operation and Maintenance Defense-wide account, and that account is funded $500 million above the amount in last year's DOD appropriations bill.

Congress has responsibility to ensure that the Gulf War veterans, who put it all on the line and are paying for that with a lifetime of pain, are not left behind.

I urge my colleagues, including my esteemed colleague from Florida, to support this amendment and help to find a cure for Gulf War illness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I claim the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, although we're going to support this amendment from my colleague from Florida, I take this time to point out that we've already included an additional $20 million for the program, the same amount that was included in fiscal year 2013. Prior to 2013, the subcommittee typically included $8 million to $10 million annually for this program. But this bill, this year for 2014, has an additional $20 million, but it is a serious issue, and it is one that we can't take lightly, and so we do support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for accelerating the efforts to find a cure for this disease. I am very grateful to him, and so are thousands of veterans.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The 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 $10,000,000) (increased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I will be very brief. This is a bipartisan amendment offered by my colleague from New York, the gentleman from the Second Congressional District, Congressman PETER KING, and myself, to transfer $10 million to mental health programs within the Department of Defense. It is fully offset.

Madam Chair, 22 veterans every day are committing suicide; 273,000 veterans have been diagnosed with traumatic brain injury since 2000; and the pace of post-traumatic stress disorder is going to require new thinking, new innovations, new technologies, new partnerships, and collaborations. That's exactly what this bipartisan amendment crafted by Congressman KING and myself does.

This amendment creates new public-private partnerships between the Department of Defense and teaching hospitals and research institutions for the research, the treatment, and outreach on military mental health matters. This is not a matter of partisanship, this is a matter of doing the right thing for our veterans. It was my honor to work together on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, actually, this amendment moves money around within the Defense health program for something the committee has worked a long and hard time over the years dealing with: the subject of traumatic brain injury and psychological health research. In fact, we included an additional $125 million in the bill above the President's request because of the importance of the issue that we're facing. We are seeing more and more cases of TBI, traumatic brain injuries, than we had expected, I believe. So we added the additional money that the gentleman's amendment would move around in the DHP, so we have absolutely no problem with this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I also appreciate having the time to associate myself with the remarks you have made on behalf of the gentleman's amendment.

Secondly, I note, as you point out, the subcommittee itself has done significant work and recognizes the problems that we face in the commitment we need to make to the individuals that the gentleman is trying to help with his amendment. So again, I very much appreciate the gentleman's remarks, as well as support for the issue in this particular amendment.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I would just close by thanking the gentleman from Florida, the chair, and the ranking member for their cooperation. This amendment is so vitally important to those who are fighting for our freedom.

In this amendment, we defend the defenders and we protect the protectors, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 312, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 6, 32, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, and 82 printed in House Report 113–170, offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF FLORIDA

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $38,000,000)''.

Page 143, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

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

Page 34, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE OF OKLAHOMA

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 13, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

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

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

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

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $19,000,000)''.

Page 143, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

Page 126, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $27,500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the en bloc amendment has been agreed to by the minority and the majority. They are noncontroversial amendments that cover topics such as suicide prevention, traumatic brain injury, and National Guard issues. The sponsors of the amendments have agreed to the amendments being considered en bloc, and I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Within this en bloc includes an amendment that highlights a very troubling breakdown within the Department of Defense, how they collect and process their personnel data.

Our brave men and women who are deployed overseas rely on the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to give them assurance that they won't need to worry about a foreclosure on their house, a lease being terminated, or outstanding credit card debt. We ask significant sacrifices from our troops, and this is a needed helping hand at a time when they are rightfully focused on serving their Nation.

In order to provide these protections, financial institutions are required by law to consult the Department of Defense's data system to validate servicemembers' deployment. This system is called the Defense Manpower Data Center, or DMDC.

I've heard from a number of stakeholders that the DMDC is riddled with inaccuracies because each service feeds their own data into the database, with no standardization between services, and much of it was originally entered by hand, with little-to-no quality assurance.

Obviously this creates a significant problem. We need our financial institutions to have accurate data so that troops can get the benefits provided by law.

I'm extremely concerned about the reliability of this data for the purposes of SCRA compliance and, for that matter, any other personnel process affected by the DOD. Going forward, I hope we can work together to address this serious data problem within the DOD.

My amendment would cut $1 million to the Defense Human Resources Activity Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account, and reinsert that funding into the exact same place, with the intent of encouraging a study on how the Defense Human Resources Activity components and the CIO identify, catalog, process, communicate and rectify mistakes or inconsistencies found when data is uploaded to the DMDC.

I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for working with me on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, this amendment considered en bloc would provide the Department of Defense the flexibility to train and equip wildlife reserve rangers to help combat illicit poaching across the African continent. Poaching and wildlife trafficking are not only a matter of conservation but a matter of international security.

As the ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee, I'm deeply troubled by the damaging impact poaching has on the economic stability of African nations. During my travels, African heads of state and ambassadors have expressed that poaching erodes the tourism industry, public safety, and regional security.

Various newspapers have reported that poaching and wildlife traffickers are more dangerous and militarized than ever before, with armed militias like Kony's Lord's Resistance Army and al Qaeda affiliates fueling conflicts with the profits from poached ivory and other animal products.

The Department of Defense can play a leading role in helping to provide the training required to protect wildlife and put an end to regional conflicts and instability fueled by poaching. Training in reconnaissance, apprehension, and effective field communication will better prepare park rangers.

I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, it does not appear that we have any other speakers on our side, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Chair, today I rise in support for amendment #127 offered by Congressman JIM BRIDENSTINE of Oklahoma; Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina and myself to H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Our amendment would provide an additional $10 million to the National Guard State Partnership Program. It would be offset by a reduction of $11 million to the Defense Media Activity in the Defense-wide operations and maintenance account.

The amendment builds on the progress made in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 that strengthened and expanded the National Guard State Partnership Program. The National Guard provides unique capacity building capabilities to Combatant Commanders and U.S. Ambassadors via 65 comprehensive partnerships between National Guard units across the United States and partner nations. The State Partnership Program directly supports the broad national interests and security cooperation goals of the United States by engaging partner nations via military, socio-political, and economic conduits at the local; state, and national levels and these additional funds will further strengthen existing relationships as well as foster new partnerships. In particular, as we rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region the State Partnership Program offers a very visible and tangible component of that rebalance that meets both our military and diplomatic objectives in the region.

Several Combatant Commanders have testified before Congress about the importance of the State Partnership Program to meeting their strategic objectives. The program has developed from assistance and partnership with primarily Eastern European nations to a program that supports all the non-CONUS combatant commanders. Again, I believe the SPP brings unique capabilities to U.S. Pacific Command in expanding and strengthening bilateral relations with many Asian and Pacific nations. The program can help to demonstrate the U.S. commitment to the region and our allies.

The amendment provides critical resources to this cost effective and beneficial program. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $22,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(increased by $22,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, before I begin, I want to first congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Florida, and the ranking member for their important work on this legislation before us today.

Madam Chair, it's no surprise to any of us that the United States Navy, with its critical role in our national defense, faces ever-increasing global threats and a significant resource-constrained environment. To maintain undersea dominance in maritime regions of economic and military importance to the United States, the Navy requires disruptive technologies that can be rapidly developed, demonstrated, evaluated, and fielded to counter other nations' expanding undersea capabilities, and to extend the Navy's reach and persistence.

The Advanced Submarine Systems Development program supports innovative and promising undersea technologies, including Unmanned Undersea Vehicles, or UUVs, as we know them, for the delivery of new and needed capability to the undersea domain.

However, under the current acquisition plan, the Navy may not have the new technologies it needs to meet requirements in this domain until after 2020. So my amendment reduces the appropriation for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, Office of Secretary of Defense by $22 million and transfers this amendment to RDT&E, Navy, for the purpose of supporting Advanced Submarine Systems Development.

This represents a funding increase to the level authorized by the Armed Services Committee and this House in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. It has been scored as reducing outlays by $3 million by CBO.

Unmanned systems, such as the Predator in the Air Force, provide increased performance for many missions and have truly revolutionized modern warfare. Autonomous undersea vehicles can add significant capabilities to the Navy's systems and platforms and act as a force multiplier for long-endurance, hazardous, or high-threat missions where humans are limited in mission success.

In response to a question I asked at a hearing earlier this year before the Armed Services Committee, Navy Secretary Lehman stated that, and I quote:

> These underwater systems, UUVs and USVs, can be relatively more useful in undersea warfare than their airborne counterparts are to surface and air forces.
>
> While the Navy recognizes the promise of these technologies, at a time of shrinking budgets, new technologies, without existing bureaucratic and industry supporters, tend to suffer disproportionate cuts and cancellations, compared to programs with political and bureaucratic constituencies and must be actively protected by Congress.

So with this, Madam Chair, support of this program will help accelerate the integration of UUVs and other autonomous undersea technologies and payloads into the Navy for the full spectrum of military needs and potentially

speed the eventual availability of these capabilities to civilian purposes such as energy exploration and environmental monitoring, just as happened with aerial vehicles.

My amendment accomplishes this in a fully competitive way accelerating, rather than disrupting, the existing development process and enabling earlier support of COCOM-defined operational needs.

With that, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, as much as I want to support my friend's amendment, I can't, so I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, the money that he would use for a large part comes from the Special Operations Command, and I just don't think that we can restrict them, like some of the amendments that we're seeing, in their ability to move about the world as they have to move about the world and do the exciting things that they do.

But the gentleman's amendment adds $22 million to the $32 million that we already included for this program. Now, that is a 63 percent spike in funding for fiscal year 2014. That makes it very difficult for the program managers or anybody involved with the program.

To assume a 63 percent increase means there may be a lot of new jobs this year, but then the next year they'd all be fired and laid off because the money is not there. This is not a consistent program, except for the $32 million that we have included in this bill.

And so as much as I would like to support his bill, his amendment, I really can't. I just don't think the program managers can handle a 63 percent increase in this or, frankly, any program.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments that the chairman has just made. I'd just point out that in the Defense authorization bill this was authorized at the higher level. And the information I have from program managers is that they could, in fact, absorb and make important use of these funds in speeding these technologies to the warfighter and enhancing our undersea capabilities.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 34, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 34, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I'm hoping to convince my colleagues that, albeit what numbers you may have in this increasing and emerging epidemic of post-traumatic stress disorder, let me give a personal story that comes by way of my interaction often with veterans and, particularly, a post-traumatic stress disorder center that we were able to fund in a hospital that previously had not had the ability to serve Active Duty soldiers and veterans.

It's a small hospital off the campus of our main Veterans Hospital in Houston, Texas, but we established a post-traumatic stress disorder center there that allowed veterans who may not have traditionally been at the Veterans Hospital, not because they did not have benefits, but for a variety of reasons, to find a comfort place to be treated for their post-traumatic stress disorder.

And they were not just veterans of the Afghan and Iraq wars, but these were ones from the Persian Gulf, from Vietnam. And they could not thank the staff and could not thank the work that we had done to secure just a small amount of dollars, which this amendment does.

This takes a small amount of dollars from a very large funding for, certainly, a commendable challenge, but it is one that I believe would benefit, as we seek to create a better quality of life for our soldiers, wherever they might be, and our veterans.

This is a $500,000 deposit, if you will, on the high numbers of post-traumatic stress disorder. I have seen it in our returning soldiers, I have seen it in our veterans, and it is clearly something that is not going away.

I think the poignant story that I want to share is how grateful this particular veteran was, who said he had never been to treatment and his whole life had been turned around. His wife was there with him. She said their lives have been turned around.

So I ask my colleagues to consider the responsible approach that we have taken for just this amount of money to reinvest in our needy, but deserving, men and women who are both Active Duty. In the instance of the story that I gave, because this facility was able to utilize TRICARE, they could serve Active Duty, and they could serve those who were veterans as well.

□ 1545

So I thank the chairman and ranking member and urge support of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I'm not exactly sure how this is targeted or how it would support the $125 million increase already in this bill. PTSD is a serious issue. It's becoming more serious as time goes on and as our men and women return from the battlefield. And so we understand the importance of the program. We did increase it by $125 million.

This amendment, I think, is positive, and I'm not going to oppose it.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Again, I would not be opposed to the gentlewoman's amendment but would want to make the observation, given the observation I made in my opening comments, that I do wish she had chosen a different account for the offset.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, PTSD is going to be with us for a long time because there are men and women returning from the battlefield who believe they don't have PTSD or don't want to admit to the fact that they have it. I can certainly understand why they do not want that on their record. But, nevertheless, it is going to show up; and when it shows up, we need to be prepared to care for those who have fought this battle.

And so I support the gentlelady's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I'm overwhelmed and very grateful to Chairman YOUNG, my dear friend who has done so much, as well as the ranking member, likewise, for his great service. He's done so much.

Let me just conclude by saying that PTSD, as both the chairman and the ranking member have agreed, is an invisible wound that you don't often see. One of the best ways to increase access to treatment is to increase the medical facilities and also the medical professionals. These additional dollars, as I understand the intent of both the ranking member and chairman, will be used effectively.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is one of the most prevalent, devastating psychological wounds suffered by the brave men and women. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,100,000)''.

Page 30, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,100,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that I'm introducing with my colleague, Ms. GABBARD from Hawaii, that would simply restore funding to the fiscal year '13 levels for cleanup and safety in public areas.

We take great pride in the United States in our military being the best trained and most powerful fighting force in the world, but decades of military operations and training have left a toxic legacy of dangerous explosives and harmful chemicals on millions of acres in this country. The Department of Defense has an obligation to remediate these dangerous areas, often in public or residential areas, in a timely fashion. This contaminated real estate contains housing, schools, parks, and playgrounds in every State and almost every congressional district in our country.

To help the Department of Defense become a better partner for our communities and our constituents, I urge you to join me in supporting funding for a program that will employ skilled, high-tech companies to clean up these dangerous liabilities and create opportunities for economic development on land that is currently a danger.

Just last month, at the height of the tourist season, Maryland officials were forced to shut down Assateague Island after a visitor noticed unexploded ordnance, or UXO, had washed ashore. Upon further investigation, they found hundreds of pieces of UXO that were discovered and had to be detonated onsite.

Our constituents demand that the United States lead by example. Keeping our families safe requires us to return the land to productive uses by paying for and cleaning up the mess we make. The Department of Defense agrees. Before the House Budget Committee last year, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, when asked if there were a way to create a partnership between local communities and the Department of Defense, said:

> I'd be more than happy to engage you in that process. The only way to ultimately achieve savings is to be able to have the cleanup and do it expeditiously. There are lots of things I think we can do to improve the process.

I appreciated Chairman YOUNG's reply on the House floor last July. When asked if the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee could commit to helping increase funding for environmental remediation on Formerly Used Defense Sites, Chairman YOUNG said:

> I say absolutely yes. I would very much like to do this, because I believe we need to do it. We hope to have an opportunity this year to do it right.

The funding levels would restore the DERP-FUDS account to fiscal year '13 levels by redirecting $25.1 million from the Ground Combat Vehicle, a program whose utility has been called into question by the CBO and CRS. It would take a modest reduction in funding by less than one-half of 1 percent. But restoring funding to this program would still mean that funding for this vital cleanup would be less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of defense spending.

At the current rate, the estimate is that it will take 250 years to clean up these sites. I find this embarrassing, frankly. I would hope that this would be the least we could do to keep faith with people who are at risk because the military has not cleaned up after itself. It's Congress that needs to step up and provide the funding so that the Department of Defense can do what it wants to do.

I yield the balance of my time to the coauthor of this amendment, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, due to its strategic location in the Pacific, my home of Hawaii has long been at the forefront of our Nation's conflicts. We have more than 100 Formerly Used Defense Sites just as a result of a defensive buildup pre-World War I and, later, in the massive rush to mobilize in World War II. These sites, often also referred to as FUDS, can be littered with dangerous unexploded bombs and shells, in addition to harmful chemicals.

As in Hawaii, Formerly Used Sites across the country—in every State and congressional district—can serve as housing developments, schools, parks, and playgrounds, areas that can be used productively. The Army Corps of Engineers has been working diligently to clean up unexploded ordnance from many sites in Hawaii, many of which I visited myself, including 135,000-acre Waikoloa Maneuver Area on the Big Island of Hawaii. During World War II, this area was home to some 50,000 U.S. servicemembers who trained and prepared for many of the historic battles that were fought in the Pacific.

One of the places that I visited and met with many elementary and middle school students was Waimea Middle School, where unexploded ordnance has been found within the last few years by these students themselves. You are talking about 9-, 10-, 11-, 12-year-old students who have to be trained in this day and age to identify what an unexploded ordnance looks like and how to report it. This is not something that we should be facing in our society today.

The effort to clean up these Formerly Used Defense Sites not only makes our communities safer, but has a significant and positive economic impact. There have been substantial investments in the training of local people in Hawaii to do this highly skilled and often dangerous work. By training these local people, we're actually saving taxpayer dollars because we're not having to import talent, pay per diem and all these other exorbitant costs, and we're providing jobs to the local community.

I sponsor this amendment because Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the Department of Defense has the resources it needs to clean up these dangerous unexploded munitions.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This amendment would add $25 million for the purpose of restoring these Formerly Used Defense Sites by cutting the same amount from the Army RDTE account for research and development.

As important as this amendment might be, Army research and development is extremely important to the soldiers on the battlefield. In today's battlefield in Afghanistan, we're facing an enemy that is constantly moving. As we move one direction, they move another direction. As we present a new device, a new weapon, a new system, they develop a way to get around it. It's important that we continue to fund Army research and development.

The President requested $237.4 million for this purpose. We added an additional $25 million for the cleanup of these sites over the President's budget request. The funding provided in the RDTE Army account supports critical research in Army laboratories and in colleges and universities across our country to ensure that our soldiers have the best that we can provide them as they face an enemy that is constantly moving on the battlefield. Unnecessary reductions to Army research and development is just not right, especially when we have already added the additional money over and above the President's budget request.

We understand the importance of restoring these sites, but we also understand the importance of maintaining our research and development for the soldier on the battlefield to have the most advanced technology and the most advanced weapons that he or she can possibly have to carry out their mission and to protect themselves while they're doing it.

So I must oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I withdraw amendment No. 11.

The CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 11 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1600

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Madam Chair, let me, first of all, acknowledge the hard work that it takes to provide for the men and women of the United States military and to secure America. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am well aware of the combined efforts, obviously, in the military and the line of demarcation between civilian, but we all are committed to the national security of this Nation.

This amendment deals with the reduction in funding of the procurement Defense-wide by $1 million. I want to give the good news. The good news is that this money would be put in deficit reduction. But I do want to acknowledge that one of the issues that we must address as we go forward in the collective intelligence agencies, as we have listened to some of the challenges that we are facing in light of the present status of the leaks that have occurred by an American citizen who was working in the capacity as a contractor—this impacts all of us. So as this $1 million would be submitted into the deficit reduction pool, I believe it is extremely important that we look very closely at the extended use of civilian contractors, the extended use of a budget that is responsible for 70 percent of the intelligence of this country.

Now, I know that some of the contractors deal with issues that are not individual personnel, but are dealing with research and dealing with equipment. But I believe that it is important that we look at the question that resulted in the disclosure of leaked and highly sensitive classified information, and the continuing raising of concern of whether or not the national security of this Nation has been impacted because of the outsourcing of intelligence responsibility.

In particular, I think we need to look at the outsourcing of determining top secret clearance. Obviously, the circumstances that resulted in the leaking is an individual that had an interesting resume, from the educational level of a high school GED—of which we respect and encourage people to complete their education—of the military service, and then on to top secret by a contractor who gave out top secret clearances. We hope that there was some kind of review. So my amendment is intended to highlight this issue.

I would hope that as we proceed, that this question will, if you will, have the ability to slow—not halt—the use of civilian contractors out of all of our agencies dealing with the issue of intelligence. We want to assure the American people that we are concerned about the protection of this Nation's national security—civil liberties as well, but also to prevent the leaks that have occurred.

Let me conclude my remarks and let me just say that I hope this brings about a discussion that will cross jurisdictional lines of the Judiciary Committee, the Intelligence Committee, our appropriators. Let's fix this enormous use and reliance on these contractors' outsourcing. Let's develop a highly trained group of Federal Governmental professionals committed, if you will, to the ongoing service to their Nation. Respecting contractors have the same loyalty, but I think it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if we can frame the utilization of contractors in such a way that we can be assured that everything that deals with the national security of this Nation will be protected.

With that, I will withdraw the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. YOUNG and Mr. VISCLOSKY for their leadership for an important responsibility in this Nation.

My amendment increases funding for the Defense Health Program's research and development by $10 million. These funds will address the question of breast cancer in the United States military.

The American Cancer Society calls several strains of breast cancer as a particularly aggressive subtype associated with lower survival rates; in this instance, it's a triple negative. But I raise an article that says: ''Fighting a Different Battle; Breast Cancer and the Military.''

We all know, by the way, that breast cancer can affect both men and women. The bad news is breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat. Let me say that sentence again. Breast cancer has been just about as brutal on women in the military as combat. More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2011. And according to that same study, more are suspected. It grows.

The good news is that we have been working on it, and I want to add my appreciation to the military. This, however, will allow for the additional research. As new young women come into the United States military, as women stay longer in the United States military, as women get older in the United States military, as women ascend to leadership roles in the United States military, these dollars provide research.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male servicemembers, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well. With a younger and generally healthier population, those in the military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer, says Dr. Richard Clapp, a top cancer expert at Boston University who works at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on military breast cancer issues. He says life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

So, my friends, I am asking that we do the right thing. We're on the right track, we're on the right rail, we're on the right road. But with the expansion of women in the military, I can assure you, for long life, a vital service that

these men and women give, it is extremely important to move forward with this amendment.

Researchers point to a high use of oral contraception that's linked to breast cancer among women that would ensure that this particular amendment would be a positive step forward.

So I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the recognition. And I think I speak for the subcommittee when I will suggest that we would be delighted to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentlemen, and thank them for their commitment to the men and women of the United States military. And let me thank my colleagues for accepting this amendment.

With that, I know that we will be safer, secure and healthier with this fight against breast cancer that continues to grow in the United States military.

I ask my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 312, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 83, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96, printed in House Report No. 113–170, offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 126, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000) (increased by $5,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN OF ARKANSAS

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 cancel or modify the avionics modernization program of record for C–130 aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

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—

(1) plan for, consider, or carry out any action to remove any portion of the Mount Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California;

(2) convey, or authorize the conveyance of, such memorial; or

(3) plan for or accept any reimbursement for any action described in paragraph (1) or (2).

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to grant an enlistment waiver for an offense within offense code 433 (rape, sexual abuse, sexual assault, criminal sexual abuse, incest, or other sex crimes), as specified in Table 1 of the memorandum from the Under Secretary of Defense with the subject line ''Directive-Type Memorandum (DTM) 08-018—'Enlistment Waivers' '', dated June 27, 2008 (incorporating Change 3, March 20, 2013).

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. NUNES OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Air Force to reduce the force structure at Lajes Field, Azores, Portugal, below the total number of military and civilian personnel assigned to Lajes Field on October 1, 2012.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. ____. None of the Operation and Maintenance funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 41106 of title 49, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract for the purchase of an American flag if the flag is certified (pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation) as a foreign end product.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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 engage in an act covered by or described in section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for flag or general officers for each military department that are in excess to the number of such officers serving in such military department as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO OF NEW JERSEY

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the performance of any Department of Defense flight demonstration team at a location outside the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I'd like to thank Chairman YOUNG and also Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for providing me the time to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, providing STEM education to America's youth is critical to the global competitiveness of our Nation. This will rely, however, on a solid pipeline of STEM-degree graduates.

I stand here today to offer my revenue-neutral STARBASE amendment No. 99 to H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense Appropriations, to increase funding to the STARBASE youth program by $5 million.

STARBASE is currently active in 79 congressional districts throughout the country and engages local fifth-grade elementary students by exposing them to STEM subjects through an inquiry-based curriculum. The program is carried out by the military services because the Department of Defense has identified a shortage of young adults graduating from these difficult and hard sciences.

The STARBASE academies work with school districts to engage students through ''hands-on, mind-on,'' experiential activities. They study engineering, nanotechnology, navigation and mapping. These are all critical

fields that will keep our country competitive.

My no-cost, revenue-neutral amendment makes a significant step towards providing and engaging America's youth with the tools they need to pursue careers in STEM, a field where jobs are available and there is a significant lack of trained workers.

A recent Brookings Institution study said that as of 2011, there are now 26 million U.S. jobs—or approximately 20 percent of all jobs in the country—that require a high level of knowledge in any one of the STEM fields. I urge my colleagues to support this revenue-neutral amendment to H.R. 2396. Our students and our workforce need this.

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

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

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. POLIS. 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 29, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $107,000,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $107,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress, one of our greatest responsibilities is to keep our country safe and invest our resources wisely, especially when it comes to securing the safety of our country.

The Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program is a missile system that is supposed to be designed to deflect missiles from rogue states like Iran and North Korea. That would be great if it worked. It is a system with a long history of failure, and military leaders have expressed doubts for years about the viability of this program.

I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, which would return the funding level for the GMD program back to the Pentagon's own request level in the fiscal year 2014 Defense appropriations bill. Specifically, my amendment cuts funding for the GMD missiles by $107 million and applies those savings to deficit reduction.

Lacking a single successful test intercept since December 2008, the GMD program is simply a failure so far. These repeated failures unfortunately have not stopped us from continuing to authorize over $1 billion for the GMD program to purchase 14 additional missiles on top of the 30 we already have in the NDAA Act of 2013.

The Government Accountability Office has noted that the testing of the system to date has been insufficient to verify that it will function as intended, and there was a most recent test failure on July 5 which supports that assessment from the GAO.

Americans want a missile defense system we can count on. We need to ensure that our missile defenses are tested and are actually capable of keeping our families safe and don't merely provide the illusion of safety. Before we continue to build an arsenal, we should make sure that it works, as custodians of taxpayer funds.

□ 1615

Now, of course, those on the other side will argue that we need to make sure that in an ever more dangerous world we need to have and invest in the missile defenses to protect against the threats from Iran and North Korea. Of course, I agree. The issue is whether this works or not and whether we should reward failure as a Congress and as a country, or whether we should invest in success.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, we should invest in success and not reward failure. We need to be candid about the challenges we face. Deterring threats and encouraging diplomacy is crucial to keeping America safe. Our national security, the safety of Americans is too important to rely on programs that have failed test after test when we need to have confidence that when we need them, they will work.

If we are serious about cutting wasteful spending here in Congress, we need to be willing to take a close look at programs like the GMD and find ways to trim spending and increase our national security. We can do this by building a leaner, more agile, more affordable military that is suited to the 21st century, while being diligent in ensuring that our existing systems can keep us safe and operate as they are intended to.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded that when two airplanes hit two buildings, it cost our economy $2 trillion and many thousands of lives. It occurs to me that sometimes we are fairly shortsighted. Sometimes even as conservative fiscally as I am, sometimes in this Chamber we don't look to our primary duty and we become penny-wise and very pound-foolish.

One nuclear armed missile coming into the United States could ruin our whole day. I am astonished sometimes at the lack of insight to this very real problem.

The system that we are speaking of today, the GMD, is the only system that we have tested that is successfully capable of defending this country against intercontinental ballistic missiles carrying nuclear warheads or other ordnance.

Mr. Chairman, I just find it astonishing that President Obama and his supporters have cut funding for our missile defenses every year they have been in office. They criticize these programs when there are test failures or delays that have been made worse by their slashing and burning of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the cost of failing in this area is simply too high. While the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System did miss its target on a July 5 test, it was one test. It has been successfully tested repeatedly since the 1999 testing began. This administration has not offered funding for testing this system since 2008.

Mr. Chairman, it should not shock us that when we don't test our systems, sometimes they don't always perform perfectly. If we cut funding for systems that don't have a perfect test record, we are doomed to have no protection at all.

Every sophisticated program in the Defense Department has had technical challenges at some time. But GMD's technical challenges are not insurmountable. We must commit to support these systems to see these challenges through.

The amendment that Mr. POLIS has offered would strike $107 million authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act. It would actually, because the authority for multi-year procurement would then be done away with, this Polis amendment actually costs the taxpayers money.

I would just ask the gentleman: If not this system, what other system would he suggest that would protect our country against a potential situation where an intercontinental ballistic missile were coming into the homeland? I would ask him to consider that.

I would now yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, the House has rejected these amendments—this and a following amendment by the gentleman from Colorado—on the National Defense Authorization Act already this year.

This amendment would strike the funding provided in this bill to provide for multi-year procurement authority of booster motors for the ground-based interceptors, GBIs, that Secretary Hagel announced the United States would deploy this past March.

This amendment, if it were adopted, and perhaps this is unintentional, but it would actually cost the United States as much as $200 million.

Perhaps the gentleman is opposed to the Obama administration's missile defense policy as articulated by Secretary of Defense Hagel. If so, that is a separate issue.

But when you look at North Korea, you look at Iran, I think it would be unwise to oppose the decision to add ground-based interceptors.

All that this amendment is doing is raising the price that taxpayers have to pay for the GBIs that the President and the Secretary of Defense have said we should buy. This isn't just my position. It is what the Missile Defense Agency and the CBO have already said: multi-year procurement will save the taxpayer money.

Now, the reliability issues that the gentleman brought up have nothing to do with this funding, because this funding talks about booster motors. Of the 26 tests that involve the GMD system, Ground-based Missile Defense, 18 of those were 100 percent successful. Of the remaining eight that had problems, none of them involved the booster motor. That is the subject of this amendment. So this amendment is misdirected if it is concerned about the stated concern of reliability.

I can't understand why we would oppose multi-year procurement and advance procurement of the 14 GBIs that the Defense Department says we will buy.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind people in this Chamber that nuclear missiles coming into this country are the most dangerous weapons that we face, and GMD is the only system that we have to protect ourselves from it. I hope this amendment will be defeated, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. To be clear, Mr. Chairman, this amendment saves taxpayer money and actually reduces the deficit by over $100 million.

I will be happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment and would want to make a couple of things clear to all of my colleagues.

The fact is the administration did ask for money. For the ballistic missile defense midcourse section in the bill they asked for $1.033 billion this year, fiscal year 2014. This is not absent an administration request.

Secondly, the gentleman from Arizona said that the bad test and the problems that they indicate are not unresolvable. I would absolutely agree with the gentleman, but this is a procurement account. Let us resolve these problems before we procure something that last month has not worked so we don't have to pull them out of silos, we don't have to invest additional taxpayers' money, and we don't have to waste that hard-earned money.

There are threats, and we ought to make sure the systems we deploy to protect our Nation work before we procure and deploy them.

I applaud the gentleman for his amendment and strongly support it.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

It is just simple business sense. It doesn't save money to preorder something that you don't know works. You don't do that in business. We as a country shouldn't do it.

This is not a theoretical discussion about advance purchasing or economies of scale. When things work there's a legitimate discussion about that. It is absolutely foolish—foolish—to throw good taxpayer money after bad before our system has proven to work to keep America safe.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $85,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment simply reduces Research Development Test & Evaluation funds for the new Ohio-class nuclear-armed submarine by 10 percent. Bear in mind, we are facing 10 percent sequestration cuts over the next decade. This will help the Navy plan for the likely effects of sequestration by cutting Cold War weapons rather than what the military really needs.

These replacement submarines are unaffordable and will weaken the surface Navy. They are expected to cost $6 billion per boat on average with a plan to procure 12 of them.

According to a report from the Arms Control Association, the operating cost of this replacement will be $347 billion lifetime. Even the Navy's own shipbuilding plan for fiscal year 2014 said:

Replacing the Ohio-class submarines will have a disproportionate impact on Navy shipbuilding plans.

It comes at the expense of other shipbuilding abilities and naval readiness. There are far more effective job creation plans than to undertake this initiative.

Our amendment offers a more balanced approach. We can easily afford to phase down or slow the replacement submarine program. The Navy can deploy 1,000 nuclear warheads on its submarines—as planned under the New START Treaty—with eight Ohio-class submarines, which means this modest cut can be easily handled.

The Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that the United States can provide for its security with fewer nuclear weapons. Yet nuclear acquisition programs are racing to preserve the current size of today's nuclear force.

Instead of wasting billions of dollars on weapons the Pentagon says it will not need, we should realign our budgets with the reality that the United States plans to reduce its nuclear arsenal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that we have already cut the defense budget pretty drastically, and nuclear weapons exist in today's world. I might not like it, you might not like it, we might wish they didn't exist, but they do exist.

Because nuclear weapons exist in this world, we need to have the ability to defend against them and also deter their use. That is important to our national security.

We do that through what we call the nuclear triad. We have the capability to launch nuclear missiles from silos that are based on land, we have the ability to launch nuclear-capable missiles from airplanes, we also have the ability to launch nuclear-capable missiles from submarines that are somewhere in these vast oceans.

Of those three of the triad, the nuclear submarine, or the submarine with nuclear capability, is the most survivable because you can blow up a silo, you can shoot down an airplane, but it is almost impossible to find a submarine somewhere in the ocean that has this nuclear capability. Because it is the most survivable, then it is the best deterrent, because we know what it can do and our enemies know what it can do.

Right now, we are planning to replace what is called the Ohio-class submarines to continue this capability. This is a capability that has kept us safe for the last 60 years. It is still important to our long-term national security. If we adopt this amendment, we will begin to cripple this capability, and that is bad for our national security.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

□ 1630

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I'd like to just sort of add a few points to the gentleman's prior comments.

First of all, the fleet is not being replaced one to one—the current fleet size is 14, and the new fleet will be 12. The program has already been delayed by 2 years because of earlier reductions in the defense budget. That 2-year delay is going to push us right up to 2021, which is when the aging fleet which is in play right now is going to start being decommissioned over time in terms of the reduction. Because of investment in design and development, which is what this amendment is focused on, we have saved $2 billion per vessel from where the Navy started when this project first commenced a number of years ago. It was $7 billion, and we are down to $5 billion per boat in terms of the projected costs that the Navy has actually come forward with.

I would just lastly note that the strategic review, which has been done under Secretary Gates and under Secretary Hagel, has repeatedly put SSBN replacement at the absolute apex in terms of national defense priorities, again, for a lot of the reasons the prior speaker indicated. Sea-based nuclear deterrence fits in perfectly well with the START Treaty, but as for the math of eight subs for 1,000 warheads, if you're going to have sailors being back home after deployment and if you're going to have repairs and maintenance, you'll need 12 as a bare minimum—a far cry from the Cold War days when 41 for Freedom was actually the size of this fleet.

We are now down to the bare bones, and we should not cut it any further. I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise not only as the Representative of the area that includes Naval Base Kitsap, which is the home port of eight SSBNs and 60 percent of the Navy's SSBN force, but I rise with a nonparochial interest as well.

I am in opposition to this amendment because we know the SSBNs, or the Ohio-class subs, have been a pillar of our national defense for over three decades. These subs and their crews act as peacekeepers around the world every single day. They are amongst our most significant assets for a continued forward-presence and are a strategic deterrent around the world. Our country, our Navy, and our sailors cannot afford to delay the recapitalization of this platform.

While I thank the gentleman from Oregon for bringing this forward, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I listened to my good friend from Florida, and I agree in terms of the necessity of having a strong nuclear deterrent, but he just ticked off that we would still have the air-based bombers and we would have land-based missiles. Even with eight nuclear submarines, we would have more than enough capacity.

Now, the historic arguments, I think, are a little bit distorted. Each of these new submarines carries 16 to 20 missiles. Each missile today carries four to five nuclear warheads, each 20 times more powerful than the bombs that decimated Hiroshima. One of these submarines—two, three, four—is adequate to serve as a deterrent for anybody going forward, especially when we have our air- and land-based in addition to this.

We have a deterrent that will make a difference to anybody as we are moving now to scale down the overall number of warheads, because who is it that we are deterring? North Korea? It doesn't yet have a missile that can even get to us, one, and a fraction of the firepower would destroy it. We could wreck China. We could decimate the Soviet Union. Deterrence is alive and well with a fraction of this, but embarking on a program to spend hundreds of billions of dollars—freezing us in time with, as I mentioned, $347 billion going forward—is foolish. Every independent analysis suggests that we will be better off in going forward with being able to right-size the nuclear deterrent. Even the 1,000 is probably more than we need today.

If we can't come to grips with the fact that we are spending hundreds of billions of dollars on things that don't make us any safer, that we can't afford, and that come at the expense of operational activities for our military that do matter, we are going to be trapped in this downward budget spiral, wasting tax dollars, not making America safer, not making it stronger, and not being able to have resources for things that would be of a higher priority for our military.

Now, notwithstanding all of the hyperbole here, this is a modest 10 percent reduction in the development resources. It's not going to stop our going forward, but it will be a signal to maybe take a deep breath and look at how we do this most effectively. I would strongly urge the approval of this amendment.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,010,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to introduce an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill, and I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their efforts on this important legislation.

My amendment would help improve the safety of advanced batteries, which are critical to both our new energy economy as well as to our current and future Department of Defense missions.

Advanced energy technologies not only produce good-paying, high-quality American jobs, but they also reduce our dependence on foreign oil, protect the environment, and lead to the advancements of new energy-efficient sources that are more effective. Thus, it is no surprise that our military requires this type of innovative technology to meet its expanding needs. Longer lasting energy sources mean our military's transportation and weapons systems are more effective in the field and limit safety risks that arise from refueling or recharging. More efficient energy capabilities mean a more efficient, more effective, and safer military.

On that front, lithium-ion batteries represent some of the most significant clean energy advancements of our recent history: they contain no toxic chemicals; they have up to three times the performance capabilities of other battery products; and they are required for many of the military's next generation weapons systems. Their need will only increase, but as often is the case with new technologies, improvements need to be made in order to ensure their safe and effective use.

Current lithium-ion batteries can cause violent fires with extreme smoke and high temperatures that are potentially catastrophic, especially on ships. As a result of these safety concerns, the acceptance and adoption of many lithium-ion-powered Navy systems under development are greatly delayed,

thus greatly limiting our ability to respond to emerging threats.

None of us here want to have any members of our military in danger, but we don't have to choose between improving our operational capabilities and keeping our courageous servicemembers safe. We are not far away from these types of advancements. New research has produced high-temperature material compounds that can significantly extend the maximum temperatures at which the batteries can safely operate.

We need to continue to develop and test these innovative compounds that require further research and development support. That is why I introduced this budget-neutral amendment, which I am proud to have introduced with Congressman CÁRDENAS—to provide for the necessary funding for research, development, and testing to improve the safety of advanced batteries.

I now yield 2 minutes to my friend from California, Congressman CÁRDENAS.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Congressman POCAN's amendment, which increases the Navy Research, Testing, Development, and Evaluation account by $10 million. This would support research, improving the safety of advanced batteries, specifically lithium-ion batteries. This amendment does not add new funding to the bill.

Lithium-ion is the present and future of our energy storage technology. This technology is critical to U.S. military personnel for communications, navigation, and vehicles on land and in the sea, air, and space. It is also important to many other sectors of the economy, including to the utility companies, transportation, aviation, aerospace, and medical devices.

As we have seen with recent airliner incidents, we can do more to address the safety of these batteries. Without improving that safety, we cannot fully realize the potential of lithium-ion technology. Without realizing that potential, we cannot improve our production capability here in the United States of America.

The global market for lithium batteries was worth more than $11 billion in 2012, and it is expected to double to $22 billion by 2016. Right now, the U.S. has a very small market share of the lithium-ion industry. The bulk of the industry is in Japan, China, and Korea. Investments like this are critical to growing the U.S. industrial base and in creating middle class manufacturing jobs. Funding research and development for this cutting-edge technology can ensure that the lithium-ion industry grows right here in America. With that growth comes more government and commercial applications.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. As an electrical engineer myself, I am very, very proud of the innovation of the United States of America, but little by little, we see that slipping away to other countries. Yet, at the same time, if we just invest a little, this $10 million will yield billions of dollars in the future.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I certainly appreciate what my colleague from Wisconsin is trying to do with his amendment. As a former chairman and ranking member on the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, I certainly attach great importance to battery research. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN is on the floor as well, who chairs Energy and Water.

The concern I do have is to make sure that we are organized as the Federal Government on this research and that we are looking at the appropriate expenditure in the appropriate places for the funds.

One example I simply would give is that, in this 2014 fiscal year's Energy and Water appropriations bill, $24 million was provided to the Joint Center for Energy Research, a DOE energy innovative hub. This hub, which team includes five of the national laboratories and several major research universities, is seeking new technologies to move in the direction that my colleague supports.

So I do appreciate his long-term goal. Obviously, we have to reduce our dependency on carbon fossil fuel from a national security perspective, but, again, I want to make sure that we are cautious as far as where and how much of this money we can effectively spend in the coming fiscal year.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Is there some movement to withdraw this?

Mr. POCAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POCAN. If I understand correctly, the chairman and the ranking member have said we can continue to have this conversation. In recognition of that, I would be glad at this time to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I look forward to working with the gentleman.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,500,000)''.

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1645

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, it's not every day I get to stand up here in front of the House and talk about a government program that is actually doing well and running ahead of schedule, but that's what brings me here today.

The Counter-electronics High Power Microwave Missile Project, or CHAMP for short, is an Air Force program to develop a capability to disrupt or eliminate an adversary's electronics without causing physical destruction to people or facilities. The only real question with CHAMP is what vehicle to use to deliver that microwave to the intended target.

As it turns out, we have an available stockpile of cruise missiles which are expensive to build and for which we have no other use. Fitting CHAMP into our existing cruise missiles is far cheaper than trying to construct a new vehicle just for that purpose. My amendment, which is fully offset, would provide $10.5 million toward that end.

By making this investment now, we can ensure that CHAMP will be able to put this weapon in the field years ahead of schedule and at a lower cost, while also continuing to develop a longer-term solution. It's a shame that fixing every government program isn't as simple as this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise in opposition because of where the funds for the gentleman's amendment are coming from.

The amendment would use funds from a committee priority, the Defense Rapid Innovation program. This program emphasizes technology development issues done primarily through small businesses.

Certainly, in my short time as ranking member on this subcommittee, I have been impressed by the lack of a true small business program at the Department of Defense, despite their protestations. DOD's track record of support for small businesses must be improved for many reasons, not the least of which is what small businesses provide to solve major issues for the Department. In the 2 years of program execution so far, fiscal years 2011 and 2012, the Department of Defense has received over 3,000 proposals for funding. This includes 2,200 proposals from small businesses across America for fiscal year 2012 funding for completion and execution this year.

Again, my concern is where the money is coming from in this amendment, and I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, all I can tell you is this: the offset from the Rapid Innovation Fund—currently the outlay rate, I think, for the first year was 43 percent from that fund.

This is a ready project. This is actually one that the Air Force has tested in a positive manner with positive results in regards to actually eliminating a threat without destroying a building or without destroying lives. If we had something like this when we went into Iraq or that area, we possibly could have done something without having to rebuild an entire infrastructure while still doing what we needed to do to be able to do our military mission.

Mr. Chairman, all I can tell you is that it is, in fact, a program that is working. It just needs a delivery vehicle. This is offset in regards to no additional spending that would be required, other than what comes from that fund that is sitting there. That's what that rapid development fund was actually designed for.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,000,000) (increased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, since its inception, the Iron Dome system has achieved tremendous success defeating rockets fired at the State of Israel from the Gaza Strip, and I am pleased that the underlying bill supports the President's request and fully funds this critical program. However, despite significant investments in this vital program, the United States has no rights to any of the proprietary information associated with that system.

My amendment would provide $15 million for the Israeli Iron Dome short-range defense system to initiate co-production of missile interceptors in the United States. This is $15 million, in addition to the funds appropriated to support Israel's Iron Dome program, to help ensure that the U.S. has a role in future production and can leverage the technology that we have invested in. Specifically, these funds will support the infrastructure, tooling, transferring data, special test equipment, and related components for U.S. production.

This amendment will help stabilize U.S. manufacturers who are facing an uncertain future with U.S. military procurement shrinking in the face of sequestration. By increasing opportunities for U.S. manufacturers, we will help support our Nation's struggling economy, while supporting and creating critical jobs here at home.

This funding will also provide a second source of production for Israel, who can leverage the rate-production capabilities of American firms to ensure that necessary quantities of Iron Dome interceptors are fielded as rapidly as possible. Providing this funding will ensure that our most critical ally in the Middle East, Israel, has the necessary capacity to defend itself against rocket attacks launched by Hamas.

In March of 2013, during President Obama's trip to Israel, the commander of the Israeli Air Defense Command, Brigadier General Shohat, spoke of the need for U.S. co-production of Iron Dome missile interceptors.

In response to concerns about future missile interceptor shortfalls and the desire to increase Israel's Iron Dome deployment from 5 to 13 batteries, the general stated:

> What would be impacted is the pace at which we equip ourselves. Bottom line, I need as many air defense units as possible and as quickly as possible.

By accepting this amendment, the House will ensure that Israel has the capability, as well as the capacity, to defend itself.

Further, in written testimony provided to the House Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Director of the Missile Defense Agency Vice Admiral James Syring indicated that the Missile Defense Agency was actively seeking Iron Dome co-production opportunities and was negotiating to obtain available technical data packages and data rights. This amendment will ensure that funding is available to move forward on this important effort.

During consideration of H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2014, by the House Armed Services Committee, I offered an amendment to authorize funding for co-production of Iron Dome, which was unanimously agreed to. Additionally, the House of Representatives authorized this funding when it voted to pass the fiscal year 2014 NDAA last month.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in order to offset the cost of this co-production, my amendment reduces two applied research programs within the Defense-wide RDT&E. Specifically, it reduces applied research in joint munitions technology by $5 million and reduces funding for applied research in chemical and biological defense programs by $10 million. These modest reductions conform to the funding levels authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act and ensure that these programs still receive adequate and appropriate funding.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment ensures that Israel has the capacity to defend itself while providing the U.S. the ability to leverage our significant investments in Israel's Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time to speak on the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this Israeli cooperative program is an important program, and the Israelis are very good and loyal allies of ours. So we support the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000) (increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, In 1990, the existing U.S. satellite-communications capacity would not support the warfighters during the first gulf war. The United States made an urgent attempt to launch an additional Defense Satellite Communication System III spacecraft to support the war effort; but it was not until February 11, 1992, more than a year after the war ended, that the mission was finally launched.

In nearly every national space policy guidance document, resiliency and responsiveness are key objectives in global communications, navigation,

and guided munitions, all of which rely on satellites that provide game-changing advantages on the battlefield. Before Operationally Responsive Space, ORS, was established, the capacity to rapidly develop and deploy satellites was inadequate. ORS's mission is to respond to emerging, persistent, or unanticipated needs and quickly deploy cost-effective satellites to provide transformational advantages on the battlefield. ORS has the ability to launch field-ready satellites within just a few days or weeks. It also rapidly develops, delivers, and employs new capabilities in a few months to less than a year.

Increased speed for the delivery of space assets not only helps to close gaps in the United States' space systems capacity; it can also improve resiliency and reconstitute satellites lost to countermeasures. In 2007, China used a ground-based missile to destroy one of its own satellites, demonstrating their capacity to target our satellites and space-defense systems. Russia is currently developing a sea-based missile and space-defense system. As other countries modernize their military, the threat level to our communications, navigation, and guided munitions satellites intensifies.

ORS has also demonstrated the ability to cost effectively deploy space assets. General Schwartz said:

> ORS is exactly what we need, innovation and greater efficiency as we contend with ongoing fiscal constraints and changing space posture.

Secretary of the Air Force Michael Donley called ORS ''critical to our Nation's national security posture, and we need to proceed at the speed of need.''

Eliminating ORS would cut the very programs that give our Nation's warfighters their military asymmetric advantage in space. The growing need for information dominance is driving a remarkable transition in space systems. ORS is integral to maintaining our advantage in space. Our amendment reserves $10 million from RDT&E for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member, and I look forward to continue to work on this important issue.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding and would point out to my colleagues that on this particular issue she has been dogged.

I do believe that this is one of a number of items within the bill where reasonable people can have a disagreement. Certainly the position that my colleague has from New Mexico is that she believes she has the most cost-effective approach that the United States Air Force should take. The problem that we face on the subcommittee, given the financial and fiscal constraints we have, is that the Air Force did not ask for funding for this program for fiscal year 2013 or fiscal year 2014. So we deferred.

I appreciate her concern, and I appreciate her raising it to the body without making any representations as to what the future holds, but again would commend her for her work on this program and again her doggedness on behalf of it.

I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 31, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $70,200,000)''.
>
> Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $70,200,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1700

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler-Garamendi-Polis amendment to eliminate additional funding for a new, costly, unproven, and unnecessary missile defense site. Our amendment would cut $70 million that was added by the Appropriations Committee for an east coast missile defense system that the Pentagon says it does not want or need.

In a June 10 letter to Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL LEVIN, Vice Admiral James Syring, director of the Missile Defense Agency and Lieutenant General Richard Formica, Commander, Joint Functional Command for Integrated Missile Defense, unequivocally stated:

> There is no validated military requirement to deploy an east coast missile defense site.

Admiral Syring told the House Armed Services Committee earlier this year that he would not be able to use additional funds for an east coast site this year because the Pentagon has only begun to study the concept. And the Pentagon already has the funding it needs for this study in FY 2014.

Furthermore, the technology is still unproven at this time. There have been no successful intercept tests for the past 5 years of the system that might be deployed on the east coast. The recent test failure of the ground-based mid-course system that would be deployed on the east coast is another reason not to rush forward with deployment.

In a time of budget deficits and looming sequester of funds, we cannot afford to spend money on a program that the military says it does not yet need and does not yet work. The Pentagon says the current system, based in Alaska and California, is sufficient to defend the entire continental United States against a limited attack from North Korea and Iran.

The CBO says an east coast base would cost approximately $3.5 billion over the next 5 years. Admiral Syring and General Formica said there are currently more cost-effective and less expensive alternatives to improving the defense of the U.S. homeland than an east coast missile site. It is a pure waste of money to deploy a missile defense site on the east coast before a need for such a site is identified and before the interceptors can be proved effective and suitable in operationally realistic tests. So we should not have this funding now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2013.

Vice Admiral JAMES D. SYRING, USN,
Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense, Ft. Belvoir, VA.

Lieutenant General RICHARD P. FORMICA, USA,
Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, Huntsville, AL.

DEAR VICE ADMIRAL SYRING AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL FORMICA: Following the briefing you provided earlier this week, I am writing to request. your responses to the following questions regarding possible future options for homeland ballistic missile defense:

1. Is there currently a validated military requirement to deploy an East Coast missile defense site?

2. Do you favor Congress mandating the deployment of an East Coast site before the completion of the pending Environmental Impact Statement required by section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal-Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239)?

3. At this time do you believe there is a more effective and less expensive alternative to an East Coast missile defense site that is also available sooner than deployment of an East Coast missile defense site?

I would appreciate your responses to these questions no later than June 10, 2013, so that we may consider them for our upcoming markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I have written the questions in a way that will hopefully facilitate a prompt and unclassified response.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2013.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEVIN: Thank you for your June 6, 2013, letter requesting additional information regarding a potential East Coast Missile Field. The Missile Defense Agency and the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense jointly offer the following response:

1. Is there currently a validated military requirement to deploy an East Coast missile defense site?

Response: There is no validated military requirement to deploy an East Coast missile defense site.

2. Do you favor Congress mandating the deployment of an East Coast site before the completion of the pending Environmental Impact Statement required by Section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239)?

Response: No. We support completing the requirements mandated by Section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

3. At this time do you believe there is a more cost effective and less expensive alternative to an East Coast missile defense site that is also available sooner than deployment of an East Coast missile defense site?

Response: Yes. Investment in Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) discrimination and sensor capabilities would result in more cost-effective near-term improvements to homeland missile defense. The Department of Defense is evaluating potential sensors enhancements that could be pursued to improve the BMDS kill chain and increase threat discrimination in addition to the evaluation of an additional interceptor site. While a potential East Coast site would add operational capability it would also come at significant materiel development and service sustainment cost. This evaluation, and others, will serve to inform decisions on our future BMDS architecture and budget requests.

Thank you for the opportunity to inform the Committee in advance of its Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act deliberations. If you have additional questions, please have your staff contact * * *

Very Respectfully,

J.D. SYRING,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director, Missile Defense Agency.

RICHARD P. FORMICA,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Commander, Joint Functional Command for Integrated Missile Defense.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentleman from New York. Two Presidents and three Secretaries of Defense recognize the advantage of an additional missile defense site for a more effective defense against long-range missile threats from the Middle East.

President Bush wanted to deploy 10 ground-based interceptors in Poland. President Obama wanted to deploy 24 SM–3 block IIB missiles in Poland. I would remind my colleague from New York that the additional idea of a homeland defense site is bipartisan and was supported by President Obama as recently as this March. But President Obama changed his mind with the cancellation of the SM–3 block IIB missiles intended for Poland in 2020, and now we no longer have a third homeland defense site which the Obama administration supported prior to March 15.

The termination of the SM–3 block IIB missile intended for Poland now means defense of the homeland against ICBM threats from the Middle East will not be as strong as originally sought by this President—that's this President, Mr. Chairman—President Obama, who has cut missile defense every time he has had the opportunity since he started in the face of a growing threat, while the centrifuges in Iran continue to spin.

The warfighters agree an east coast site adds to the defense of the United States. General Jacoby, NORTHCOM Commander, said:

> What a third site gives me, whether it's on the east coast or an alternate location, would be increased battle space; that means an increased opportunity for me to engage threats from either Iran or North Korea.

Mr. Chairman, it's a very simple matter of telemetry and geography. The east coast site would allow us much greater battle space and not have to make our West Coast sites travel the entire length of the continent in order to engage a potential incoming Iranian missile.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to sometimes be amazed. This is the most dangerous kind of threat that we face in America. The first purpose of this body is to make sure that the country's defenses are taken care of and that we provide for the national security of this country. And yet in a growing threat environment, by colleagues on the other side continue to want to cut missile defense. Mr. Chairman, I would urge defeat of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman and my good friends who serve on these committees with me, this is not about the President and this is not about missile defense. This is about the unnecessary expenditure of a very important national asset—our money.

Testimony given in committee indicates that we may or may not need an east coast missile defense site. And we also know that the current missiles that are being used for these anti-ballistic missiles don't work. At least there's a failure, and there's been repeated failures just in the boost system, let alone if we can hit Iraq with a rock. So the problem here is this money should not be spent now for this site.

It is absolutely clear: the Department of Defense from last year's budget and appropriation has sufficient money to determine where to locate a site. With regard to the cancellation of the missile that was discussed a few minutes ago, it doesn't fit in the existing sites, and so they canceled it because it doesn't fit in the hole in the ground. So what are we doing here? This is $70 million, not a vast amount of money when considering the appropriation for the Department of Defense, but that's $70 million that could be used to—well, how about protecting a levee of some city in the United States? It could be used to much better effect.

There was another amendment that I understand that failed that took another $100 million or so out of this particular thing. We ought to be taking what money's available and putting it into something that actually might work, which would be directed energy. But an amendment for directed energy was refused an opportunity to be heard on the floor. So we really ought to be thinking seriously about how we move forward with this. I have great respect for my colleagues, but we ought not just throw money after other money.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman, and I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Missile Defense Agency estimates provided in 2012, the cost of 20 silo GBI sites, that's including missiles, is approximately $3 billion and could be built over a 5–6 year period of time. This cost is almost half the funding the administration has stripped from MDA in the past 2 years.

These funds are critical today. Iran will not slow down its ballistic missile program just because the gentleman wants to cut the funds for our defense. They are testing rocket engines and missiles now.

The Department of Defense tells us also that Iran continues to advance its space launch and longer-range ballistic missile capabilities. Iran has used a space-launch vehicle, the Safir-2, to place a satellite in orbit, demonstrating some of the key technologies required for an ICBM to be successfully developed.

This was reaffirmed recently by the latest biennial report from NASIC, the leading experts on ballistic missile intelligence. General Jacoby, Commander of the U.S. Northern Command stated:

> We should consider that Iran has capability in the next few years of flight testing ICBM-capable technologies.

And:

> The Iranians are intent on developing an ICBM.

The Missile Defense Agency's own illustrative briefings to the House Armed Services Committee have shown that MDA planned to spend funds—like those appropriated in Chairman YOUNG's mark—while site selection and EIS processes were underway. These funds absolutely can be spent today.

That the administration didn't request them is dispositive of nothing. Chairman YOUNG showed leadership in adding these funds to match those provided by the FY14 NDAA, and I thank him for that support. I urge defeat of the Nadler-Garamendi-Polis amendment.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I have great respect for my colleagues on the subcommittee. However, the argument that has been made is incomplete. We're talking about whether we're going to spend an additional sum of money this next year on a program that, A, has large questions about whether it works; and, B, the military doesn't need the money right now. If the gentlemen remember the committee hearing, Mr. Chairman, the general said he didn't need more money now. He had sufficient money from this year's appropriations for next year carrying on the studies that are necessary as to where to locate the site. It may not be on the east coast; it may be elsewhere.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said that the testimony was that they did not need the money today for additional testing, but they do need the money today for deployment, Mr. Chairman. This administration, throughout its tenure, has weakened our missile defense capabilities, which protect us against the most dangerous weapons in the history of humanity. We should not continue to go down that road. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the question is, will we waste the money? We are told by the director of the Missile Defense Agency and the general commanding the Joint Functional Command that they cannot use the money. There is no validated military requirement to deploy an east coast missile defense site, and he would not be able to use additional funds for an east coast site this year because they have only begun to study the concept.

It may be that in the future we may want an east coast site. But to appropriate this money now is a pure waste of money because now they are simply studying the concept. They can't spend it; they probably won't spend it. Why waste the money? I urge people to vote for this amendment.

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. NADLER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. SHEA-PORTER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. 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 34, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,500,000) (increased by $4,500,000)''.

Page 34, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,500,000) (increased by $4,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, today I'm offering an amendment with my colleague, Congressman LOBIONDO, to support veterans with PTSD and traumatic brain injury, or TBI.

This amendment designates $4.5 million within the peer-reviewed Psychological Health/Traumatic Brain Injury Research account for a 3-year study to evaluate the therapeutic service dog training program currently operating at the National Intrepid Center of Excellence and Walter Reed National Military Medical Center.

This innovative servicemember dog-training program is designed to a safe, effective, nondrug intervention to treat the symptoms of PTSD and TBI. Servicemembers report improvement in their PTSD or TBI symptoms when participating in a therapeutic service dog training program.

The servicemen and -women involved in this program report a number of positive results, including lower levels of depression, improved self-control, improved sleep patterns, a greater sense of purpose, better integration into their communities, pain reduction, and improved parenting skills. This year's NDAA House report directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct whatever studies are necessary to evaluate this promising program. This amendment provides the resources for such a study.

There is now considerable anecdotal evidence that training service dogs reduces the PTSD symptoms of their warrior trainers, and that the presence of the dogs increases the sense of wellness in servicemembers and their families.

□ 1715

The most eloquent testimonials are from servicemember trainees themselves. One said:

It's been great working with the dogs. They're helping me with my depression, anxiety and sleep. With a dog at my side, my stress measurements returned to normal for the first time.

Another:

It's great knowing that I'm helping to train a service dog for a servicemember who has physical disabilities.

Another:

It's hard for me to put into words how very important working with these dogs has been to me. Working with the dogs gave me a purpose again and a way to continue to give back to soldiers. Training these dogs helps me rebuild my confidence level and to feel that I'm functioning as an effective member of the Army and of society.

And one more:

The dog I'm training bonded quickly with my daughter and me. The dog allowed us to connect in a very positive way. Working with the dog has taught me patience, which also carries over to being a parent.

And finally:

Going out into crowded public places has been very hard for me. However, to train a service dog, you have to lead them confidently through places like grocery stores and on underground trains. I find that while I'm teaching the young dogs how to navigate these places, I am much more comfortable as well. I'm even learning how to enjoy interaction with strangers who approach me to talk about the dog.

The soldier also noted:

Being allowed to sleep with a dog that I'm training has been very helpful. I had been only managing to sleep a couple of hours a night before being cleared to have a dog spend the night with me. That night I slept almost 6 hours and I had no nightmares. I awake so much more refreshed. My wife has noted the improvement as well.

The dogs that these servicemembers with PTSD train become highly skilled service dogs for veterans with disabilities, while the Warrior-trainers reap the therapeutic benefits of training them. This amendment is a win-win-win. It's good for returning vets, it helps combat PTSD, and it doesn't add a dime to the deficit.

I and Congressman LOBIONDO urge you to support these promising research efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time to speak on the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We're pleased to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. O'ROURKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. O'ROURKE. 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:

Strike section 8058.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, my amendment aims to provide the Department of Defense with additional budgetary flexibility, should they need it, to guarantee that the resources are available to properly maintain family housing at our military installations.

Section 8058 of this legislation prohibits funds from being used to repair or maintain military family housing. My amendment would strike that provision and, I believe, provide needed flexibility at a time of austere budgets and sequester.

I represent Fort Bliss, one of the largest installations in the Army. There are over 3,700 homes on Fort Bliss, and my community, El Paso, Texas, takes immense pride in creating a high quality of life for all those who serve at Fort Bliss.

We have an obligation to our servicemembers and their families to ensure they have first-rate housing. It is good for morale, and it is the right thing to do.

I understand that funds for repair and maintenance are included in the Military Construction-VA appropriations bill. My goal is simply to do everything we can to protect our servicemembers and fulfill our responsibility to them.

I know that the chair and the ranking member share my goal. I am prepared to withdraw my amendment, and I would hope the chair and ranking member would be willing to work with me going forward to continue providing our servicemembers and their families first-rate housing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

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

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 8107, 8108, and 8109.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes to begin with.

Mr. Chairman, the political and legal expediency of the detention center at Guantanamo, Cuba, has not been worth the cost to America's reputation around the world, nor to the erosion of our legal and ethical standards here at home.

My amendment would enable the U.S. military to transfer or release the detainees who have been cleared by the intelligence community and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to their home countries and bring those not cleared for release to the United States to be charged, tried, and sentenced.

Those who advocate the continuance of Guantanamo don't seem to realize that so many of the prisoners still held at Guantanamo were, in fact, wrongly captured. The majority never engaged in hostile actions against the United States or its allies.

The fact is that we know today Guantanamo continues to serve as a rallying cry for extremists around the world; and until we transfer and try the detainees, there is no denying that Guantanamo is hurting our national security.

We need to re-evaluate our approach to the long-term threat of terrorism and realize that policies that mock the concept of equal justice under the law, and that undermine our respect for human rights, make it more likely, rather than less likely, that we will be attacked again.

How can we expect Americans held captive abroad to be accorded the right to be sentenced and brought to trial when we hold 166 prisoners in Guantanamo, without charge and without trial?

Eighty-six percent of the Guantanamo detainees were captured in exchange for a bounty, in many cases a very large bounty that represented a whole year's pay for people turning them in. The majority of them, as I say, have never committed hostile acts against the U.S. or its coalition allies; and yet they have been held for more than 12 years without charge.

My colleagues like to argue that detaining or trying suspected terrorists in the U.S. would endanger national security, but that's simply not true. More than 400 defendants charged with terrorism crimes have been successfully convicted in the United States since 9/11, including a former Gitmo detainee who was tried in New York City, the Times Square Bomber; the Shoe Bomber, Zacarias Moussaoui, who conspired to kill innocent Americans on 9/11. They've all been charged; they've all been tried; they've all been convicted—all of them here in the United States, and no security incidents.

More than 300 individuals convicted of crimes of international terrorism are today incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons within the United States, with no escapes or attacks and attempts to free them.

There are six Department of Defense facilities where Guantanamo detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent capacity.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I'll yield myself another minute.

Now, it should be said in the context of an appropriations bill how expensive it is to keep Guantanamo open. We're currently spending $1.6 million per detainee, compared to $34,000 per inmate at a high-security Federal prison here in the United States.

And in the defense authorization we just provided another $260 million in operations costs and another $186 million for construction to continue this temporary facility, almost half a billion dollars. This does not make sense.

And now we've got the hunger strikes because people see no future ahead of them. They're afraid that they'll be jailed indefinitely for charges that they can't even defend because they haven't been given the opportunity.

That's not who we are as a Nation. We're a Nation of law. We're a Nation of respect for human life.

But to hold these detainees and, in some cases, 46 of them are being tube-fed, strapped down for hours while a tube is inserted down their nose, that's not what we do.

So let's stop it. Let's close down Guantanamo and do the right thing.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would like to start by saying that Mr. MORAN is a very important member of the Defense Subcommittee, and he and I have very few differences, except on this one issue where we have a strong disagreement.

The language that is in the bill that he would strike is the same language that we've been carrying now since FY 2010, and it is the same language that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act that the House passed earlier this year.

The provisions that we include ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are judged as the most dangerous will never be released or otherwise brought into our homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, they ensure that, prior to releasing a Guantanamo detainee to a foreign country, a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to reengage in terrorist activities and the foreign government can maintain control over that individual.

Unfortunately, we have already seen an alarmingly high rate for Gitmo detainees to return to the battlefield. These detainees have posed direct threats to U.S. personnel and U.S. interests, a threat that could only grow as we draw down from Afghanistan if they are able to establish safe havens to plot against the United States.

The single greatest threat to the U.S. homeland and interests abroad currently is al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, a group established and run by two foreign Gitmo detainees that were released under a previous administration.

The current law provisions in the bill reflect the right balance on this important issue, and I think a ''no'' vote is

appropriate. A ''no'' vote is keeping in context with the House position as has been stated many times over.

And so rather than give these bad guys an opportunity to go back home, or to go back to some other country adjacent to their home, and allow them to get involved in recreating a danger, a threat to our troops and our interests, wherever they might be, I just think it's not smart to remove the language from the bill that we already have.

So I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which would remove the existing limitations on transferring detainees out of Guantanamo.

Our Federal courts have a proven record of prosecuting terrorists, and our Federal prison system is already imprisoning hundreds of convicted terrorists in facilities here in the United States.

□ 1730

It makes no sense to have an external facility, especially one in Cuba, of all places. Guantanamo is a continuing stain on our national honor. It should be closed now. Of the 166 detainees at Guantanamo, 86 have been cleared for release; that is to say, they have been found guilty of nothing and judged to pose no danger. There is no reason and no right for us to hold them further.

The detainees will gain no additional rights by being held in the United States. The Supreme Court has ruled that detainees have the same constitutional rights at Guantanamo as they do here. We cannot hold people indefinitely. People may not be terrorists and may be guilty of nothing. We must restore who we are and vote for this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I simply would reiterate that in my opening statements, I indicated that I do believe the language in the bill and the limitations are a mistake. Guantanamo Bay ought to be closed. It is not constructive. I do not believe at this point in time it is constitutional, and so I do support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, these detainees are detained for a reason. The reason is they either hurt, killed, or threatened our American troops or our American interests. That's why they're at Guantanamo in the first place. It just doesn't seem right to me to send them back to the battlefield to threaten more troops, to threaten the lives of more soldiers. It's just not right, and it's not a good amendment.

I suggest that we should defeat this amendment right where we stand, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. 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 126, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000,000)''.

Page 134, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,600,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to represent Omaha and its surrounding areas. It has a magnificent base with extremely important missions. What that means is that I represent not only uniformed members who serve there, but civilian workers who work on that base also.

Mr. Chairman, I can't go out in public without somebody coming up to me and saying, I'm one of the furloughed workers. I can't afford to lose those days. What are you going to do?

Well, I think that's a legitimate ask of that person. Frankly, I can't go to a sporting event. Even in my own neighborhood there are people asking me what we're going to do to help them.

Now, the answer here in this body has been, mostly, if the DOD really wanted to make their pay whole and not give them furlough dates, they could do that. This is a political move by the President. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not willing to play that level of politics with my constituents' pay.

So what this amendment does is moves $2.6 billion out of the Afghan Security Forces account. It reduces that account from $7.7 billion to $5.1 billion, moving it to an account that can be used to supplement those wages and eliminate the furloughs of 55,000 civilian workers working on our bases across the country.

Does this cure every furlough? No. But it does the vast majority, and it gives flexibility to the DOD to perhaps reduce the furloughs to the point where it is a negligible impact on 100 percent.

Let's talk about this fund, because there seems to be some confusion about the fund.

The Afghan Security Forces account is the fund of which the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction, or SIGAR, has uncovered $2 billion, Mr. Chairman, of waste, fraud, and abuse. This is that fund that has been in the paper a lot lately for building bases that nobody wanted and nobody is using. This is the fund that bought Russian helicopters for the Afghan military that no one knows how to fly and they're sitting there rusting. This is basically a type of slush fund to be used for special projects that accusations have been made are simply lining the pockets of some Afghan officials.

So all we're doing is reducing the amount of proven fraud within this fund. The reality here is we reduce the fund and we save our own civilian employees that go to work every day but now have been told to stay home for a certain amount of days. We can protect those workers. Let's focus on U.S. workers, those working on our bases. Let's make them the priority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WALBERG). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, given the time limitation, I would address the issue of furloughs that the gentleman makes.

Furloughs are a result of the Budget Control Act that was passed in 2011. It's the result of sequestration that occurred because of the adoption of that law. The gentleman who has offered the amendment voted for that act that has caused sequestration to occur and now is causing furloughs to take place.

I would point out that I think it is patently wrong to carve out any class of Federal civilian employees to the detriment of others. I mentioned in my opening statement that I thought it was wrong that for the 4th year in a row we are not providing a pay raise for any Federal civilian employee at the Department of Defense, which essentially represents a revenue loss to those employees working for the people of this country of $437 million.

So it is not a lack of sympathy for those who are losing a portion of that paycheck over and above that pay increase for the last 4 years that is the cause of my concern, but I would point out to all of my colleagues that other government agencies have also decided to use furloughs. And as the gentleman rightly pointed out, he doesn't solve all of those problems. They include the Department of Labor, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Justice, the Office of Management and Budget.

While this bill under consideration doesn't fund these agencies, where is the outcry, where is the concern for those Federal employees, and who is speaking for them now?

Three fiscal year 2014 appropriation bills have passed the House. While the Department of Veterans Affairs was exempted entirely from sequestration under the Budget Control Act that the gentleman voted for, no furlough exemptions were granted within the other two bills. There was no hedging of funds to avert furloughs for them for bills that have already been considered by this body and passed by this House without this type of exemption.

Allowing exemptions for one agency is unfair to others—allowing exemptions that pit one agency against another agency and wrongfully determines the value of work performed by one Federal employee vis-a-vis another depending on what department they work in. If we value the work of our government employees, we should seek to block all scheduled furloughs, not a select few. We should end sequestration. And I did not vote for the Budget Control Act.

Until we fix this problem, the work of the government will not be done as efficiently and as effectively as possible. Maybe parts will not be bought; maybe maintenance will be deferred; maybe somebody is going to lose their job because a contract is not let; maybe someone is furloughed; but we should not temporarily fix one dislocation caused by sequestration that only defers decisions of significance that need to be made today, going forward.

Again, I would strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Can I ask how much time the gentleman has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I don't have a lot of confidence that when the American troops are out of Afghanistan it's going to be any different than it was when the American troops went to Afghanistan. And we have paid a dear price for our involvement there, but I have the hope that maybe the Afghanistan Security Force will shape up and do what we think they should—and that is to keep al Qaeda and Hezbollah and all the other terrorist groups away from creating more trouble for the United States and becoming a breeding ground and training grounds. Therefore, I have to oppose the amendment. But I do not have a lot of confidence in that government and the Afghan Security Force.

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, if you don't trust the Afghan Government, you should never give them $2.6 billion. This is on top of the $5 billion that they were to receive. This money was specifically added to the budget for the Afghan military to buy something—parts, airplanes. We have absolutely no idea what they're going to do with this money.

We would never, under any circumstance, give our own military a $2.6 billion blank check, but that's exactly what we're doing here. You're asking for fraud and abuse. We should bring this money back and make sure our own people are doing the work that the Defense Department needs.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield myself the balance of my time.

As the U.S. draws down forces—and I appreciate the chairman's remarks—for the post-2014 security environment, we should prepare to leave Afghanistan on positive terms. We should help repair a nation torn by years of war with the means to develop itself and to move beyond the past conflict. And so I am opposed to the means to finance the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is will you vote ''yes'' for our civilian employees working on the base or will you vote ''no,'' which says I support the waste, fraud, and abuse in this fund.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. TERRY. 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 Nebraska will be postponed.

□ 1745

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 126, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $600,000,000)''.

Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $600,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment cuts aid to Pakistan in this bill in half. This is the same amendment that passed this House last year by voice vote.

Pakistan seems to be the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries that we call allies. They have proven to be deceptive, deceitful, and a danger to the United States.

The day Osama bin Laden met his maker will go down in history as an important moment. Our manhunt did not end in a remote cave in the mountains, but in a palace in a bustling military town 35 miles from Islamabad. To think that the most senior levels of the Pakistani Government did not know he was there requires, as Secretary Clinton has said, the ''willing suspension of disbelief.''

Soon after, our suspicions were confirmed. Instead of celebrating with us the capture of the number one terrorist in the world, Pakistan arrested the one person that helped the United States capture Osama bin Laden. And last year, Pakistan sentenced Dr. Afridi to 33 years in prison.

In February of 2012, a NATO report said ISI—which is Pakistan's CIA—is aiding the Taliban and other extremist groups in Afghanistan and Pakistan by providing resources, sanctuary, and training. In June of 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. But they did not. They told the terrorists that we were coming.

Throughout 2011, Pakistan tried to cheat the United States by filing bogus reimbursement claims for allegedly going after militants when they weren't even doing that. On September 22, 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that:

> 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 Americans and NATO troops, who were injured because of that bombing. Admiral Mullen went on to say that this terrorist network acts as the arm of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency.

It doesn't seem to me that Pakistan deserves any more of our money. We've been doing the same thing for the last 10 years. Since 2002, Pakistan has collected a total of $26 billion of American money. And what have we gotten in return? Treachery. It's time for a new strategy with Pakistan.

There are some who say we need to pay Pakistan to help with our withdrawal. All their shutting down of the southern route showed was that we don't need Pakistan. We were able to pursue our mission even though they shut down that route. What really endangers our troops is not whether or not we have a southern supply route but whether or not we have access to Pakistan's tribal areas. Of course that has been off limits, according to the Pakistan Government.

This bill gives Pakistan over $1 billion. Cutting funding in half hopefully will send a message—long overdue—to the Pakistanis that they can't play us anymore, that we mean business.

To add a few more comments, Mr. Chairman, a poll conducted in Pakistan showed that 64 percent of the Pakistanis consider the United States the enemy, and yet we are paying them $1 billion a year? Doesn't make any sense to me. Plus, Americans who have an unfavorable view of Pakistan is 81 percent.

So why do we pay Pakistan to be our enemy? Why do we pay them to hate us? Mr. Chairman, I submit they will do both of those things for free.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that we need a new relationship with Pakistan. The gentleman claims—and I'm sorry that the easel just disappeared, but I believe it was about 64 percent of the Pakistan people consider us the enemy. I don't know the origin of that report, but I would take it at face value given the representation of my colleague.

My colleague also suggests there's another poll that says 81 percent of the U.S. people do not have a favorable opinion about Pakistan.

He did say that we need a new relationship, and I would agree with him. I think relationships are built on communication, and not polls. I think if we governed all of our actions in this Congress based on polls, we would get nothing done. Sometimes we have to suck it up and do things that maybe at first are not politic to do. Sometimes people fight in their families, unfortunately. And hopefully they sit down and communicate and resolve their differences. Sometimes different groups of people have problems and maybe even don't like each other sometimes. But if they talk to each other and they get to know each other, maybe they can resolve their differences.

The relationship with Pakistan, I would not deny, has been difficult, but maintaining that relationship is essential. This relationship has helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism. And Pakistan has allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to the counterterrorism mission.

The world, I would remind my colleagues, is a very great place. In June of 2012, Pakistan demonstrated its commitment to a stable and secure Afghanistan by reopening the ground lines of communication. I regret, with the gentleman, that they were closed for a period of time. This has eased tensions with the U.S. and improved logistical support for our troops.

Withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts within their military and their government generally—rifts and difficulties we should be looking to heal, not exacerbate today. Aggravating this divide is very, very counterproductive to the objectives in this region.

I would add one further comment. In addition to counterterrorism activity, the fact is Pakistan's nuclear weapons capability provides ample reason for the U.S. to continue positive engagement.

I certainly would appreciate yielding to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) if he wishes it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me associate myself with your remarks. Respectfully, we need to assure we have a relationship with the Pakistani Government to make sure that their nuclear weapons capacity is well secured.

And while polls may reflect, as the gentleman says, a very poor view by Americans of Pakistan, we need their support and cooperation not only for the 68,000 troops we have there but the international forces that are working with our troops to help the people of Afghanistan have a better life.

So yes, there may be corruption and there may be ill will among the Pakistani people, in our view, of our involvement over there, but we need to, as we exit Pakistan, to make sure that we get our forces out of there using the road network. Otherwise, we'll have to take a lot of our supplies and men by air, and that would be enormously expensive. We need to keep a good relationship with the Pakistani Government.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for his remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the ranking member's comments regarding Pakistan.

One thing, the bill cuts half of the funding to Pakistan. It does not cut the nuclear protection that the United States further emphasizes for Pakistan. So that is not cut in my amendment.

The gentleman mentioned actions. I think the Government of Pakistan over the last decade has shown that they cannot be trusted, that they use the money for improper purposes in Pakistan. And I am of the opinion that some of that money goes to hurt American troops that have been in the field for a good number of years.

So I think that we should cut 50 percent of the money that we send Pakistan. It's in the best interest, in my opinion, of the United States. Their actions prove they cannot be trusted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 130, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 141, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, the men and women of our National Guard serve their dual Federal and State missions bravely. It is essential that we appropriately equip them to succeed in both of those missions.

The Guard plays a critical role in supporting emergency disaster relief. And I applaud their purchase of 500 Humvee ambulances for use in every State, but these ambulances are severely lacking. They contain only the minimal and most basic medical equipment sets. Alarmingly, they lack modern life-saving equipment like cardiac defibrillators and vital signs monitors.

The Guard's ambulances must be properly equipped to deal with emergencies. This is especially important in a State like Oregon, which faces the threat of wildfires and the prospect of a massive earthquake and resulting tidal wave.

As the ambulances are outfitted now, personnel will be extremely limited in the available treatment they can provide to the injured people they seek to protect. State Guard associations and the National Guard Association agree. They have ranked their procurement of medical equipment sets as a priority for the last 2 years. Clearly, there is a need, and we need to meet it.

Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, it's my understanding that you are opposed to the amendment, as drafted, but support the underlying policy. And Chairman YOUNG,

I appreciate your support of an assessment on this issue on the floor last year. I ask if both of you will be willing to work with me to address this issue as the appropriations process moves forward. And if so, I would withdraw my amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield to the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would, first of all, not make any representations as to what will happen ultimately in conference; that is unpredictable. But I do compliment the woman for pointing out the valuable role that the Guard serves both as far as our military as well as disaster relief.

The fact is that additional resources are needed as far as saving lives and ensuring people's safety. In particular, again, a dual use, if you would, a twofer. The fact is, despite the large amount of money set aside in this bill, there are fiscal constraints. Some of that pressure is evidenced by the lack of funding for the program that you so ardently are addressing. So again, I would think, speaking for myself, I certainly hear your voice.

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I want to thank her for being willing to work with the subcommittee on this issue for quite some time.

We understand her interest and we agree with that interest. And we look forward to continuing to work with her as we proceed with this bill through the conference and back to the House floor—hopefully one day. We just want to guarantee her that we will continue to work, and we thank her for her cooperation.

Ms. BONAMICI. Reclaiming my time, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and ranking member, for your leadership on this bill, and also for your efforts to support the Guard.

□ 1800

I withdraw my amendment in light of the comments made on the floor this afternoon.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. WALBERG. 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 131, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $79,000,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $79,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. RIGELL of Virginia that will go a long ways to ensure American tax dollars in Afghanistan are spent in a wise and realistic fashion.

My amendment would specifically reduce funding of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by $79 million to a total of $200 million, the level adopted by this House during last year's Defense appropriations bill. The savings would then be sent to the spending reduction account.

We have already spent billions of dollars toward rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, and Congress has appropriated over $1 billion alone to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund since it was created in 2011.

As of March 31 of this year, SIGAR, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, reported that only $102.9 million of the $1 billion that Congress has appropriated has actually been dispersed for projects.

Perhaps even more significant, SIGAR has found that the projects which are under way are behind schedule and years away from completion and raise serious concerns about whether some of the projects may run counter to our goals and the COIN strategy, either because they have created expectation gaps among the Afghan people or that they lack local citizen support.

This year, $279 million has been requested for two new infrastructure projects. Now, I know we all look to our commanders in the field for guidance on what they need to finish the job in Afghanistan; but with $400 million in unobligated funds, I ask, Mr. Chairman, why commit to two brand-new projects that we will likely never complete?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have used the infrastructure fund in Afghanistan on any number of occasions in my district and in the committee and on this floor as an example of the failure of our country to invest in the infrastructure of the United States of America, and have indicated that we are spending money to invest in the infrastructure of Afghanistan and failing in the United States.

The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that in the coming years we have about $3.6 trillion of economic infrastructure investment we need to make, and a shortfall as far as funding is about $1.6 trillion.

But I would note that the gentleman's amendment does not rectify that domestic problem we face because the cut he proposes that I do oppose redirects those funds to the Spending Reduction Account.

The fact is as far as a legacy in giving the people of Afghan a chance in the future, I do believe we have to continue with this program. It was requested by the Secretaries of Defense and State in November of 2010 for the fiscal year 2011 appropriations act. At that time, Secretary of Defense Gates and Secretary of State Clinton said it is needed to support critical infrastructure projects, such as an initiative under way to bring electricity, simple electricity, to Kandahar City, which directly supports counterinsurgency strategy.

I would point out to the House that in 1989, the international community—and I think we would have to include our country in that—abandoned Afghanistan to years of civil war. As a result, this region of the world gave us the Taliban and al Qaeda in the wake of the withdrawal after Soviet incursion of the 1980s. I do not think we should make that mistake again, and we should make an investment.

As I mentioned in an earlier debate, as the U.S. draws down forces for the post-2014 security environment, we should prepare to leave Afghanistan on positive terms. As we depart, the U.S. should help to repair a nation torn by years of war with the means to develop itself to move beyond the past conflict.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, according to the President's own budget request:

> The Afghan Infrastructure Fund has been an invaluable resource in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Initiated in fiscal year 2011, the AIF funds infrastructure projects in Afghanistan that are a key feature of the counterinsurgency strategy and the civil-military strategic framework endorsed by the commander, U.S. Forces-Afghanistan to lock in security gains and maintain stability by providing basic, essential infrastructure of the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, in other words, these projects that would be eliminated or reduced are vital to protecting our currently deployed troops and civilian employees besides the Afghanis themselves, and that is a worthy investment. We still have 68,000 troops over there, a lot of civilians supporting the effort, contractors even, and a lot of international forces. They deserve this protection. This is a good long-term investment.

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

Mr. WALBERG. I request of the Chairman how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. WALBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to yield at this time 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, sir. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly bipartisan in that we are bipartisan in favor and they are bipartisan against. We all, Mr. Chairman, have the best intentions.

But I would submit to the people that speak in favor of the spending of this fund, in theory it is wonderful and it is great; but the same people that endorsed this built a $43 million base that will never be used and will be torn down.

The fact is much of this money cannot be maintained. We are giving moneys to the Afghanis for programs that they cannot maintain—they can't maintain the roads, they can't maintain the equipment that we give them; and so it is wasted. It has gone on and on and on. Much of it has been stolen over the years. There is a lot of theft and a lot of corruption.

The gentleman's amendment, which I joined with him on in a bipartisan fashion, cut $79 million. Mr. CICILLINE has an amendment that cuts everything. I've got to compromise the cuts—about half of it. Some of it needs to be cut, if not all of it, but at least half.

We are throwing away moneys that we know from the past are wasted and not doing the job that they are intended to do. Hell is paved with good intentions.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a review, my amendment would reduce funding of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by $79 million to a total of $200 million—the level adopted by this House during last year's Defense appropriations bill.

SIGAR has found that the projects which are under way right now are behind schedule and years away from completion and raise serious concerns about whether some of the projects may run counter to our goals and the COIN strategy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, additionally, as the end of operations in Afghanistan draws near, the Afghan people will need to bear the responsibility of building and maintaining their own infrastructure, to say the least.

The Afghan Government has often not been a reliable partner in these projects. They have often had little role in designating these projects—designing them, carrying them out, power lines, roads, and building projects that ultimately will not be used.

The Department's own budget justification states that because not all fiscal year 2012 and 2013 projects have been awarded, the fiscal year 2014 budget estimate is based on ''limited actual cost data.''

At a time when often difficult choices need to be made, we have a concern that as Congress is being asked to support funding and projects, that they really have limited cost data involved.

I ask for support for this amendment. I believe that the dollars can be used, indeed, to grow an economy for ourselves and ultimately deal with infrastructure projects here in our own country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. 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 Michigan 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 printed in House Report 113–170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. GABBARD of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. NUGENT of Florida.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. POE of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) 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 50, noes 372, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—50

Bass
Beatty
Braley (IA)
Capps
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Engel
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (IL)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
McKinley
Meeks
Moran
Payne
Peters (CA)
Richmond
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Sires
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Walz
Waxman
Webster (FL)

NOES—372

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Cárdenas
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Tsongas

□ 1840

Messrs. CLYBURN, ROSKAM, AMASH, NOLAN, MURPHY of Florida, FORBES, HIGGINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. DEGETTE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HONDA, LIPINSKI, GARCIA, and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) 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 176, noes 242, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—176

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Honda
Horsford
King (NY)
Lucas
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nunes
Rice (SC)
Rokita
Stutzman
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1844

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) 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 141, noes 272, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—141

Amash
Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Burgess
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—272

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Bass
Campbell
Carson (IN)
Coble
Coffman
Grijalva
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Johnson (GA)
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Pittenger
Rokita
Ruppersberger
Stutzman
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1848

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 381, I inadvertently missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) 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 49, noes 372, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—49

Amash
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke
Cohen
Conyers
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Grayson
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
McDermott
Meng
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
O'Rourke
Payne
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Rush
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Takano
Titus
Velázquez
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—372

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks

Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Coble
Eshoo
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1851

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) 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 93, noes 327, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—93

Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Burgess
Cantor
Cole
Conaway
Cook
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Griffith (VA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
King (IA)
Lamborn
Lankford
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCaul
McKeon
Messer
Miller (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—327

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Carson (IN)
Coble
Coffman
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1855

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 173, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—173

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (NY)
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1858

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) 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 175, noes 247, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—175

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—247

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (NY)
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1902

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) 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 186, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—186

Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Bass
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cooper
Crawford
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Pallone
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Ruiz
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Williams
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—237

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Levin
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Moore
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1905

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 386, I mistakely voted "no"/meant to vote "yes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the following amendment printed in House Report 113–170 on which further proceedings were postponed:

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) 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 283, noes 139, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—283

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—139

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Cárdenas
Carter
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Davis, Danny
Delaney
Dent
Edwards
Ellmers
Farr
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grimm
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
McCarthy (CA)
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mullin
Noem
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Pittenger
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Schock
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walorski
Waters
Watt
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Jones
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rokita
Tsongas

□ 1922

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. WENSTRUP) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2792, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–173) on the bill (H.R. 2792) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2218, COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1582, ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–174) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2397.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1927

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 113–170 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 312, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 31, 68, and 85, printed in House Report No. 113–170, offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $60,000,000)''.

Page 143, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $14,000,000)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

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 maintain or improve Department of Defense real property with a zero percent utilization rate according to the Department's real property inventory database, except in the case of maintenance of an historic property as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) or maintenance to prevent a negative environmental impact as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to operate an unmanned aerial system in contravention of the fourth amendment to the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I want to thank the chair from the great State of Florida and the ranking member for their work putting together this bipartisan legislation.

I rise today in support of the en bloc amendments that include my bipartisan amendment to the Defense appropriations bill with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN). Our amendment would eliminate wasteful spending on unused facilities, which can save tens of millions of dollars in fiscal year 2014 alone.

The Department of Defense has hundreds, possibly thousands, of buildings and structures that it has rated at zero percent utilization. This is an incredible number of useless facilities the Department of Defense is paying to maintain.

Federal agencies as a whole must do a better job at managing their facilities. Taxpayers cannot continue paying for unused and underused buildings while the Nation is at record levels of debt. That is not good government and not smart spending.

□ 1930

That is why earlier this year I introduced the SAVE Act to root out up to $200 billion in wasteful and duplicative government spending over the next 10 years.

This amendment is an extension of one of the 11 commonsense solutions included in the bipartisan SAVE Act, preventing the Department of Defense from spending money on facilities that the Department itself has rated at zero percent utilization.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that we must rein in government spending, and the best place to start is by rooting out waste. My amendment is a commonsense solution to do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for this bipartisan en bloc amendment and rise in support of my amendment that would better ensure that we meet the urgent mental health needs and addiction treatment needs of military personnel returning from Afghanistan.

After more than a decade of war, many of our heroes are returning home from several tours of duty in Afghanistan and Iraq. To honor their service, we have the responsibility of ensuring that we develop treatments to address the specific health needs of our returning veterans. This year, as our troops return home to their families and loved ones, Congress should be increasing investments in the research that will help us better understand how to provide these veterans with the care they need and deserve.

Early indications and analysis suggest the need to focus our efforts on psychological health and substance abuse. Importantly, in many cases, our returning veterans suffer from both mental health and substance abuse disorders simultaneously. Delivering health care to these patients is exceedingly difficult, but it is our responsibility to address this critical health need among our Nation's heroes.

I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member because this legislation contains important investments in peer-reviewed traumatic brain injury and psychological health research programs, but I believe that we have the means and the ability to do more. As this health need grows more acute and as more veterans return home, we should be increasing these investments. That's why this amendment would increase funding for psychological health research by $13 million and substance abuse research by $1 million.

To pay for these increases, my amendment would slightly reduce the increase in funding for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund by $60 million, a modest decrease of a total allocation of $7.7 billion. My amendment would shift a small fraction of this increased funding, reducing the total allocation by less than 1 percent, in order to provide a small increase in funding for critical health research for our veterans and returning military personnel here at home.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for including this in the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. CICILLINE. 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 131, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $279,000,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $279,000,000)''.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I first ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to reflect the figure of $200 million as the reduction in the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund because of the passage of the previous amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would shift funding away from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund in order to reduce our deficit and focus on investing here at home.

This bill appropriates $270 million to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund over the next year. This fund is notorious for its inefficiency. Several government watchdogs, including the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, have repeatedly found that projects funded through the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund are hopelessly behind schedule, lack proper oversight, and are poorly administered.

One example, the Kandahar Bridging Solution Project, which was developed to help provide electricity to a troubled region in Afghanistan, went 20 percent over budget in its first year of development, costing $8 million more than planned. Even with these cost overruns, the anticipated gains from this project are in serious jeopardy because of the slow pace of construction of related infrastructure that are central to the region's long-term electricity needs.

The failure to complete this project has led to higher fuel costs borne by the American taxpayer and raises serious questions about Afghanistan's ability to sustain electricity production in the future because of these high costs.

The original intent of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was to identify a small group of infrastructure

projects in 2011 that were shovel ready and capable of being completed by the middle of 2013. The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was never meant to last beyond the completion of these seven projects or into fiscal year 2014. And yet here we are, once again, appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for projects that remain stalled and ineffective. Meanwhile, we're making major cuts in critical domestic funding here at home and doing almost nothing to rebuild the crumbling infrastructure in our own country.

Congress has appropriated more than $1.1 billion over the last 3 fiscal years to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. This bill would commit another $279 million in fiscal year 2014, despite the release of a Special Inspector General report indicating five of seven projects remain six to 15 months behind schedule. The same report also concluded that ''Congress and the U.S. taxpayers do not have reasonable assurance'' that projects completed using AIF funds would be sustained or made viable by the Afghan Government after we leave.

This is increasingly disconcerting when we consider that only about 10 percent of the $400 million appropriated in fiscal year 2012 has been dispersed as of April 2013, with another $325 million of taxpayer money from the current year appropriations remaining unspent.

So we know the money is not being sent out quickly enough to accomplish the original intent of the program—to complete infrastructure projects by the middle of 2013. And we know that even if we were to complete these expensive projects, that they will likely not be maintained by the people of Afghanistan after our withdrawal. Knowing these facts, why should we provide an additional $279 million to this fund for next year? That is the definition of throwing good money after bad.

Of course, it is also useful to remember the context in which we're spending the additional money on Afghanistan's infrastructure. These are incredibly difficult fiscal times here in our own country.

Earlier today, we passed a rule for consideration of legislation that makes deep cuts to investments in domestic transportation and infrastructure. It eliminates the TIGER program to fund local transportation programs; it zeroes out our investments in high-speed rail; and it decreases funding to upgrade our airports and other FAA facilities by more than $500 million. Does this Congress really believe it's more important to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Afghanistan's infrastructure when we're cutting those same investments in our own roads, bridges, airports and transportation systems? Let's put America's needs first.

My amendment reduces the deficit, eliminates the inefficient Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, and allows us to refocus on building our own infrastructure here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent the completion of the two most strategic initiatives funded by the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund—the Northeast and Southeast Power Systems—and limit the lasting counterinsurgency effects intended by the AIF program. Available, reliable power promotes jobs and economic development, which increases stability and reduces insurgency and insurgent influence.

Mr. Chairman, Kandahar Province has been a primary focus for AIF investment. Of all the areas in Afghanistan, none is more important to the future of the Afghan Government or to the Taliban insurgency than this province—the Taliban's birthplace, location of its former capital, and spiritual heart.

AIF projects support the ''Build'' phase of the Shape, Clear, Hold, Build counterinsurgency strategy and are a critical component of the integrated civil/military campaign that sets the conditions for Afghanistan's decade of transformation beyond 2014.

Power distribution is currently provided through 12 provinces, serving 10 million Afghans. And Mr. Chairman, let me just remind you that we just passed an amendment that already cuts this account by $79 million. This amendment cuts more funds than are left in the account.

According to DOD, the lack of reliable electricity is the single greatest impediment to Afghanistan's economic growth, and thereby the stability necessary to support drawdown and transition.

Significant work on five of the seven power projects is in its beginning stages and is unlikely to be completed until well after the NATO mission ends in 2014. If project goals are set and not achieved, both the U.S. and Afghan Governments can lose the populace's support. It's for these reasons that we remain in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would associate myself with his comments.

I do appreciate the gentleman's concern. The money spent in Afghanistan ought to be spent carefully and efficiently and we ought to have an investment made for those expenditures. But I harken back to the last debate we had when we did abandon this country in 1989, and as a result, that region of the world gave us the Taliban and al Qaeda. I don't want to take that type of chance. And simply because we have failed ourselves in this country by a failure to invest in our infrastructure, I do not believe this is the time to fail the Afghan people. I do associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and am opposed to the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the argument that we owe it to the Afghan people to ensure that we rebuild their economy, we owe that responsibility first to the American people.

We have a crumbling infrastructure in this country—our roads, our bridges, our ports, our transit systems. Every economist I know says that investing in infrastructure so that we can get goods, services and information in this competitive 21st century economy is critical.

I hardly believe, with all due respect, that giving $1.1 billion, where only a little over $100 million has actually been spent, that that is abandoning Afghanistan. This is $1.1 billion of taxpayer money; only $111 million has been spent. And we're now appropriating another $279 million. I don't believe we're abandoning anybody.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $139,000,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $139,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which as originally drawn was like the amendment I offered last year that passed with a pretty strong majority, halves the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Mr. WALBERG and I were cosponsors on a bipartisan amendment that passed that cut $79 million.

To get this amendment to the same point, we would have to amend it down $60 million, I believe, to get it from the 279 to the cut. I don't know if we want to do an amendment or not. The more money it takes, for me it's fine, but if we wanted to halve it.

I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to reflect the cut not to be—an amount of 139, but to take into consideration the 79, and so to make this amendment only $60 million. So I would like to offer an amendment to the amendment to make this amendment reflect a $60 million cut to make the total cut 139, which would be half.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

□ 1945

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, that is just better, because this amendment is kind of a compromise between the amendment Mr. WALBERG and I had and Mr. CICILLINE's. Mr. CICILLINE's cut the fund entirely. This cuts it in half. A little more than half is really better.

The fact is, yes, we need the infrastructure in America; but we spent a lot of money on the infrastructure fund in Iraq, and we know from experience that a lot of that money, if not most of it, was stolen and wasted.

The same things happened in Afghanistan. The Inspector General has reported it; and, in fact, Afghani officials have reported it. They do not have the expertise, nor do they have the abilities, to maintain products after they are built. When the roads are constructed, they can't maintain them. So it is throwing money away.

The same thing happened with air-conditioners and other products that we gave the Iraqis and we have given the Afghanis. They cannot maintain them. They can't maintain them when they do construct them, but before that half of it is ripped off and graft. There are rankings of the most corrupt countries on the face of the Earth. Afghanistan is always number one or number two, and continues to be.

No matter how long we stay there and how long we have been there, the level of corruption has remained right at the top. That is not going to change.

Giving this money away is basically encouraging and endorsing and seconding corruption and graft that we have seen in Afghanistan over the years, and waste. This Congress should not be passing funds that we know are going to be corruptly going to officials who are putting it in their pockets, not helping the Afghani people.

In a perfect world, I wouldn't offer the amendment. In a perfect world, I would say, oh, ''Charlie Wilson,'' what a great movie, what a great story, we pulled out too soon. Well, Charlie Wilson was right in theory. He was wrong in application, because they steal and it is corrupt and they cannot maintain it. We couldn't have put enough money and enough people. You have to change the ethics.

I've heard a lot of people here on this floor talk about situations in America. They say, we can't do it, it has got to be the family do it. Well, talk about the family—the whole country is corrupt. They have stolen and stolen and stolen American dollars. We are throwing them away, and we need to stop it.

It should be a place, just as the Walberg-Cohen-Esty-Rigell amendment passed, that this amendment passes, so that we limit the amount of money that is at risk and we save this money for the American taxpayer. We put the money into deficit reduction, the next generation doesn't have to pay for the corruption of the Afghani officials and the waste of Afghanistan with the inability to maintain the projects that they finally might get squeezed out after they steal as much as they can. We should not be funding this.

I would ask that we approve our amendment in the name of fiscal austerity, deficit reduction, anticorruption, and just plain old, good old common sense. We might as well just have a bonfire and burn this money up before it goes over there because it is not going to work. In theory it is great, but in reality it doesn't work. The definition of ''insanity'' is expecting something different when you do the same thing over and over and over and you get the same result and you keep doing it.

So this Congress, which has less than 10 percent popularity right now, doesn't pass an insane amendment to give money to corruption and to waste, I ask you to approve this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, let's remind ourselves the Afghan Infrastructure Fund is aimed at providing water, power, and transportation projects, and more recently to increase the electricity supply throughout but, specifically in southern Afghanistan, to light shops and power factories and to construct provincial justice centers around the country.

It is clear that remaining projects could take 12 to 24 months to complete. A lot of work has already taken place, in particular on the seven power projects in its beginning stages; and as I said in the previous amendment, unlikely to be completed until well after the NATO mission ends in 2014. If these goals are not met, then a lot of great investment and a lot of good work will have gone for naught.

We remain in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

If the ranking member would like to speak on behalf, then I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and simply would take a bit of a different tack.

I do appreciate the gentleman's outrage over any act of corruption, whether it is in the country of Afghanistan or whether it is in the United States of America. We do have a responsibility to make sure these moneys are spent for the intended purposes.

But there is an insinuation that all expenditures in Afghanistan today are subject to corruption. I doubt there is a congressional district in this country that has not had, at some point in time, a public official sent to Federal prison for public corruption.

We then find people in our individual districts who are honest, law-abiding and who make the necessary investments. I am certain that the overwhelming number of people in Afghanistan and their government, as with the United States, are of that ilk. Those are the people we ought to assiduously make sure get this money, and for that reason would be opposed to the amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

All you have to do is look at the top, Mr. Karzai and his brother, who was killed, who was one of the main drug runners down there who was killed. The whole country from the top to the bottom is corrupt.

I thank the gentleman for his thoughts. You can't find honest people there to see that this money gets to their people. They don't care about their people. They care about their own power, their own money, their own riches. They are corrupt, and we are throwing this money away.

Let's face reality and pass the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to 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 Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. COFFMAN. 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 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $553,800,000)''.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $553,800,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Last year, this body, in the FY13 Defense authorization bill, specifically prohibited the Department of Defense from using any taxpayer funds to purchase Russian-built Mi–17 helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing.

Our reasoning was simple: the Russian export company involved in the deal, Rosoboronexport, had an established track record for aiding our adversaries, having supplied both Iran and Syria with advanced weaponry in the years prior.

However, despite our entirely reasonable objections to using taxpayer dollars to fund our enemies, the Department of Defense was intent on circumventing the will of Congress.

The language of the bill prohibited the use of FY13 funding. DOD responded by using any unobligated FY12 funds, circumventing the will of Congress as expressed in a law we passed and the President signed.

On June 16 of this year, DOD awarded a $553.8 million contract to Rosoboronexport for the purchase of 30 brand-new Mi–17 helicopters.

Last month, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, or SIGAR, released an audit of the Afghan Special Mission Wing, and their findings were shocking. The very first sentence of the audit reads:

> The Afghans lack the capacity—in both personnel numbers and expertise—to operate and maintain the existing and planned SMW fleets.

Finding recruits who are both literate and have no known association with criminal and terrorist elements is incredibly challenging.

The Afghan Special Mission Wing, or SMW, was stood up in July of 2012 in order to provide air support for Afghan Special Forces executing counternarcotics and counterterrorism missions, many of which are flown at night.

Further complicating the issue is the fact that the pilots assigned to the SMW, less than 15 percent are qualified to fly with night-vision goggles. The vast majority of counterterrorism missions take place under the cover of darkness.

My bipartisan amendment reduces the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund by $553.8 million, an amount equal to the contract DOD entered into with Rosoboronexport for 30 Mi–17 helicopters, and increases the Spending Reduction Account by the same amount.

Frankly, my preference would have been to rescind the FY 2012 dollars that DOD used to circumvent the will of Congress and enter into this deal, but an amendment of that nature would be subject to a point of order. This amendment forces DOD to reallocate resources if they want to continue down this path.

Mr. Chairman, I am not debating whether this helicopter is ideal for the rugged terrain of Afghanistan, or whether it is an easier platform for the Afghanis to train on and execute missions. There seems to be an overall consensus that, in fact, it is.

My concern, and the reason I introduced this amendment, is that the United States taxpayer should not be paying for 30 brand-new helicopters when, A, they don't have the pilots to fly them; B, they don't have the trained personnel to repair them. In fact, SIGAR reports that only 50 percent of the current wing is airworthy due to a lack of maintenance; and, C, Congress explicitly prohibited DOD from entering into this agreement in the first place.

Furthermore, the DOD is asking the American taxpayer to spend over $700 million a year to maintain these helicopters, and that spending is not scheduled to end in 2014 when we pull out our forces from Afghanistan.

Additionally, the Pentagon just announced last week that the purchase of Russian-built Mi–17 helicopters will not end with the 30 they just purchased for the SMW. Their plan is to equip the Afghan Air Force with an additional 86 brand-new Mi–17s. If you consider that the cost of 30 helicopters was over $500 million, this new purchase will be well over $1 billion, and probably over $1.5 billion. This for a helicopter that the Afghans have proven they lack the personnel to fly and the capability to maintain.

I urge my colleagues to support the Coffman-Garamendi-Murphy-Cohen amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. I claim the time in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment's sponsor is to reduce the Afghanistan National Security Force's Fund by over $550 million in order to limit the purchase of Mi–17 helicopters.

I am pleased that my friend from Colorado at least acknowledged that he was not going to argue with the purpose of the helicopters and the need for the helicopters, because as we all know, a properly trained and equipped Afghanistan National Security Force is the safest and quickest path for our forces to leave Afghanistan. Reducing funding from this account will only inhibit our ability to achieve the goal.

The amount that the amendment seeks to cut, over $550 million, is for the purchase of 30 Mi–17 helicopters that were purchased with fiscal year 2012 funds, and Congress was later notified of the Secretary of Defense's intent to exercise the purchase on April 1 of 2013.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of funds is being taken from a prior year allocation, or a prior year appropriation, which makes this amendment just simply a punitive amendment to this year's funding.

I oppose 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 Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

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

Mr. COFFMAN. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

□ 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,615,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we've had a lot of discussion here in the last several minutes about Afghanistan. This amendment follows along the same line, but it's actually far greater in dollars.

Last year, we appropriated $5.1 billion to the Afghanistan National Army for their support. In this year's budget, an additional $2.6 billion was added for—who knows what? It was $2.6 billion of American taxpayer money for something—airplanes? supplies? support equipment? trucks? It was unspecified, unknown, to be used by one of the most corrupt governments—no, excuse me—the most corrupt government in the world. $2.6 billion of American taxpayer money for something, unspecified, to be used somewhere, somehow—I suspect, more likely, in some bank account in Bahrain.

What are we doing? What justification is there for $2.6 billion of additional expenditure for the Afghan National Army? Have we lost our minds?

No. We're just going to lose our money. What is going on here? What are we doing? What is this all about?

This money should never be spent for some unspecified purpose. We take our Department of Defense, and we hold them to a very tight account. We don't let them spend money without a contract, without reviews by the inspector general, without reviews by our committee, but here is $2.6 billion, unspecified.

Oh, Mr. Karzai, use it wisely.

Come on. Come on. Let's not do this. This amendment would simply say, You can't have that money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Afghan National Security Forces include both the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police. It has been one of the United States' top priorities since operations began in Afghanistan in 2001.

The purpose of the Afghan National Security Force development program is to grow the capacity and the capability of the Afghan National Security Forces in line with international agreements. This year's request totals $7.7 billion. The request is further delineated into the categories of Defense Forces, Interior Forces, and Detainee Operations. Included within the categories is the base request for operations and sustainment to conduct day-to-day operations, totaling just over $5 billion, and an additional $2.6 billion for the enablers, which my friend refers to in his comments from the well.

The gentleman says, if I heard him correctly, that we don't know what these enablers are. We do know what these enablers are, and people who have backgrounds in security or in the military would understand the importance of howitzers or of night vision devices or of regional military hospitals, training, logistics, and maintenance expenses, and a host of other associated items that we refer to in this legislation as ''enablers.''

The Department of Defense has taken steps to right-size the funding needed to support the needs of the Afghan National Security Forces. The core request is, indeed, the right amount. Calendar year 2014, Mr. Chairman, will be the last year that a large U.S. troop concentration will be in Afghanistan. In the years to follow, the Afghan National Security Forces will be there as the frontline force, thus helping to protect the U.S. and NATO troops against our foes.

With that, I remain opposed to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I request to know how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAULSEN). The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I find it difficult that our esteemed Appropriations Committee, which watches the taxpayers' money with such ardor and intensity, would increase by 51 percent the amount of support that the American taxpayers are giving to the Afghan National Security Forces—the police, which are among—no, excuse me—they are the most corrupt—and the army, which is questionable, and certainly the government, which we know to be the most corrupt in the world—that it would simply write $2.6 billion more money than we were giving them last year, for a total of $7.6 billion, for something—something—unspecified.

We would never do this for our own military. Never would we do that. We would have them lay out how they were going to spend the money before we would even consider giving them the money, and then we would hold them to tight account.

I cannot understand why we would do this. There is no justification other than, oh, we're leaving, and we've got to help them, so throw some more money at them. They already have been appropriated $52 billion, and only $40 billion of that has been spent. There is $12 billion left in the account, and you're going to add $7.6 billion to that.

What are you doing? What justification is there for this other than, oh, they may need it because we're leaving? They're going to use it for—let's see—other things—well, maybe for some field hospitals, maybe for some airplanes, maybe for some supplies—maybe, maybe, maybe—but there is nothing written. There is nothing written. Oh, yes. We know the American Army or the American military will somehow spend it wisely. There is a 10-year record of its being spent unwisely. $2.6 billion.

What could we do with it? Could we reduce the deficit? Could we build some levees? Could we educate some kids? Could we do some research in the United States?

Come on. Of all of the things we're doing here today, this is the most disgusting.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOMACK. First of all, we have the list.

I recognize that the gentleman has argued that, while there may be something printed on the list, on paper, of ''how would we know that it's actually going to go for those purposes?'' I get that, but let me also remind the gentleman that this was all in the President's request as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOMACK. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. How many times have I heard from this side that the President is wrong? The President is wrong in this case.

Mr. WOMACK. So I'm assuming that the gentleman would admit that the President is wrong in this case as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. He most certainly is wrong in this case. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WOMACK. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just simply say that we have the list. On the list are, certainly, items that would go to the very core of the capability of the Afghan National Security Forces in order for them to be able to protect themselves and to be able to protect us as we continue to prepare for leaving that theater of operation. So I am strongly opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

At this time, in my having no further comments, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 34 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. FLEMING. 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 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to appoint chaplains for the military departments in contravention of Department of Defense Instruction 1304.28, dated June 11, 2004, incorporating change 2, dated January 19, 2012, as in effect on July 1, 2013, regarding the appointment of chaplains for the military departments.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

My amendment is fairly simple. The DOD is permitted to appoint military chaplains—individuals who minister to the spiritual needs of any and all members of the armed services—in accordance with the current DOD policy. Chaplains must possess appropriate educational credentials, 2 years of religious leadership experience, and, more

importantly, must receive an endorsement from a qualified religious organization attesting to the tenets of the endorser's faith.

In June, the Members of this body—Democrats and Republicans alike—twice affirmed that the military is not permitted to appoint atheist chaplains. Despite these recent votes and by completely bypassing Congress—the voice of the people—and current DOD standards, it has been confirmed that the military is considering the possibility of appointing an atheist chaplain. Since the formation of the chaplaincy in 1775, chaplains have been affiliated with faith and spirituality. By definition, chaplains minister to the spiritual needs of our men and women in the armed services—a vital function that an individual without any inclination towards spirituality would not be able to perform.

I would like to thank my colleagues—Representatives FORBES, BRIDENSTINE, JORDAN, PITTS, and LANKFORD—for their support of this amendment.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support the chaplaincy of the U.S. military, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fleming amendment.

I think there is a basic misunderstanding here about the needs of people who lack a particular faith tradition. I would also point out that we already ordain nontheistic chaplains in our military, including Buddhists, which is a nontheistic faith. Some Unitarians may also have a nontheistic faith tradition. However, over 20 percent of the members of our military identify as nonbelievers. While, of course, their needs should be catered to by members of the chaplaincy from diverse faiths, it's only fair to have their humanism, or outlooks, represented.

Now, why is this different than a reason a member of the military might seek support from a medical professional or from a psychologist as the gentleman has argued one should? Those are different needs.

A psychiatrist or a medical professional is not equipped to answer those kinds of existential questions that a member of the military might seek out to discuss with a chaplain: Why am I here? What's the meaning of life? How do I justify the use of force? People who are nontheistic in their outlooks and who are humanists wrestle with those same existential questions as those of us of faith. So I strongly encourage my colleagues to not adopt an amendment that would be restrictive on the military.

Now, to be clear, the military has not announced plans to move forward with ordaining humanist chaplains; but what this amendment does is to lock in place a 2004 rule, placing it in statute and preventing the military, even if they feel the need should arise for the good of the chaplaincy, from having the flexibility they need to appoint humanist chaplains.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Dr. FLEMING, for your leadership on this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. I support this amendment to prohibit the appointment of atheist chaplains.

My constituents back in Oklahoma are shaking their heads. The secular left is so invested in ripping God from everything that I must stand here with my friend Dr. FLEMING in order to prohibit Obama's Department of Defense from establishing an oxymoron—atheist chaplains.

Military chaplains have a duty to faithfully serve all servicemembers and to facilitate the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment. As a Navy pilot with combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, I recognize that war affects all servicemembers—believers and atheists. However, those without faith have plenty of options, from counselors to psychologists, from whom to seek emotional support.

Why does the secular left insist on ruining the integrity of the chaplaincy in order to serve their agenda of institutionalized godlessness?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 2015

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, our intent is not to promote institutionalized godlessness. Our intent is to promote constitutional fealty.

When a young man or young woman raises their right hand and swears allegiance to this country and agrees to serve in the Armed Forces, they do not consign themselves to serve as a second-class citizen, irrespective of their faith or their life philosophy.

It is wrong to say to a soldier who comes from such a tradition, that he or she, if they have an issue on which they're troubled, must go to a mental health professional in order to receive counseling, rather than someone who comes from their philosophical faith or tradition.

The other problem with this amendment is it frankly second guesses the military leadership of this country, the Pentagon of this country, the Defense Department, and says that even if they would decide that such a decision would be appropriate, they're prohibited from doing so.

Our law recognizes that our Constitution establishes no religion. We should have equality of treatment for our Armed Forces. I'd urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS, who is, by the way, a chaplain himself.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting amendment, especially for me, because I am currently a chaplain in the United States military.

I appreciate the arguments that have been made here, but let's just bring back something that needs to be made. When we deal with this in the contradiction of terms, a chaplain is there to provide services and spiritual guidance and a guiding hand, if you would, to all—those of faith and those with no faith. That is done in a confidential setting, and it is done in a way in which the person who brings to the chaplain their feelings, their needs, and their conversations are kept in that inviolate conversation.

What I'm here to do is to support this amendment because I believe it attacks the basis of the chaplaincy, it attacks the chaplaincy as a whole, this introduction into the DOD to bring an atheist chaplain to, really, the heart of the chaplaincy itself.

I think it is beyond more than just do those who have no faith have a place to go. It's not about that. I believe it's about the faith of the chaplaincy as a whole and the standards that have been set up.

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

Mr. FLEMING. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if a chaplain is doing their job right, then all feel welcome.

When I was in Iraq, I would go across and see everyone at night. I had many times those who profess no faith at all who would come to me and say, Chaplain, I don't believe there is a God, but I have a wife at home that I'm having trouble with. Can you talk to me? That's what a chaplain does.

This amendment reaffirms the establishment of our chaplaincy, and I believe that is what it protects; and it protects those with faith and those without faith and those who are somewhere in between. This amendment needs to be approved.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for his efforts on behalf of the chaplaincy. I agree with his interpretation of the rules and responsibilities of the chaplaincy. And we try to represent the diverse faith tradition of the men and women who serve.

In that faith tradition are those who look at objective fact, free thinkers, humanists, atheists. They too have the same mentoring, spiritual existential needs as others. And, of course, just as Catholics have to handle the needs of Jews and Muslims in the service and Buddhist chaplains handle the needs of

others, they're all trained to handle the needs of soldiers. We also want to make sure we have a chaplaincy that reflects the broad diversity of belief systems.

Over 20 percent of today's members of the military don't have a theistic outlook, are nonbelievers. That's an important thing to represent in the chaplaincy. Many major universities have humanist chaplains. Hospitals have humanist chaplains. Many of our allied European militaries have humanist chaplains.

As one of the other gentlemen argued, there is no political goal or secular agenda here. We simply want to make sure the military is not prevented from providing chaplaincy services for the men and women who put their lives at risk defending our country every day. Every man and woman who serves should be able, when the need arises, to have a private consultation with a chaplain; and we should include in the chaplaincy people who represent the full diversity of the beliefs of the quality of men and women who serve.

Increasingly, there are seminaries who prepare humanist chaplains for ordination and work in the field, in hospitals, in universities, and again in the militaries that have them. I personally hope that this is a direction that our military considers in the future. We ran a similar amendment that would move it in this direction to an authorization bill; 150 Members voted for it. I'm confident even more Members will want to vote against restricting the military from moving in this direction.

Again, to be clear, the Obama administration and the military have given no indication that they want to go this way; but as we reassess our ongoing personnel needs and how best to support the men and women who serve, I believe that many members of the military will come to the conclusion that this is an excellent way to do this.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, with all due respect to my good friend from Colorado, there is no way that an atheist chaplain or atheist whatever can minister to the spiritual needs of a Christian or a Muslim, or a Jew, for that matter.

As a result, that is the whole problem here. When you're talking about a chaplain, what are you talking about? How do we define chaplain? A chaplain is a person who ministers to spiritual needs, but who is assigned to a secular organization. The military is 99.9 percent secular. The only thing that we add to it that is nonsecular is the chaplaincy.

Also, I would say to you is that there is a limited number of chaplains. And if we begin to displace chaplains who are actually from religious organizations with those who are atheists, who do not believe in spirituality or a deity, then that's going to limit even the number that's going to be available to the others.

It's nonsensical. It's an oxymoron. But as I've said before, and I'll say this again, remember that an atheist is a person who does not believe in a deity, does not believe in a spiritual world. It's impossible for that person through his or her beliefs or training to minister to the spiritual needs of somebody who does.

In the final analysis, I believe that an atheist chaplain would be the last person in the world that we would want for a dying soldier who needs that last moment of counseling in their life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. RIGELL. 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 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund'' may be used to plan, develop, or construct any project for which construction has not commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which would prohibit any of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund to be used to begin new infrastructure projects.

There are a host of amendments that will address current projects. That's not the focus of my amendment. My amendment is focused on new projects.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the summary of an audit provided to Congress on July 12, by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It contains key findings that really make the case that my amendment is needed. The opening paragraph states this:

More than 10 years after international intervention in Afghanistan, the U.S. Government, the international community, and the Afghan Government continue to face challenges in implementing programs to build basic infrastructure.

That's certainly consistent with what I observed firsthand during my trip to Afghanistan.

It goes on to say that five of the seven infrastructure projects for fiscal year 2011 are up to 15 months behind schedule. USAID, the lead agency of this effort, certainly doesn't need to be taking on new projects when it can't get control of its current projects.

Really of far more importance and what is so deeply troubling, Mr. Chairman, is what is stated at the close of that same paragraph:

In some instances, these projects may result in adverse counterinsurgency efforts.

Let that sink in, Mr. Chairman. The Inspector General is making clear to us that the American taxpayers' dollars may be funding infrastructure projects that actually work against our counterinsurgency efforts.

It goes on to state the two reasons why that might occur.

First, these projects create an expectations gap among the affected population; second, they lack citizen support.

Look, even the Afghans don't want some of these projects.

The harsh reality is this, Mr. Chairman: while we're furloughing hardworking Americans who work alongside and support our men and women in uniform, we have poured not millions, but literally billions, $89.4 billion, in reconstruction efforts really into a cauldron of graft and corruption. It's not the way to spend America's tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop building infrastructure in Afghanistan.

Finally, the Inspector General's report makes clear that we are building infrastructure that the Afghans cannot possibly maintain and sustain. They don't have the money, and they won't have the money. Buildings will deteriorate. Generators will run out of fuel. Lights will go out. Yet we keep building. We keep adding to the national debt.

Look, we're hiring Afghans and laying off American workers. This doesn't make any sense, Mr. Chairman. It's time to stop building infrastructure in Afghanistan.

That is why I urge my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, to look carefully at this issue. I believe that will lead to a vote for my amendment, which will prohibit any of the Afghanistan infrastructure funds be used to begin new infrastructure projects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this is another in a line of amendments that we have debated here this evening;

and I hate to be repetitive, but I am going to be. We and the international community have failed the country of Afghanistan in the last century. Today, in terms of the loss of life, in terms of injury, and in terms of our national treasure, we are paying the price. For over a decade, we have now had a commitment to this country, and we ought to meet that commitment at the end just as we did at the beginning.

The gentleman wants to prohibit essentially any new projects from commencing. I think it is important for our colleagues to understand that there are a number of very important projects that do need to be undertaken and completed. All of them involve, basically, power systems.

I don't think there's anybody in this Chamber who has not at one time or another lost power to their home or their business. It's something we all take for granted as American citizens. If any of you have read the Caro biography on Lyndon Johnson, in the first volume I was most struck by his chapter describing the day in the life of a woman in Texas with no energy and how hot that house was and how hard it was to bring that water to that house and how difficult it was to make sure clothes were cleaned and food was prepared and how exhausted and bent and broken these women were in the State of Texas before rural electrification took place.

□ 2030

I think there are a lot of people in the country of Afghanistan today, because they lack power, that they are bent and broken, and potentially are subject to being persuaded that there are other avenues to take in life for a better one, as opposed to the principles that our country espouses. I think particularly for those women who are bent and broken because they have no power in the country of Afghanistan, we ought to give them a fighting chance at the end.

We've been fighting in that country for 12 years, let's give them a fighting chance at the end. Let us undertake some new construction to give them that chance. Simply because we have failed in some instances in this country is not, again as I have said before, is a reason that we should fail others.

I see the gentleman from California rise, and I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in opposition to this amendment.

I understand the gentleman's concerns about what's happened in Afghanistan, what is happening in Afghanistan. Many of us have been to Afghanistan many times. That country was totally destroyed by the Russians during the prior war. They were left with nothing. It is probably, if not the poorest, one of the poorest countries on the face of the Earth, rubble on rubble.

And when we leave, and we are going to leave Afghanistan in 2014, what we're saying is we're going to give them the basic parts of energy production, which is what the primary source of this money is going to develop.

So I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and join the gentleman in his opposition.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. I appreciate the comments of both of my colleagues. I certainly don't agree with them. However, if I understood the gentleman correctly who led in opposition, and I do want to get this right, and I will yield if I don't get it correct, but I made the notes here that the gentleman said we have failed the nation, the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I did not. I don't want to fail them.

Mr. RIGELL. Don't want to. Thank you for the clarification.

Mr. Chairman, by any measure, we won't and have not and will not fail those people because we have sacrificed so great a measure of treasure and loss of life. We have met every obligation to the people of Afghanistan. And look, our principle and primary and exclusive obligation, of course, is to the American people. The best indicator of future performance is past performance. We have not demonstrated competence, as much as we've tried and good people have given their all. In fact, some of our civilians at USAID, as we all know, have given their life in this effort. But we have not demonstrated a competency to advance these projects, and here are the facts on the economy.

The entire revenue stream for the Afghan government is about a billion dollars a year. We've raised up a military operation there, the Afghan army and police, the largest employer by far in the country, that has an annual expenditure of about 7 or $8 billion. Look, the math doesn't work. We've created a structure here that's going to require, absent some difficult decisions, a sharp reduction of expenditures there.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. SCALISE. 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 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract after the date of the enactment of this Act for the procurement or production of any non-petroleum based fuel for use as the same purpose or as a drop-in substitute for petroleum.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I bring forward is a very basic, straightforward, commonsense amendment that deals with the funding priorities within the Department of Defense. We know we are living in a post-sequester world. We have many hearings here on Capitol Hill where we have generals and, in fact, even the Secretary of Defense talking about the threats to military operations through the sequester cuts. We all know that those are real, and especially in these tight economic times, and even if we weren't in tight economic times, but especially right now, we ought to be watching every single dollar that is spent within the Department of Defense and work to find ways to make smarter use of those dollars.

One of the things that we've found as we've combed through is that the Department of Defense has been entering into contracts to buy renewable fuels, biodiesel and other forms of renewable fuels to supplant what are the traditional, conventional fuels. The problem is that the contracts they are entering into are tremendously more expensive to the taxpayer than if they just bought conventional fuel.

So what this amendment would do is to say that the Department of Defense cannot enter into those contracts to buy nontraditional fuels at these higher costs.

I want to give a couple of examples. I think it is important to note a few of them because this is something that has been happening recently that we found. There is a memorandum of understanding between the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Energy for each of those entities to spend $170 million each to ''assist development and support of a sustainable commercial biofuels industry.''

Now, Mr. Chairman, whatever you think of expanding and developing a biofuels industry, that's not a mission of the Department of Defense, and especially when their budgets are being cut and the generals and the Secretary of Defense are saying they don't have enough money to perform and execute their basic military operations. Yet they're spending $170 million to prop up a failing biofuels industry when

they could instead be buying traditional fuels.

I just want to give one example of what we call this renewable energy sticker shock. Here you've got furloughs at the Pentagon, the military has grounded the Blue Angels, and yet they have a contract right now to buy renewable jet fuel at $59 per gallon—$59 per gallon—when the traditional cost of conventional jet fuel is $3.73 per gallon. And yet the military, to carry out some kind of social agenda, is spending an extra $56, almost $56 more per gallon, so they can buy renewable fuel. So this is one example of many where the military is not making the smartest use of their military dollars, at a time when Secretary Hagel himself has testified before committee that the services have begun to significantly reduce training and maintenance of operating forces.

So if they're reducing the training and maintenance of operating forces, why are they spending hundreds of millions of dollars to prop up a renewable energy industry that is clearly not viable yet. One day it will be, but today it's not, and yet they're spending in some cases 5, 10, 12 times more to buy this renewable energy than they would pay for conventional, wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. This amendment just says that has to stop.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would begin by pointing out that the Department of Defense is the single largest consumer of energy in the United States of America, and I certainly do believe that we need to move from a carbon-based economy, particularly given some of the countries in the world where we procure carbon products such as petroleum. Many people talk about it as an economic problem, and it is. Many people characterize it as an environmental problem, and it is. We're talking about the national defense today, and I certainly agree with former Senator Richard Lugar from the State of Indiana who has always characterized our dependency on foreign petroleum as a national security issue.

This is the perfect bill to have the largest consumer of energy begin to reduce our dependence on these very countries that have cost us so much of our treasure and so many of our lives.

This amendment would defund section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act. The fact is the argument is made that this hurts our readiness and that's not the case. In July the Department of Defense stated very clearly:

> The provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we need today worldwide to support military missions, but it also sets an important baseline in developing the fuels we need for the future.

The gentleman would indicate that there is nearly a 20-fold difference in the price of renewables and the price of petroleum at the pump today. The price of $3-some cents a gallon, unfortunately some jurisdictions $4 a gallon, can be purchased very close to this building. Many of these fuels have to be transported to places like Afghanistan. There's an additional cost that is worked into that 20-fold increase.

Additionally, I do not think we need to complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy options. We want to give our warfighters as many options as possible when they are in the field to take advantage of.

This section also does not prevent the sale of petroleum products, nor does it prevent Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need them. Instead, it simply prevents the Federal Government from propping up the makers of these types of fuels with long-term contracts when we're trying to wean ourselves from them.

So I do think that the amendment should be opposed, and I do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time, and it is my understanding that I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has the right to close.

Mr. SCALISE. I will close, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman makes an important point when he says that the Department of Defense is America's largest user of energy. Then I think it is even more important that they watch every penny. You know, I've got hard-working taxpayers, soccer moms in my district, that will drive an extra three blocks just to save a penny a gallon on gasoline because they can see that price at the pump, and it matters to them. If they can save a penny a gallon, they'll drive a couple of extra blocks. And yet you've got the Department of Defense, the largest user of energy in the Nation, according to my friend, saying that they're willing to not drive an extra block to save money; they'll drive a couple of extra blocks to spend $59 a gallon when they can buy that same jet fuel for $3.73 a gallon.

Again, another contract, there was a big, high-profile production on the Great Green Fleet where they flew some planes on renewable energy. It cost an extra $10 million just for that one example.

Again, they're flying the Blue Angels—they're grounded right now, and we're out there flying jets that run on algae and cooking oil, spending hundreds of millions of dollars more than if you used traditional jet fuel.

So while I applaud the gentleman's effort to support renewable energy, that's not something that the Department of Defense should be wasting hundreds of millions of dollars on when the Secretary of Defense has said that we actually are right now significantly reducing training and maintenance of operational forces. We should take those hundreds of millions of dollars we'll save with this amendment and provide it for our troops for the support they need because right now it actually risks our troops' lives. It's a 50 percent higher risk for them to be transporting renewable fuels than it is to transport traditional fuels because of the density of that renewable fuel. So it puts them more at risk. I urge support of this amendment. Let's save those hundreds of millions of dollars and dedicate it towards our Nation's security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I maintain my opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. TERRY. 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 157, after line 2, add the following new section:
>
> SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

□ 2045

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise because of 650,000 people in my district; 4,400 employees who serve at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska are being used as political footballs.

Programs like the section 526 that we just heard the gentleman from Louisiana discuss mandate that the armed services spend entirely too much money on fuels. Section 526 also bans our military from using other traditional energy sources like oil sands from Alberta, or even coal-to-liquids.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support, though, for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who has done this amendment in the past. To me, it's not about who gets the credit or who reaps the rewards, just that it gets done.

I'm tired of the Pentagon using civilian workers on base as a political football and then spends the money that they do on fuels. So by working together to cut waste from this bill, like

section 526, we can find ways to protect our constituents who have devoted their lives to serving the men and women who wear the uniform.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. WITTMAN. 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 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have before you today provides that none of the funds in this year's Defense appropriations act may be made available to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round, better known as BRAC.

Remember, we have a current BRAC in place that continues to cost our Nation dollars in the defense budget; and I want to remind folks, too, that this same language passed in this year's National Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 315–108 on June 14, and it says that we want to make sure that we're making the right decisions in the context of what's going on around us.

We have an existing BRAC that will not save a penny until 2018. The original cost-savings estimates on that BRAC were $21 billion. Today, the cost of that BRAC is estimated at $35 billion, and the Nation won't break even until 2018. In fact, in this year's President's budget, the estimated cost of that BRAC is $450 million.

Now, we wouldn't want to proceed with another BRAC with potential cost savings somewhere in the future while we're still paying for the additional BRAC, especially in light of the budgetary needs that are before us with our Nation's defense budget.

With the sequester going on, with those reductions, and with the uncertainty surrounding the current state of affairs with our national defense, why would we want to continue in the realm of uncertainty spending more dollars with an uncertain future about when savings would occur, when we haven't even accrued savings from the 2005 BRAC?

Again, just not the time to go about this, not the time to put in place another Base Realignment and Closure commission.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I seek to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

I note that the gentleman's amendment says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to propose, plan, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

If the gentleman had simply said today we should not execute that national additional Base Realignment and Closure round, I would not have stood on my feet. But the fact is, he said we shouldn't propose or plan either.

He also indicated that because we are today paying, I believe, some hundreds of millions of dollars for the current base closure, we should not consider paying for another one.

But the question I would ask, rhetorically, not necessarily of my colleagues, is, don't we have to sometimes make an investment for the future?

That is, there are cleanup costs, there are close-up costs, there are demolition costs, and those are short-term costs. But potentially, those are investments year in and year out for decades where this Nation's taxpayers can save money.

And where the gentleman says we shouldn't consider another closure and, at this point I'm not aware that there's a proposal pending, what if we could save money by doing that?

Should we simply say no?

Should we just say no to everything?

Is it wrong to consider how we might look at every last base and military facility in this country to save taxpayers money?

Essentially, the gentleman's amendment says it's wrong to look at them. It would be wrong to propose to the Congress, that has the authority under article I of the Constitution, to decide whether, then, we execute that proposal.

Is it wrong for an administration to look nationwide where we're spending almost $600 billion for a more expensive Department of Defense, but not a larger one, that says we have a plan, and they send it to the Congress?

But we can't even do that, so we can't have a discussion. We can't have an open and free debate. We can't even, would not be allowed, under the gentleman's amendment, to say, you know what, you've got a plan, but we can make it better. We could make it more efficient. We could amend it, but we're prohibited from doing that.

I think the time for simply saying no, no, no, no, no is gone, and I think the gentleman's amendment is wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that, in light of what we have today, with the uncertainty, with the sequester, with the reduction in funds where we are saving money by furloughing Federal employees, now is not the time to spend more money in this realm of uncertainty, especially when the Secretary of Defense is undertaking a strategic choice in management review to determine what our strategy should be going forward. We certainly want to determine the strategy first before we're going to make additional expenditures on closing bases.

Also, there's a current evaluation going on with our facilities in Europe and our facilities in the Pacific. Shouldn't we finish that first before we start even considering closing bases here in the United States where, by the way, we still haven't gotten to the point of saving money from the last BRAC round, which will take at least 13 years to save money?

So if we start another one that would take another 13 years, are we in the position to spend more money to do that while we have these areas of uncertainty surrounding us, a sequester resulting in furloughs, an evaluation of the current strategy for the United States, an evaluation of base structures in other areas of the world?

I say that this is absolutely the wrong time to pursue a BRAC in any way, shape or form, to propose, plan or execute a BRAC in all those areas.

Let's create some certainty with what's happening right now with this Nation's defense, with what we're doing with planning, to make sure it's a logical, a thoughtful process where there's some certainty, not throwing more uncertainty in the process, which is what a BRAC round would do now.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to emphasize, at this time in our Nation's defense budgeting, we ought to be looking at where we can save dollars, where we can apply dollars to those areas of greatest need. And I argue those areas of greatest need are for this Nation's readiness, the training of our troops, the operation and maintenance of our equipment, making sure that we get those dollars there; and that before we pursue a BRAC, we ought to know what the areas are, where we are going to go with this Nation's strategy, what our base structure should be in other areas of the world.

After being at war for nearly 12 years, now we have a well-trained, battle-hardened, combat-tested force, and they are an all-volunteer force that's more joint than ever. We want to understand where we need to be going forward to make sure that we provide for them.

Closing these bases now, or even pursuing a Base Realignment and Closure commission, this is not the time to do that.

Mr. Chairman, again, this is the wrong time. We ought to be looking at the place in time where we have actually accrued the savings on the last BRAC, which started in 2005. Before we pursue another, we ought to make sure we know what this Nation's strategy is, militarily, before we pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission. We ought to know what should our base structures be elsewhere in the world.

Before we pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission here in the United States, we ought to make sure we understand where we're going with the sequester, where we're going with furloughs, where we're going with end-strength with our military before we close bases.

If we're going to be reducing end-strength by 100,000 and say, by the way, let's pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission now, how do we know where we need to be?

That uncertainty is not where we need to be, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the gentleman, on any number of occasions during his discussion, talked about the uncertainty that we face in this country because of sequestration, and I couldn't agree with him more and would point out that the gentleman voted for the Budget Control Act that created sequestration that has now created the uncertainty that we face, which I find very regrettable.

The gentleman, also, in his concluding remarks, indicated that we need to look to save money. I couldn't agree with him more.

He also indicated, and I would accept it for the sake of our discussion here on the House floor, that some of these processes take 13 years. I think the gentleman makes my argument. If it takes 13 years, we ought to start today, so that that child who is born later this week has the benefit of these savings we both want before they get to high school.

Why wait to save the American taxpayers money by potentially not considering a plan?

I think we ought to be thoughtful here, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 113–170.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. FLORES. 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 157, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources.

My amendment is simple. It would stop the government from enforcing this ban on agencies funded by the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), said a few minutes ago, the initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel.

We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel. One of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable, Middle East crude resources.

I offered this amendment to the Fiscal Year 2014 Homeland Security Appropriations Act and the Fiscal Year 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act, and they both passed on the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

□ 2100

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my good friend from Texas.

I also want to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Section 526 was added to the 2007 energy bill as a last-minute add-on, with no hearings, without any information about it whatsoever, and it is beyond misguided. It may sound good on paper, but it is totally unenforceable.

No one in their right mind has a clue what the life-cycle greenhouse gases are for any of the fuels that anybody buys. And, quite frankly, as we blend crude oil sources at a refinery to run through the refinery on a most efficient basis, there is absolutely no way to separate out the gasoline jet fuel diesel that comes from that refining that would be required if—let's assume for sake of this conversation we actually get the Keystone pipeline done, some of that oil from Canada starts flowing south into our refineries. There is absolutely no way anyone can certify which gasoline coming out is related to those sources versus some others.

So this is misguided. It's unworkable and extreme. I would prefer that we exempt the entire all of government from section 526, but that's obviously beyond the scope of tonight's legislation. I want to thank my friends—Mr. FLORES, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. GINGREY—for, again, posing the striking or exempting of the Department of Defense from the misguided requirements in section 526, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, as we said earlier, this amendment is a simple fix, and that fix is to not restrict our fuel choices based on bad policies or misguided regulations like those in section 526. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, grow the American economy, create American jobs, and become more energy secure.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I won't prolong the debate because this is either the third or fourth installment, if you would, of this debate, but my response to the current iteration is the same as I have expressed throughout the night. We do have an energy problem in the United States of America, and I agree with former Senator Richard Lugar that it is, first and foremost, a national security interest, given where we get petroleum products.

We've been at war in the Middle East. We've been at war in Afghanistan. We have other problems internationally, much of it precipitated because of our dependence on that fuel. This is not the time, I believe, that we ought to in any way, shape, or form retard the largest consumer of energy in this country from examining and helping to create a vibrant market for alternatives to reduce that.

So, for those reasons and the reasons discussed earlier in this evening's debate, I would be opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed the debate tonight and I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

I would say this. This amendment does not do any of those things that he

said it would. It does not prevent and does not restrict the ability of the Federal Government or the Department of Defense to purchase any alternative fuels—it does not restrict those—including biodiesel, ethanol, or other fuels from renewable resources. So it does not do any of those things that would prevent the flexibility of the Department of Defense in acquiring fuels. As a matter of fact, it helps the Department of Defense have more flexibility.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this a amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time

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

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

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

Mr. FLORES. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. COLE. 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:

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 carry out a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) that—

(1) includes in the notice of the furlough made pursuant to section 752.404(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, ''sequestration'' as the reason for the furlough; and

(2) is of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is paid from amounts in a Working Capital Fund Account pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I'm offering a bipartisan amendment this evening, Mr. Chairman, to prevent funds from the so-called Working Capital Fund from being used to implement furloughs of DOD employees. This amendment would affect approximately 180,000 workers scattered around the country in different working Capital Fund units. Tinker, Hill, Robbins, the great Air Logistics Centers, account for 26,000 of those.

Working Capital Fund employees are indirectly funded by the government and not by direct appropriations. The commands where these employees are paid have more than sufficient funds to continue to operate without a furlough. Indeed, furloughing these workers would be counterproductive and ultimately cost money.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern and the fact that he is focused on working capital that is essentially funded through customer reimbursement, but as I mentioned in an earlier debate, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I voted against the Budget Control Act. I think sequestration is an abhorrent way to run the government. I was disappointed last year when we made every Federal agency in this Nation, including the Department of Defense, wait 7 months until we told them how much money we were going to give them. And then, we told most of the agencies that we're going to give you what we gave you last year.

Now we're suffering because of furloughs. And the concern I have here, again, is making distinctions between one Federal employee and another. They're all very important. I don't know what going to work every day as a guard in a maximum security Federal prison must be like, but I don't know that we carve out an exception for them. I don't know what it is like to be a Federal law enforcement official working undercover, putting your life at risk, getting reimbursed, but not being carved out for furlough.

We have people at NIH, the National Institutes of Health, doing groundbreaking research as far as people's health and safety; and perhaps they not themselves are risking their lives, but tomorrow, if they were at work, could make a discovery that could improve or prolong someone's life. And I think it's a very difficult proposition to begin to make those distinctions between various Federal employees.

I absolutely share the gentleman's concern as to what is happening with the Federal workforce. I have mentioned in committee and on this floor more than once today that I'm appalled that for 4 years we hold Federal employees in so little regard. We have not given any of them a raise in 4 years. But we scurried to the floor because people were going to be inconvenienced at airports because of potential slowdowns at the FAA. Well, Federal employees actually do things for our safety like make sure, when we leave the ground in an airplane, we're safe.

So, again, I'm very concerned here. The fact is I do think allowing exceptions for one agency is unfair to others. Allowing exceptions that pit one agency against another wrongly determines the value of the work performed by some government employees vis-a-vis others. We ought to value all of their work collectively, together, and should not be looking for temporary fixes of one dislocation, as great as it is, caused by sequestration. What we ought to be about—and I know the gentleman is about—is to end this madness, if you would, and get back to the business of governing this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from the State of Washington (Mr. KILMER), a new Member from the Sixth District.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Let me take a second here to say I oppose sequestration, I oppose the furloughs, and I believe Congress should be moving forward on a plan to eliminate sequestration and the process of furloughing workers. But Congress hasn't done that, and now we're forced to deal with an ugly process where we're cutting accounts and cutting workers, not because it makes any sense for the public interest or for our security, but because Congress can't get its act together.

This amendment responds to what I believe was an incorrect decision by the Department of Defense to furlough civilian workers who work at entities that were funded through Defense Working Capital accounts. The Working Capital Funds are revolving funds that provide goods and services across the DOD that were established to promote stable pricing and reliable access. They were designed to be self-sustaining.

I certainly empathize with the other workers and groups that are facing furloughs, but these workers are not funded through direct appropriation. I believe that these indirectly funded employees are specifically exempted by law from sequestration. Furthermore, I believe that furloughing these employees and, thereby, delaying their work will not save any money, will only increase costs for DOD and hurt taxpayers and jeopardize our military readiness.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority whip from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This issue is straightforward. It deals with Defense Working Capital Funds.

This is just like owning a business. When you provide a service or a product, you get paid for it. That is how Defense Working Capital Funds operates. They're paid through reimbursements for the services they provide to the Department of Defense, which is already funded for the fiscal year. Thus, Working Capital Funds do not receive direct

appropriations and, therefore, furloughing these individuals have no savings. They actually have the direct opposite effect. It will cost you more, there will be delays, and, most importantly, individuals will be harmed in the process.

The specialized work the Defense Working Capital Fund employees perform is vital to our Nation's security and our warfighters around the globe. A blanket 11-day furlough policy, such as China Lake in my district, will only end up slowing down getting our warfighters the best and latest technology to complete their mission when called upon to protect and defend America and safely return home to their families.

This is very simple. They are a business that performs work and they get paid for it, and the money is already there. That's why I ask and urge all of us to join in supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my classmate and colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as stated, this workload is a self-sustaining process, which means, if the workload is there, and it is, then the money is there, and it is. To furlough the employees in this area saves no money, it completes no work, but it does raise the cost of overhead for all of the depots.

I have empathy for the Pentagon. They made a decision that everyone should share the pain in an effort to be fair. Unfortunately, title 10, section 2472, tells us how this fund should be managed. Sharing the pain isn't one of the options.

I appreciate what is going on here, but the Defense Department cannot simply pick and choose. This amendment does not start a new program. It simply requires that the existing law be followed.

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

Mr. COLE. I yield 1 minute to my good friend from the great State of Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proud cosponsor of this truly bipartisan amendment, as demonstrated by those who are speaking in favor of it tonight. I, too, voted against sequestration, and I oppose furloughing any DOD citizens who work on behalf of our national security and our troops. Those working at the Rock Island Arsenal, which I represent, proudly serve our country. They don't deserve a pay cut because of Washington's dysfunction. It's as simple as that. That's why Congress and the administration must find a balanced, commonsense way to replace sequestration.

This amendment addresses the unique situation of Working Capital Fund civilians like those at the Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center, who are already funded from prior years. I think that's important to keep in mind. Furloughing these men and women doesn't create direct savings, as has already been mentioned; rather, it delays work for our troops, hurts our readiness, and increases costs for taxpayers without direct savings.

□ 2115

Again, I oppose all furloughs, and I do oppose sequestration. This amendment, I believe, is a commonsense policy for DOD and for Working Capital Fund employees, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Again, it's a fully bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend from the great State of Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a sensible, bipartisan solution. It helps the country by helping those who work at our depots and other areas. I would just ask that my colleagues join this bipartisan coalition that's working in support of this amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 43 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. DELAURO. 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:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to train the Afghan National Security Forces Special Mission Wing to operate or maintain Mi-17 helicopters.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds in this bill from being used by the Defense Department to train the Afghan Special Mission Wing to operate or maintain Russian-made Mi-17 helicopters.

Over 93,000 people have died in a tragic war in Syria that is being fueled by Russian arms being supplied to the Assad regime. Over 1.6 million Syrian refugees are now hosted across five countries. By the end of the year, half the population of Syria will be in need of aid.

We know for a fact that the Russian arms manufacturer, Rosoboronexport, is arming Syria. The Syrian Army requested 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenades, and sniper rifles with night-vision sights. And Russia also recently announced it would provide Assad with advanced S–300 missile defense batteries. Yet, our Defense Department continues to channel business to this Russian arms manufacturer.

DOD recently skirted around a prohibition on purchasing Mi-17 helicopters from Russia's state arms dealer in last year's Defense appropriations bill, signing a contract with Rosoboronexport to procure 30 Mi-17s for the Afghan Specialty Mission Wing using 2012 Afghanistan Security Forces Fund moneys.

This contract signing, flying in the face of congressional intent, incredibly came just days after this House voted 423–0 to strengthen the prohibition on Pentagon business with the Russian arms dealer—a prohibition also included in this Defense appropriations bill.

Even more egregious, it also came on the heels of a report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction that recommended suspension of the plans to purchase these helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing as the Afghans do not even have the capacity to use them.

The Defense Department touts the 30 years of experience the Afghans have with the Mi-17 helicopters as a key reason to purchase them, yet we are still trying to train them to fly these helicopters instead of American-made helicopters—training that the Inspector General report says has been slow and uneven.

The report also argues that moving forward with the acquisition of these Mi-17 helicopters is highly imprudent until, among other things, an agreement is reached on NATO's Afghanistan Training Mission concept for reorganization within the Afghan Government to support this Special Mission Wing.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. taxpayers should not be subsidizing the Russian state arms dealer that is fueling the war in Syria. The language already included in this bill states this. We should also not be spending money to train an Afghan unit to fly these Russian helicopters, particularly when the Inspector General has raised serious questions about the content of that unit's capabilities.

I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the Afghan National Army Special Forces are the most capable component of the Afghan National Security Forces and have made significant strides toward becoming an independent and effective force in Afghanistan.

The only path forward to getting out of Afghanistan is to make sure that we have an effective army, special force, that can do the necessary work to make sure that the fragile Afghan governance that is there survives.

The purpose of this amendment is not to limit the Afghan Special Forces but to further restrict the use of the helicopter it employs to support its mission. The development of the Afghan Army Special Operators remains a critical component of the overall operation structure and strategy to sustain the transition to Afghan security lead.

In other words, if we want to get out of there by 2014, 2015, the Afghan Air Force must succeed. And it has a history, whether we like it or not, with the Mi-17. It's more efficient to expand its fleet and build on their existing knowledge of maintaining that fleet than to completely shift to an entirely different aircraft.

Additionally, U.S. helicopters are more technologically advanced. They're a better helicopter, I'll agree. But it would further prolong the timelines of getting the AAF where they need to be to completely take over the program.

The Mi-17 has been certified by the Department of Defense and is to be the right aircraft for the missions in Afghanistan. The Mi-17 has a long history in Afghanistan and was designed for the high altitude terrain there.

So I reluctantly oppose the gentlelady's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to say to my good friend that I think that we ought to be amenable to working with Afghanistan in these final days, but I don't make up this information.

Our Defense Department continues to channel business to this Russian arms manufacturer. DOD skirted around the prohibition on purchasing Mi-17 helicopters in the last appropriations bill. We voted overwhelmingly—I don't know that there has been a vote in this House on a bipartisan basis that was 423–0—to prohibit this.

So what did the DOD do? The DOD went around that and went to a different pot of money. And one could acknowledge that, but in addition to acknowledging that, I'm going to quote to you from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction:

> Afghan Special Mission Wing: DOD plans to spend $908 million to build air wing that the Afghans cannot operate and maintain.

Now, I don't know why we keep in business an Inspector General that would give us this report, and then we fly in the face of it and not acknowledge its veracity. In addition to which, we are dealing with an arms dealer that is supplying arms, grenades, Kalashnikovs, missiles to Syria, where over 93,000 people have already been killed.

The point is that we shouldn't enter a contract when there is no capability to fly these helicopters.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, we're not talking about a helicopter manufacturer that would suffer. It's the combat unit in Afghanistan that would be devastated and unable to fulfill its mission, and if it's not able to fulfill its mission, then we will not have a capable military to take over when the United States leaves in 2014.

I'm not going to defend Russia or their foreign policy and what they're doing in Syria, but we do want Afghanistan to succeed. So I reluctantly must oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. 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 Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. LEE of California. 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:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. (a) The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by one percent.
>
> (b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available—
>
> (1) under title I for ''Military Personnel'';
>
> (2) under title VI for ''Defense Health Program''; or
>
> (3) under title IX.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressmen POLIS, BLUMENAUER, CONYERS, and SCHRADER, who have joined me in offering this amendment.

Our amendment is very straightforward. It would trim Pentagon spending by a very modest 1 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates our amendment would result in a reduction of discretionary spending of $5.9 billion, and it does so while maintaining our national security and protecting our Active Duty military personnel.

This Defense appropriations bill is $28.1 billion more than the Pentagon's current funding level, which includes $5 billion more than the President's request for war spending in the Overseas Contingency Account. In total, this bill includes over $85 billion in war spending at a time when the majority of the American people and a growing bipartisan group in Congress are calling for an expedited end of military activities in Afghanistan.

Our amendment simply takes the total amount in the bill, reduces that amount by 1 percent, and then allows the Department of Defense to choose what accounts to take the reduction from. As I mentioned before, military personnel accounts and medical and health care programs are exempt from this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, month after month we have been talking about ways to address the budget and the impacts of the harmful sequester. The question before the body today is: How do we ensure that we have a budget that reflects our national security priorities, our moral values, and our underlying economic strength? I'm talking about a budget that protects the most vulnerable in our country and a budget that ensures that we have priorities to create jobs and turn this economy around—in other words, nation-building in our own country.

What this amendment does is say that we need to put everything on the table—and I mean everything—and that includes the Pentagon. Believe me, if I could, I would support much greater cuts to the Pentagon. But surely $5 billion can be found among the tens of billions of dollars lost each year at the Pentagon due to waste, fraud, and abuse. You know that that $5 billion is a mere drop in the bucket when you look at what has been actually taken away without knowledge of where that money has gone, when you look at the suitcases filled with cash in Afghanistan, and previously in Iraq.

Even with this modest cut of 1 percent, the Pentagon base budget would still far outpace any other nation in defense spending. The United States spends as much on its military as 13 countries combined. But all three of these are close allies. I'm talking about China, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, India, Saudi Arabia, Germany, of course Brazil, Italy, South Korea, Australia and Canada. Combined, we spend more than those countries.

Finally, Americans believe that no Federal agency should really be immune from cuts, including the Pentagon. In fact, the average American would pursue a much larger cut of over $93 billion, according to a poll released in 2012 by the Stimson Center.

So it's long overdue that we be honest with the American people and begin to have some real debate about deficit reduction, job creation, and the reduction of spending. And that includes the Pentagon.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I'm the first to admit that the Department of Defense should not be immune to reasonably based reductions. We should be doing that. That's exactly what we've been doing the past few years and will continue to do this year.

□ 2130

This bill that we are deciding today and tomorrow is $3.4 billion below the President's request. In fact, over the past 3 fiscal years, this committee has produced defense budgets which totaled $71 billion below the request, only $32 billion of which has been due to sequestration.

The Department is already facing another $44 billion arbitrary reduction in spending if we don't stop sequestration from going into effect in FY 2014. Any further immediate and arbitrary reductions would likely bring the Department to a grinding halt, perhaps past the point of recovery.

Specifically, reductions could require reducing/canceling training for returning troops; canceling Navy training exercises; reducing Air Force flight training; delaying or canceling maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles; and delaying important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and military barracks.

Finally, the allocation of this bill is essentially in line with both the Ryan budget, as well as the Defense authorization bill. National security should not be subject to partisan politics. Instead, we should show our support for these brave men and women who have sacrificed so much and continue to do so.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentlewoman's approach. I have on more than one occasion in talking about the Department of Defense, my constituency indicated, as the gentleman noted, no one should be immune to cuts; and if you can't find 1 cent out of every dollar at the Department of Defense to save, there is something wrong with the leadership at the Department of Defense.

But I rise in reluctant opposition for two reasons:

One is I have an inherent objection to across-the-board cuts because I think we ought to make sure we are very targeted as far as our financial decisions.

Secondly, given the across-the-board cut that has been referenced of more than $30 billion in the current fiscal year because of sequestration under a bill I voted against, we are talking in this instance about filling a significant arbitrary hole.

So again, I would reluctantly be opposed to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first thank our ranking member for his comments and just reiterate the fact that while this is a 1 percent cut across-the-board, it allows the Pentagon to make those decisions about where the Pentagon and our military officials believe the cuts should come from and how to reallocate our funds.

Certainly as the daughter of a veteran of 25 years—I'm an Army brat—I recognize and support our young men and women who have been placed in harm's way and who have sacrificed so much for our country. There is no way that I would offer an amendment that would harm our troops.

A 1 percent cut really forces us to pause, quite frankly, and forces us to look where we can find savings when we scrutinize the Pentagon budget, the same way that we scrutinize our domestic discretionary spending. At a time when American families, businesses, and government agencies are facing budget cuts, why shouldn't the Pentagon be asked to become more efficient and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse?

Let me reiterate that this bill includes $5 billion more than the President's request for the overseas contingency account. So it makes no sense. We need to begin to focus our resources on nation-building at home, ensure our national security, and really make sure that all of our agencies begin to look at waste, fraud, and abuse. Certainly, the Pentagon should be the first to do that, especially given the fact that we have not had audit requirements of the Pentagon and still don't know what type of resources there have been wasted and misallocated.

I ask for support for this very modest amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have made significant cuts in our national defense and continue to do so. We are at lowest levels as a percentage of GDP expenditures for our national security in a long time.

I would rise in opposition to this amendment, would urge a ''no'' vote, and 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 NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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:

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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It simply reduces the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear missiles, by a third, from 450 to 300.

We are in the midst of an extraordinary budget crisis. We are facing unsustainable debt. Yet we continue to spend approximately $50 billion to $55 billion annually to maintain and even grow a nuclear arsenal and associated programs designed for a Cold War that no longer exists.

Russia is no longer the existential threat it once was, and we are working closely with Russian leaders to reduce our nuclear arsenals together. While other nations, such as China, have some nuclear weapons, their stockpiles pale in comparison. China has no more than 50 to 75 single warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We can significantly reduce our nuclear arsenal of 1,700 and still maintain a robust military edge over any rival. As we look to reduce our nuclear stockpile, we should be strategic and make targeted cuts.

According to a recent report issued by General James Cartwright, retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of U.S. nuclear forces; Secretary Chuck Hagel; and a number of other military and foreign experts, all land-based ICBMs could be eliminated. Let me take a moment to repeat that. The former commander of all U.S. nuclear forces thinks we don't need any ICBMs—none. According to the report:

The U.S. ICBM force has lost its central utility.

The report outlines four key reasons ICBMs should be eliminated:

First, ''Direct wartime nuclear operations against Russia alone, were Cold War scenarios that are no longer plausible.''

Second, flight paths over all land-based ICBMs to any potential adversaries—Iran, North Korea, China—would have to travel through Russian air space. This could trigger ''confusing Russia, and triggering nuclear retaliation.''

Third, ''U.S. Trident submarines and B–2 strategic bombers can deliver nuclear weapons to virtually any point on the Earth.''

Fourth, ''ICBMs in fixed silos are inherently targetable.''

Once again, these are not my assessments, nor the assessments of some anti-nuclear groups. These are the assessments of General Cartwright, the retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of U.S. nuclear forces; Richard Burt, a former chief nuclear arms negotiator; Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, former Ambassador to Russia, Thomas Pickering; and General John Sheehan, a former senior NATO official.

The former commander of U.S. nuclear forces has issued his support for the elimination of ICBMs.

This amendment merely calls for a reduction by one-third. We have limited resources, and that means we have to make choices. As we look to cut spending, let's cut military investments that do nothing to keep us safe in today's threat environment, such as ICBMs.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment, which amounts to the unilateral reduction of our nuclear forces. Unilateral reductions of our nuclear forces are wrong for national security—period.

These reductions have been directly and explicitly recommended against by the Joint Chiefs and senior DOD civilian officials, all who have said that reductions must be made bilaterally in concert with Russia.

I am deeply concerned that not only is this proposal to unilaterally disarm unwise; it is also shortsighted. It could seriously diminish the long-term security of our Nation.

We face a world today in which nuclear threats to the United States are increasing and our conventional military capabilities face dramatic reductions. Given this, our nuclear deterrent is becoming more important, not less.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, in my home State of Montana, is home to 150 of our Nation's intercontinental ballistic missiles. Earlier this year, I visited Malmstrom and I met with the leaders of the 341st Missile Wing to discuss the importance of our ICBM mission to our national security.

Colonel Robert W. Stanley, the commander at Malmstrom, gave me this commander's coin, which bears a motto that truly sums up why our defense strategy is effective. It says this: ''Scaring the hell out of America's enemies since 1962.''

This motto clearly demonstrates the importance of our peace-through-strength strategy. We cannot underestimate the role that our strong nuclear defenses have played in keeping America secure and maintaining peace not only with Russia, but throughout the world. In fact, some say we have never had to use our ICBMs. I would argue we use them every day to ensure that the world is a safer place.

That is why I urge my colleagues to also support the amendment that I've introduced, alongside Congressman LAMBORN, Congresswoman LUMMIS, and Congressman CRAMER. Our amendment will help keep America safe by maintaining a strong nuclear deterrent and preventing the Obama administration from pursuing efforts to unilaterally reduce our nuclear arsenal.

The Obama administration requested funds in their 2014 budget proposal to do environmental impact studies of our ICBMs, which is widely seen as a back door to attempting to reduce our ICBM fleet.

Our amendment simply prohibits this study. Now is not the time to reduce our ICBM fleet, which is why I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose Mr. QUIGLEY's amendment and to support the Daines-Lamborn-Lummis-Cramer amendment.

I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Quigley amendment as well. It will defund the operation and maintenance of 150 of our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Regardless of your stance on the nuclear triad—and we will have the opportunity to discuss it later—it is irresponsible to stop funding maintenance of our nuclear weapons with no formal reduction plan.

Are we supposed to leave warheads rotting in the silos? This amendment does not fund the decommissioning of warheads. If it did, a full-scale reduction of our force would be a costly endeavor, one that takes time and is a decision that should not be taken lightly.

But it will effectively reduce our ICBM capabilities by one-third without any strategic considerations or multilateral negotiations with other nuclear powers. The Joint Chiefs have directly and explicitly recommended against a unilateral reduction.

As the administration continues to weigh final force structure decisions scheduled to occur in FY 15, I ask my colleagues to consider the consequences of removing this funding the year before.

The mission of the Air Force Global Strike Command is to provide a safe, secure, effective nuclear deterrent force for the President of the United States. The Quigley amendment would impede the Air Force's ability to fulfill that mission, preempts the President's force structure decision, and lacks feasibility without preparation.

I urge you to oppose the Quigley amendment.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This cut is not required by any treaty. There is no strategic analysis, as the gentlelady said. There is no estimate of how this would affect the balance between the United States and other nuclear powers.

Events over the last several years, as well as through analysis, such as that done under the Nuclear Posture Review, have confirmed that we need to maintain and revitalize our nuclear deterrent.

I rise in strong opposition to this reckless amendment.

□ 2145

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I am always concerned when the Joint Chiefs have a strong opinion about our national defense. Given that, these reductions have been directly and explicitly recommended against by the Joint Chiefs and by senior DOD civilian officials. These gentlemen have all said the reductions must only be made bilaterally, in concert with Russia.

This is shortsighted; it is unwise; and it is a threat to our national security. Therefore, I oppose this unilateral reduction in our nuclear forces.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Let me just say that I've been here 4 years now, and I recognize what the Department of Defense is—it is our jobs program.

I respect my colleagues for defending jobs in their districts, but this isn't about national security—it's about job maintenance, which is not what this is supposed to be about. If we're going to spend money in creating jobs, I want to build bridges and schools and transit systems.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I quoted in my opening remarks, rather than getting larger and more expensive over the past decade, the military has simply grown to be more expensive. Our world has fundamentally changed since the days of the Cold War, and certain aspects of our military's national security strategies have evolved. However,

I do not believe that our nuclear weapons have had a corresponding change relative to our consideration as to their deployment in numbers.

I do think that Congress has a very important role to play in helping the administration make rational decisions as to the size and composition of the stockpile and of the complex that supports it. In talking about that complex as a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I will point out that there are significant costs over and above those in this particular bill given the civilian control over the warheads at that particular Department.

I also do not have a concern that, in any way, shape, or form, the gentleman is proposing that we unilaterally disarm this Nation. I believe that we certainly have adequate protection, and I support his amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. DENHAM. 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:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to implement the Trans Regional Web Initiative.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is crucial in this time of limited budgets that we transfer funds from those programs which are either duplicative or ineffective to the highest priority uses for the Department, such as maintaining readiness and taking care of our personnel. With that in mind, I have introduced a limiting amendment to prohibit the Department of Defense from using funds to implement the Trans-Regional Web Initiative.

This program consists of a series of general news Web sites that cater to foreign audiences. The Department requested $19.7 million to continue this effort during fiscal year 2014. An April 2013 GAO report found that the TRWI program lacks meaningful performance metrics and is poorly coordinated with other U.S. Government public diplomacy programs. I want to put this $19.7 million in perspective.

With this money, the Army National Guard could have retained 2,000 soldiers of the 4,000 it has been forced to reduce from its end strength due to budget cuts. That is 2,000 guardsmen who could be supporting our active component, responding to natural disasters, or securing our border. Instead, that money is going to Web sites providing entertainment news and lifestyle advice to the Balkans and Middle East.

It is important to remember that the United States already spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year in providing quality, independent journalism overseas through the Broadcasting Board of Governors. In fact, every week, more than 203 million listeners, viewers, and Internet users around the world engage with U.S. international broadcasting programs which are completely separate from the duplicative and expensive TRWI program.

How can we possibly justify unnecessary and ineffective, duplicative measures by the Department of Defense? How can I tell someone in my district that he was furloughed but that we found the cash to pay for an article about the plight of child actors in Turkey?

Our colleagues in the Senate have already acted. The Senate Armed Services Committee found that the costs to operate the Web sites are excessive, that the effectiveness of the Web sites is questionable, and that the performance metrics do not justify the expense.

I want to thank Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the Project on Government Oversight for their support on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of limited Federal resources, we cannot afford to continue wasteful programs like this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, over the past several years, this committee has taken a very hard look at all of our military information operations programs—a very hard look. While the committee reduced or eliminated funding for those we judged not to be appropriate Defense Department activities, this was not one of them.

This is a fully acknowledged program, with each Web site sponsored by a geographic combatant commander. These Web sites provide important news and information about events in their regions and about U.S. activities being conducted in those regions. These Web sites are an important opportunity for the United States Government to inform foreign audiences about U.S. military activities in their regions, including joint military training exercises or, very importantly, about humanitarian assistance.

Too often, we find ourselves frustrated that foreign populations fail to appreciate the support they receive from the United States, particularly from the United States military, or to understand the U.S. position on issues impacting their parts of the world. This is often because people are unaware of our efforts. These Web sites offer the combatant commanders the ability to get the word out, and I believe and we, the committee, believe that that's important. Therefore, I urge the rejection of the amendment.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. I would simply associate myself with his remarks and, particularly, with his introduction.

The subcommittee has had concerns and questions about the program in the past and has worked very closely with the Department of Defense. I do think it shows the oversight that this subcommittee continues to exercise. Again, I join with the gentleman in opposition.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just end by saying that this is another attempt to cut waste.

Give the Department of Defense the flexibility to retain our personnel. 2,160 National Guardsmen, to be exact, could be saved and retained by cutting this amount of waste. As well as having Citizens Against Government Waste, the Senate has shown great wisdom in this particular instance in coming together with us and cutting this type of waste.

I think this is a great opportunity to really show that we support those brave men and women by retaining those positions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this program also supports our very brave men and women.

I oppose the gentleman's 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. DENHAM).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–170 on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 44 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 45 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. DENHAM of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—184

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
Meadows
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Upton
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—237

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Esty
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Cantor
Coble
Gohmert
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita
Schock
Simpson

□ 2222

Messrs. TONKO, ISRAEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Messrs. PASTOR of Arizona and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, RIBBLE, WATT, GINGREY of Georgia, LANGEVIN, FINCHER, MEEKS, HANNA, and YOHO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the 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 249, noes 173, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—249

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa

Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—173

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Delaney
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scott, Austin
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Denham
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita
Schock

□ 2228

Ms. EDWARDS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GOSAR and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) 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 346, noes 79, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—346

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—79

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Cárdenas
Carter
Conaway
Cook
Crenshaw
Daines
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Ellmers
Fleischmann
Forbes
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Goodlatte
Granger
Grimm
Hartzler
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Long
Luetkemeyer
Marino
McKeon

McNerney
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Pearce
Pompeo
Reichert
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sewell (AL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Visclosky
Walorski
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita
Schock

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2232

Messrs. COLE and GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) 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 276, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—150

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kelly (IL)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—276

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2236

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) 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 253, noes 173, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—253

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston

Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—173

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2239

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) 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 332, noes 94, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—332

Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Runyan
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—94

Aderholt
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Clarke
Cole
Connolly
Crenshaw
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Enyart
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Grijalva
Grimm
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hudson
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCaul
Meeks
Meng
Nunnelee
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Reichert
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wilson (FL)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2244

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) 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 237, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—237

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2247

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The 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 333, noes 93, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—333

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer

Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—93

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Cárdenas
Carter
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crenshaw
Daines
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Hartzler
Holding
Hudson
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McKeon
Meadows
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Noem
Olson
Pearce
Perry
Pompeo
Reichert
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ruiz
Runyan
Scott, Austin
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Valadao
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2250

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 109, noes 317, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—109

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
Deutch
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—317

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

□ 2254

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 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 142, noes 283, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—142

Andrews
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—283

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bass
Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2257

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—185

Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hensarling
Honda
Huelskamp
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Upton
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—238

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Bonner

Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Coble
Frelinghuysen
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Rokita
Ruppersberger

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to carry out any activities under the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership Agreement, signed on May 2, 2012, except for such activities authorized by Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I've been here all day, like most of my colleagues. I've watched it on TV, I've been here on the floor. And I've heard so many times other Members say we're going to be out of Afghanistan in 2014. I hate to tell them, but that's not true. The administration is about to finish a negotiation with Mr. Karzai, who is a crook, to say that we will be there for 10 more years.

This amendment, what it does is basically just say that we in Congress have a responsibility to the American people to meet our constitutional responsibility of making sure that any agreement that the President should negotiate with any country, we're responsible for funding that agreement, that we will the vote on it. That's basically what this amendment does; it just says that, as we move forward with this strategic agreement, that the Congress will vote on the funds, and not just have any administration, Democrat or Republican, just to assume for 10 years that the taxpayers are going to buy into this agreement.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and would point out that I do think it is long past time that we should be reconsidering the underlying authority—the Authorized Use of Military Force that was approved by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States in 2001. But I do believe, absent the reconsideration of that legislation—which I do think this body should be about—I believe it does provide the underlying authority for the Strategic Partnership Agreement that the President has initiated. It has been in force for over a year, serving as a guide for the relationship between the United States and Afghanistan. And in May of last year, the President and the Afghan President signed the agreement.

The agreement does, I believe, infer the role of Congress to fund training of the Afghan Security Forces. The agreement indicates that the administration associate such funding annually, and obviously there is a congressional role.

This agreement provides the necessary long-term framework for the relationship between the two countries after the drawdown that will have taken effect by the end of 2014.

I do believe that the amendment offered makes no allowance for what agreement might serve to guide our relationship with Afghanistan in the future. And given it's important in managing our drawdown and in transitioning the Afghan security forces themselves, I believe it is essential for the U.S. to continue to honor this agreement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). I want to thank him for his long and tireless leadership on ending the war in Afghanistan. He always asks the hard questions—or the questions that no one else wants to take on—because he believes so strongly in standing by our uniformed men and women and their families.

In May of 2012, the United States and most of our NATO allies entered into an agreement with Afghanistan called the Strategic Partnership Agreement. That agreement outlined in fairly broad terms how we and our allies will continue to support the security and economic development of Afghanistan over the near and long term.

Now, on the positive side, it was this agreement that provided the outline for how the United States would turn over responsibility for combat operations and national security to Afghanistan forces this year and next year in order to draw down our forces and end the war in Afghanistan by the end of next year. Congressman JONES and I would like to see that drawdown happen faster and sooner, but at a minimum, to happen on the time frame outlined by the President.

The unknown question is: What happens post-2014? Will the President determine that U.S. troops need to remain in Afghanistan? If so, how many troops, for how long, and for what purpose? Will we continue to train the Afghanistan military and police forces? And if so, how many U.S. troops will be involved? How long will it take to complete that mission? How much will it cost?

I believe it is right to demand that Congress specifically authorize the terms and costs of America's continuing involvement in Afghanistan. Congress has put this war on autopilot for too long. It is shameful. We need to take responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. This is a reasonable, rational amendment. And quite frankly, every one of us, Democrat and Republican, should vote for this.

Mr. JONES. May I inquire of the Chairman how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 3¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if this Strategic Partnership Agreement involves the protection of our American troops and our allies, then there's good reason to oppose this amendment.

This is an agreement between two sovereign nations. Understandably, the two proponents of this amendment are against our involvement and would like us to leave tomorrow—and indeed we may. But in the process, I would hope that we wouldn't be putting ourselves and our soldiers at risk by an amendment of this type and nature. For those reasons, I oppose it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman's remarks.

As I mentioned before, I would not argue that we should not be reconsidering the underlying authorization. But to the extent it exists today, I do believe it does authorize this agreement. I continue to be opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, you know, it is so ridiculous that America is financially broke, can't pay our own bills, and we're going to borrow money to pay for this agreement in Afghanistan.

The former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, when I asked him, what do you think about this agreement? I'll read his one sentence:

> Simply put, I am not in favor of this agreement signed. It basically keeps the United States in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt regime. It continues to place our troops at risk.

We are not being realistic. The American people are fed up and tired. We had 79 Americans killed the first of March to the end of June, and not one person on this floor knows that tonight but me.

Why and how can the American people continue to work their butts off, pay their bills, and we're going to prop up a crook in Afghanistan named Karzai and give him 10 more years of the American taxpayers paying his bills? It is a sad day for the taxpayers of America.

Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN. This is a reasonable approach. All it says is that we in Congress, every year, will vote whether we keep funding the wasted time, life, and money in Afghanistan.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

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

Mr. JONES. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Amendment No. 49 has been withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. KLINE. 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:

> 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 give covered graduates (as described in section 532(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 503 note)) a lower enlistment priority than traditional high school diploma graduates as described in the second paragraph of the memo with the subject line ''Education Credential—Definition and Tier Placement'', dated June 6, 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 2315

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

I rise in support of this amendment. As chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, as a retired Marine colonel, I have a unique and fortunate position to ensure the young men and women enlisting in our Armed Forces have the best education in preparation for the defense of our Nation.

Currently, students who earn a high school diploma from charter schools, home schools, hybrid schools, and other means of modern education are required to score significantly higher on the Armed Forces qualification test than others just to qualify to enter the military.

This policy, Mr. Chairman, is in direct contravention of congressional intent established in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

Last month, my colleagues unanimously supported my amendment to the FY 14 National Defense Authorization Act to reverse the DOD's discriminatory policy and ensure equal treatment for all students who desire to enter military service. The bipartisan Kline-Polis-Paulsen amendment prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Defense to enforce any policy that continues to not equally treat education credentials for enlistment.

This amendment stops DOD from giving a lower enlistment priority to students who attend home schools and charter schools and makes congressional intent clear that all students should be given the same opportunities to enlist in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the dream of military service for all patriotic Americans who simply want the chance to be able to raise their hand and pledge to defend our Nation without unnecessary burdens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment.

I salute the leadership of Chairman KLINE who fully understands the public education side and the military side. We are bringing forth this amendment as another opportunity to make sure that what is already clearly the will of this House, as articulated through the NDAA, actually comes to pass.

Very simply, this is a provision that ensures that any student who receives a diploma from a legally operating accredited secondary school in compliance with the education laws of the State and district in which the person resides is given the same opportunity to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces as a traditional bricks and mortar high school graduate. This includes graduates of online schools and hybrid schools who completed their secondary education and earned a degree.

Currently, these classified students who attend online schools are called tier 2 for purposes of military enlistment. What this effectively means is they can enroll in the military; however, on the Armed Forces qualification test, they have to score 50 or higher instead of 31 to 36, depending on the service branch, for a bricks and mortar high school.

What we should care about in public education and in the military is preparedness for the job, not what particular type or model or size or shape of school that they went to. From the military perspective, we need young men and women who are capable and able to execute their responsibilities to serve our country.

From the education perspective, we want to encourage innovation, and we shouldn't be sending a message—and this body has spoken clearly and has the opportunity to speak clearly again—that we discourage innovation

within public education. We should not say that just because a particular school is distributed or doesn't have a bricks and mortar campus, as long as it is fully accredited by a school district and held to the same standards as any other public school, that should not be dealt with in a separate way in this matter.

Congressional intent is clear. The NDAA bill includes language to not let the DOD make a distinction between graduates of traditional high schools and those who attend online schools. This amendment would ensure that all students are held to the same standard when it comes to being eligible for military service.

That is why I am proud to join Chairman KLINE and Representative PAULSEN, leaders for charter schools and education choice and online education, to propose this amendment to the defense authorization act which would ensure that no funds are used to give a lower enlistment priority to students from online schools as compared to traditional bricks and mortar high school diploma graduates.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

We accept his amendment.

I would note that I know marines never retire.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

I thank my colleague and friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

I think that congressional intent has been absolutely clear and is, in fact, in law. It is astonishing to me that we have to be down here on the floor this evening with this amendment to bar funds from the Department because they are just failing to comply with congressional intent in the law.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues. I urge all my colleagues to vote for 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 Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. LAMALFA 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:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay any fine assessed against a military installation by the California Air Resources Board.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask for support for my amendment to H.R. 2397.

This amendment ensures that funds appropriated to support our men and women in uniform are used for the purposes the House intends, not diverted by overzealous regulatory agencies attempting to pad their own budgets.

This amendment provides a simple funding limitation prohibiting use of any funds appropriated in H.R. 2397 to pay fines levied against the various branches of the military by the California Air Resources Board.

As you may be aware, the California Air Resources Board is known for the excessive regulatory burdens it attempts to impose on virtually every sector of California's economy from personal automobiles to farming. In recent years CARB, and its subsidy regional boards, have targeted military installations for alleged emissions violations, in many cases as minor as simply failing to notify CARB of activities in the manner that CARB finds most convenient.

For example, a northern California Air Force base faced fines of $10,000 per day after using emergency generators to power radar installations serving a vital anti-ballistic missile warning role.

In another instance, a southern California Navy installation was initially fined $917,000 for simply demolishing an old and outdated building without approved documentation.

Lastly, Camp Pendleton was fined in July of last year for unapproved solvents in a bottle of spray cleaner.

These California installations are critical to our national defense as we pivot towards the Pacific. How can we tie the hands of these vital installations when they are at the forefront of our national security initiatives?

These amounts may seem minor in the context of the appropriations measure we are taking up. However, at $10,000 a day, just two days of these fines could actually fund at least a year of college for a veteran under the GI Bill.

Voting for this amendment keeps funding for our military in the hands of our servicemembers instead of the California Air Resources Board.

Please support our servicemembers and vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the amendment, as the gentleman suggests, seeks to exempt the Department of Defense from paying any fines related to infractions which seem to be environmental in nature from the California Air Resources Board.

I would point out to my colleagues that, as they know, there are a large number of military bases in California, and I believe it is imperative to maintain good working relationships with the communities who host the bases, as well as the various State agencies who ensure good living conditions for all Californians.

Accepting this amendment could create the perception that the Federal military installations in California are above the law when dealing with environmental issues.

I would certainly urge a ''no'' vote on this particular amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, in responding to that, this is a very narrow amendment that simply gives a green light to our military installations that, yes, we welcome you in California, we like the idea that you are here providing a safety security net over not only our State, but to all of the United States, and that overzealous regulators have had actually a very hostile relationship with these installations, as well as many businesses in California. So we need to send a signal that they can no longer go unchecked with the ability to come write up a fine at any time they choose to.

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I think that being such a narrow measure is what we have here, that we do need to send the proper message to our military, to our people, that when they serve in the military and would want to get out and be part of the GI Bill and, importantly, to the American taxpayers, that your dollars are actually being expended for this appropriation towards the type of thing that you care about, and that is defending the Nation and not having to defend themselves from overzealous regulations like anybody could enlist in California.

I hear CARB is one of the biggest complaints of my constituents all around my district, as well as from our friends in the military that are just there to try and defend us.

In taking up this measure here tonight, I think it is a very proper thing that we do to have the right signal that we do support our military, we do support our fighting men and women, and that it is best to put forward the defense of our country rather than defending some frivolous environmental regulation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would notice that the gentleman suggests that his amendment is very narrow in scope, and I appreciate that fact. I appreciate the fact that, for example, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management was not cited, the Department of Environmental Management in the State of Illinois was not cited, nor for the other

47 States in this country relative to the enforcement of environmental statutes.

I would further propose to my colleagues that the gentleman is seeking a solution for a problem that does not exist. I do not know the specifics of the fines that were purportedly imposed at Camp Pendleton. However, the gentleman did allude to a northern California Air Force base and did suggest that fines were imposed by the California Air Resources Board.

I would suggest that that is not necessarily the case. In fact, it was the Feather River Air Quality Management District, it was not the California Air Resources Board, that found that this Air Force base had 526 days of multiple violations of local air district rules. The district came to a settlement agreement with the Air Force base to properly permit its equipment and bring it back into compliance on a certain timeline. The settlement states that if the Air Force base did not hold up its end of the bargain, it could face a fine.

The gentleman provided a second example for a southern California naval installation. In fact, it was not the California Air Resources Board that was involved. It was the San Diego Air Quality District that took enforcement action when this naval base demolished a building without doing proper asbestos removal and remediation that is a danger for those who are engaged in that activity. The San Diego Air Quality District, not the California Air Resources Board, was enforcing a Federal asbestos law in this case, and in the end the Air Quality District fined the Navy—that is true—$40,000, not $917,000. So I would suggest the amendment is a solution that is looking for a problem.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2330

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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:

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 conduct an environmental impact study in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq.) of intercontinental ballistic missiles or the facilities in which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, such missiles are located.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It prohibits funds in this bill from being used to do an environmental impact study on our intercontinental ballistic missiles. You might think that an environmental impact statement, or an EIS, sounds innocuous, but let me lay out the facts that we have.

First, the Obama administration has made it clear that it believes in nuclear zero—the idea that we can achieve a world without nuclear weapons. This sounds like a wonderful idea, but our competitors and adversaries will almost certainly never give up their nuclear weapons. So, until there is a change of heart on the part of our adversaries, this could be a dangerous idea.

We've had reductions in our nuclear forces to date, and it hasn't stopped our potential adversaries—or hostile countries for that matter—from reducing their nuclear programs. As a matter of fact, they've been increasing. I'm talking about countries like Iran and North Korea. In President Obama's second Berlin speech just a few weeks ago, he announced a desire to reduce America's nuclear arsenal by one-third regardless of what the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, the Iranians, the Pakistanis or anyone else, for that matter, does.

It is in this context that we see in this budget the President's requesting an environmental impact statement for our current ICBM forces. We decisively rejected an amendment not just a few minutes ago here on this House floor that would have defunded one-third of our ICBM forces.

I am proud to be joined in this effort to protect our ICBMs by the three Members who represent States in which bases are located at which we find our ICBMs.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Wyoming, Representative LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the New START Treaty does not require the closing of an ICBM facility, but the purpose of this study is to close an ICBM wing or squadron.

While President Obama has announced plans to further reduce America's nuclear capabilities, there is no negotiated proposal with Russia or a Senate-confirmed treaty for reductions of this size. The Air Force has a plan for the ratified reductions, placing 30 silos in warm status before February 2018. These baseline numbers will meet the New START deadline if the administration just allows them to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lamborn-Lummis-Daines-Cramer amendment and ensure that Congress provides proper approval of the goal before spending money on the process.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank my colleague for pointing that out. I appreciate her coming to the floor.

I know we are joined in this effort by Representative STEVE DAINES of Montana and by Representative KEVIN CRAMER of North Dakota, and they wholeheartedly support this amendment as well. A strong nuclear deterrent is what we need in the face of uncertainty, not any kind of unilateral disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is directed at the administration's plan to consider further reductions below the levels established in the New START Treaty. As the gentleman indicated, it would prohibit funds from being used to conduct a study of the environmental impact on intercontinental ballistic missiles and their facilities.

The President in his June 2013 guidance on nuclear employment affirms that the United States will maintain a credible deterrent, capable of convincing any potential adversary that our abilities and the adverse consequences of attacking the United States or an ally far outweigh any potential benefit they may seek through such an attack.

I believe that the United States' national security resources ought to also be considering other possibilities as to our national security beyond the remote possibility of a direct nuclear exchange. Events of the past several years demonstrate that the U.S. faces a very complex set of national security threats:

The possibility of attacks such as those preceding 9/11, including the USS *Cole* bombing and the U.S. Embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya;

Regional instability and strategic challenges arising from the Arab Spring in Egypt, Syria, Libya, and elsewhere;

The continuing challenge of Iran, including its support of terrorist organizations with regional and global aims;

Refocusing U.S. national security priorities to the Asia-Pacific region with a focus on China and North Korea; and,

The nearly constant threat of cyberattack.

As I said in an earlier argument, I also do not think we ought to arbitrarily, throughout this evening and

tomorrow, continue to say ''no'' about proposals and studies and plans. We ought to be having a full and complete conversation and debate about those possibilities.

For those reasons, I do oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I inquire of the balance of my time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have to take issue with what was just stated as far as maintaining a credible deterrent even with massive unilateral further reductions. We've already reduced our nuclear forces under New START to 1,550 weapons, and when you reduce beyond that, it becomes less credible to our allies that we will have a credible deterrent.

We have a nuclear umbrella right now with about 30 countries relying on us. If we start unilaterally reducing the number of our nuclear warheads, they will become less certain about our deterrent. They will be incentivized to go out and start their own nuclear programs. I'm talking about countries like Japan and South Korea, which have a neighbor, North Korea, that is threatening to them. If we want to see more nuclear weapons in the world, we should reduce ours. Other countries are simply not going to follow our example, and it will lead to more nuclear weapons worldwide.

So I would urge the adoption of this amendment. I disagree with my colleague from Indiana, and I would ask for a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The ICBM land-based missiles are the most cost-economical deterrent of the nuclear triad. This is the most efficient way to deter our enemies.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate my objection to the gentleman's amendment, and would ask for a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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:

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, across this country tonight, 600,000 Defense Department civilian employees are struggling with a 20 percent pay cut due to civilian furloughs, and these are scheduled to go through the end of September.

These are hardworking American patriots who work hard to keep our Nation secure. They are supporting our warfighters. They are doing essential work. They are working side by side, shoulder to shoulder, with Active Duty personnel who, because of the language of the Budget Control Act, are exempt from any kind of furloughs. I approve of that, but it's sad that the civilians are singled out for this treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I talked today to someone from the administration who came to a hearing for Armed Services. He said that the savings are estimated to be about $2 billion for the rest of the year. That may sound like a lot of money except when you look at the entire DOD budget of $500 billion. $2 billion is four-tenths of 1 percent—less than half a percent—of the total defense budget for this year.

This is a savings that is a false economy. It is demoralizing, and it is hard on the families that are suffering this. We should adopt this amendment, which says that the Defense Department can find other savings but not take it out of the hides of the civilians who are supporting our warfighters.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. I want to thank Representatives LAMBORN, BARROW, and JENKINS for their bipartisan work on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we obviously need a comprehensive solution to the sequester. Ideally, that's what we would be doing. I don't want to proceed in a piecemeal manner, but absent a comprehensive solution, I think we have an obligation to act to ease the pain of the sequester when and where we can.

At Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas, 11,000 Department of Defense civilian employees are furloughed for 11 days, which is a 20 percent pay cut for the remainder of this year. These workers are essential. Many of them work at Beaumont Army Medical Center, where they care for our wounded warriors returning from war. Those wounded soldiers are now facing longer wait times and reduced care because of these furloughs, and it is already becoming harder to retain the best employees.

We have to do better both by our servicemembers and those civilian employees, who are so critical to our military. I urge all of my colleagues to help prevent more furloughs and to support this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of this amendment.

Because Congress can't get its act together, more than 3,200 Department of Defense employees in my district are being furloughed. This amendment offers a simple fix to that serious problem. It's also a positive indicator of what we can accomplish if Congress is willing to come together on the issues that matter most to the folks back home.

We have a fiscal crisis, but the solution to that problem shouldn't be built on the backs of the people who didn't get us in this mess in the first place, especially since our national security depends so much on civilian DOD employees. This amendment allows for the necessary cuts in Federal spending, but it also protects the folks whose livelihoods are on the line.

Issues like this demand that we put aside our differences and find common ground. I urge my colleagues to get behind this bipartisan effort and to support this amendment to end these furloughs.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas, Representative JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

My district is home to Fort Leavenworth and Forbes Field, which are two Kansas military installations at which families are struggling with the DOD civilian furloughs. While they may not serve in uniform, many of these civilians provide critical support for our warfighters.

While I support this level of funding cuts, I oppose the administration's decision to take certain programs off the table and put an unfair burden on our military. The House acted six times to prevent these furloughs, to resolve sequestration, and to find savings elsewhere in our bloated budget; and even though the administration and the Senate majority had nearly 2 years to develop an alternative, they did nothing.

Civilian employees are not the problem, and they should not be singled out to pay for Washington's out-of-control spending habits. I ask my colleagues to join me to protect these Americans from another round of painful furloughs next year and support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Colorado that he has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which does away with painful furloughs and which, in very many cases, may have been political in nature.

I represent the Corpus Christi Army Depot at which civilian employees are actually Working Capital Fund employees. They are not funded by appropriations but are funded by the work that they do and are equally subjected to this when, in fact, they could be saving the government money by rebuilding helicopters for less cost than that of the original equipment manufacturers.

We need to relieve all Federal employees from this burden, which, in my opinion, is politically motivated, and this is a good way to do it—through this amendment.

□ 2345

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I agree with the proponent of this amendment on one very important detail. I have noted throughout the evening that a number of my colleagues voted for the Budget Control Act that led to sequestration, that led to some of these problems. And I would like to note that the gentleman voted against that bill, and I think very knowingly anticipated that there could have been very serious unintended consequences.

So I do respect the persistence and consistency of his views. But having said that, again, as I have on a number of these amendments this evening, I have a great concern about differentiating between certain civilian employees in one department and those in another.

There's no question that the civilian employees throughout the Department of Defense do critical work. It could be serving in a hospital. It could be doing security analysis. It could be serving the troops in any number of capacities. No question about it. But I don't think we should make a distinction between that type of work and those who work for OSHA, who make sure that workplaces are also safe for American citizens every day when they go to work. We shouldn't make that distinction between those civilian employees and FBI agents who risk their lives every day. We shouldn't make that distinction between those employees and U.S. marshals who risk their lives every day.

Correctional officers in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Capitol Police Officers, U.S. Custom and Border Protection officers, those who serve within the Coast Guard as civilian employees, those who are forestry aides and fight fires out west—all are obviously risking their lives—Federal protective service law enforcement specialists.

Again, the point I would make is we do have a very bad law. We ought not to be making temporary fixes for dislocations that have been caused by it. That only defers decisions that need to be made of a more permanent basis.

Again, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman, I believe, was correct in the first instance, as far as not wanting to see us reach this point. I understand his impulse in trying to begin to correct some of these problems. I personally think we need a more holistic approach, and for that reason would respectfully oppose his opinion and ask for a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. MEADOWS. 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:

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 pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or to otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It prohibits the use of funds for the payment of salaries to Presidential recess appointees until they're formally confirmed by the Senate.

In 1863, a law was passed that barred unconfirmed recess appointees from being paid. This law stayed on the books until 1940. However, over time, a number of broad exceptions were made that gradually eliminated the original intent of the law and rendered the prohibition useless.

This amendment reapplies the original intent of the law to further reassert the Senate's authority in the confirmation process and prevent taxpayers from having to pay the salaries of unconfirmed Presidential appointees.

Our Founders envisioned a Nation of checks and balances to ensure no branch of government has too much power. The United States Senate is in charge of confirming executive appointees for a reason—to ensure Presidential appointees are in the best interest of the American people.

For too long, both Republicans and Democrats have ceded Congress' authority to the executive branch. This amendment is a positive step, which will ensure the administration is accountable to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour, I urge support and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is trying to undue longstanding rules about when salaries can be paid to people who receive recess appointments under the President's constitutional powers. The amendment is injecting unnecessary and unrelated controversy into this bill. Its enactment could further worsen the paralysis and gridlock that is already affecting our ability to govern.

The Constitution clearly gives the President of the United States the power to make temporary appointments during the recess of the Senate to positions normally requiring Senate confirmation. This is a power that has been routinely exercised by Presidents since the beginnings of our government.

It is true that an issue has recently arisen about the scope of that power. Two Federal courts have recently ruled that the language is being interpreted too broadly and that recess appointments can only be made during a recess between sessions after sine die adjournment. Those rulings are contrary to previous rulings by other courts and to longstanding practice by Presidents of both parties. The new interpretations, of course, would invalidate of course not only certain appointments by President Obama, but also many dozens of appointments made by his predecessors, including Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and George W. Bush.

The issue is now before the Supreme Court, which has accepted these cases for decision during its next term. If the Court does rule that Presidents Obama, Bush, Clinton, Reagan, and their predecessors were misreading the appointments clause of the Constitution, then the whole landscape for these appointments will have changed and the proposed language of this amendment will be largely irrelevant. But if, as many believe likely, the Court upholds the more traditional interpretation, the tight restrictions proposed by this amendment may themselves be contrary to the Constitution.

The proposed amendment would alter rules that have been in place for more than 70 years and which say that recess appointees cannot receive salaries under certain, fairly narrow circumstances. The amendment would greatly expand that prohibition. The current rule strikes a reasonable balance, which the amendment would completely upset.

We already have enough gridlock. I do not want to make it worse, and I certainly do not believe this bill is the place for this particular amendment or this debate and would strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Understanding he has rescinded his time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. MULVANEY. 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:

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

SEC. ____. The total amount of appropriations made available by title IX (not including amounts made available under the heading ''Overseas Deployments and Other Activities—Procurement—National Guard and Reserve Equipment'') is hereby reduced by $3,546,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is very similar, almost identical, to a similar amendment that Mr. VAN HOLLEN and I offered during the National Defense Authorization Act several weeks ago. We've added a couple of cosponsors. We've added Mr. COFFMAN, a Republican, and also Mr. MURPHY, a Democrat. In addition to that, we've made some important changes to the amendment.

What does the amendment do first of all? The amendment simply seeks to take the OCO budget back down to what the Pentagon asked for. The Pentagon asked for roughly $81 billion. The committee saw fit to give them $86 billion, and we think maybe letting the Pentagon decide how much the Pentagon needs for OCO is probably a good basis for discussion, and it is the basis for this discussion.

There is one exception to that, Mr. Chairman, and this is where the important difference from the last amendment several months ago comes in, which is there is some concern. Mr. VAN HOLLEN and I believed it was ill founded, but there was some concern as to whether or not the previous amendment prejudiced in some fashion the National Guard. While we disagreed with the National Guard's position, we respect it. So for that specific reason, there is explicit language in this amendment that excludes the National Guard from this reduction. Instead of going all the way back down to where the Pentagon asked for, we're giving the Pentagon what they asked for, plus the $1.5 billion for the National Guard.

For folks who had some difficulty with our amendment a couple of months ago because they were concerned about the impact on the National Guard, even though we thought that was, again, ill founded, we have sought to protect that in this particular amendment.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, what we're asking for is simply what the Pentagon asked for in the first place, with extra protections for the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Budgeting for contingency operations, especially 1½ years in advance, is very difficult. Goodness knows, the war on terror in Afghanistan and what we did in Iraq, we never knew how long we would be there and how expensive it was.

For example, despite having a higher overseas contingency allocation for fiscal year 2013 of $87 billion, budget execution during fiscal year 2013 has proven that that request was understated by as much as $10 billion. As a result of the extent possible, funds for OCO are being cash-flowed from baseline funds which have already been squeezed due to the sequester, resulting in profound readiness implications. Ships are not sailing, planes are not flying, and civilians are being furloughed. We've heard a lot about that on the floor today.

Additionally, I think all of us know that we are exiting out of Afghanistan. The timetable may be a year or two, or maybe the Commander in Chief will decide to expedite our departure. Transportation costs are spiked as men and equipment are moved and deployed, and God only knows things can happen on the travel route. We've heard a lot about that on the floor, too. Things can happen in Pakistan that might require additional expenses, billions of dollars more if we have to move men and materiel by aircraft. Contractor costs spike for many functions such as dismantling forward operating bases. Some of that's occurring now in disposing of excess materiel or turned over to the private sector to complete. Of course, the reset of equipment carries a very high price tag. There are a lot of reasons that this money is needed.

I strongly oppose this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

MR. MULVANEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague, Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, and our colleagues for offering this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, just last month, Secretary of Defense Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before this House as to the amount of money that would be necessary to support the war in Afghanistan and our overseas operation, the so-called OCO account. What they told this Congress was that the President's request of $80 billion was the amount necessary to accomplish our objectives and to support our troops. Yet this defense spending bill that is before us adds another $5 billion that was unasked for and unnecessary.

So if there are extra moneys stuffed into this account, why are they put in this account as opposed to somewhere else? The answer is that it's a very clever accounting scheme because the other account, the base budget for defense spending, is subject to a cap, but moneys for the war account are not. So every dollar you somehow put into the war account is a dollar that escapes the cap. You can put lots of dollars into that war funding account, even though they have nothing to do with supporting overseas operations. I give the committee an A for creative accounting and an F for truth in budgeting.

What this amendment does is it says to the military we're going to provide you the funds you asked for, but, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, we're actually going to add $1.5 billion additional for the Guard and the Reserve.

There's no reason we should be throwing money into the war accounts that don't belong there simply as an accounting scheme to avoid the cap.

□ 0000

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before I close, let me just say for the RECORD, the $5 billion extra was in the National Defense Reauthorization Act which the House passed I believe in June, and just for the record, funding for the overseas contingency fund in our bill matches the amount recommended by the House Budget Committee, which membership is well known and is present on the floor this evening. So it has a pretty good endorsement, and for this reason I strongly oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I thank my friend for the opportunity here today. I would simply agree with him that it is difficult to plan out 18 months in advance as to what is going to be happening in Afghanistan. However, I would think that the folks best suited to be able to do that planning would be the folks who are actually running the overseas operations. It would be the Pentagon and the Armed Forces, who are the folks who asked for the $81 billion that we are giving them.

To Mr. VAN HOLLEN's point, the Secretary was here saying this is exactly what he needs. I recognize the fact that there could be contingencies, but you have to think that number is already built into the request. More importantly, the additional money, the slush fund, the money over and above the $80.7 billion that the Defense Department has asked for, is not saved for some rainy day, it's not saved for some

contingency that we haven't anticipated that might come up in the next 18 months—it's spent. It's spent.

So we simply ask for support for this amendment and try to get us back in line with spending the amount of money that the Pentagon asked us to spend, respecting the integrity of the base budget, the 302(b)s, but also not using up money in a wasteful fashion in the OCO account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. PALAZZO. 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:

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 rebase Air Force, Air Guard, and Air Force Reserve aircraft until 60 days after the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force has submitted its report under section 363(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the Air Force from making changes in fiscal year 2014 until 60 days after Congress hears from the Commission we established to report on the global structure of the Air Force.

Over the last two years, Congress and the Air Force have engaged in numerous discussions about the future of our forces. I've had an opportunity to engage in many of those conversations about what the Air Force can afford, what provides us the greatest capability, and what ensures that our men and women get home safely.

These discussions have included decisions the Air Force has made regarding the realignment of forces. Some of these decisions made a lot of sense. Some of them did not. But as we've had these conversations as these decisions are being made, I can't help but feel like I'm listening to the Air Force play the same broken record over and over again.

What I see happening, Mr. Chairman, is the Air Force continues to talk about cutting costs. They talk about mission capabilities and readiness. And then they turn around and spend millions upon millions of dollars re-basing planes and uprooting personnel all over the Nation, only to reevaluate and move them again just a few years later.

And in the end, it seems like the Air Force isn't making smart financial decisions, and some of these moves don't even make sense from a mission perspective.

Last year, my colleagues and I addressed some of these issues during the National Defense Authorization Act process. We included language in the House version of the bill that would have stopped movement of some of these planes until the Air Force could provide better answers for their decisions. I was disappointed that the final version of the bill omitted this amendment.

Instead the final bill established a National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force for the very purpose of reevaluating these basing decisions and reporting back to Congress. Specifically, we are looking for that Commission to tell us if or how the current Air Force structure should be modified to best fulfill mission requirements in a manner that is consistent with our available and limited resources.

The Commission was also given several considerations to keep in mind while completing this study. They wanted to ensure structure meets current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands, achieve the appropriate balance between Active Duty Air Force and reserve components, provide sufficient numbers of active Air Force to ensure we can recruit from the pool for reserve components, and make sure that we maintain an adequate peacetime rotation force.

I am encouraged by the formation and the progress of this Air Force Commission in last year's NDAA. In fact, I went and testified before this Commission earlier this afternoon. I think they have some valuable contributions to make in these discussions.

But I am still disappointed that the Air Force is still determined to enact those questionable decisions before hearing from the Commission. If this body doesn't act, those decisions will go into effect in October of this year—moving hundreds of planes, uprooting families, transferring units, modifying missions, spending millions of dollars possibly to rethink it all and re-base again in a few short years. Yet the commission's report is only a few short months away.

Am I the only one who thinks this doesn't make much sense?

We're making bold decisions on the structure of the Air Force without waiting for the recommendations of the study that we mandated. This is a plain-as-day example of putting the cart before the horse.

My amendment would simply call for a temporary freeze on Air Force movements until we can review the findings of the report. I feel like this is a pretty reasonable amendment given that we asked for the study in the first place. At a time when our military is already under incredible strain, when budgets are already tight, it is imperative that we get this right. My amendment may even save us money in the long run. I ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue about the Air Force's total force plan that was contained in the fiscal year 2013 budget. The subcommittee would agree that, looking back, it was poorly conceived and was made even worse by the lack of communication between the services, the reserve, and Congress. And I supported and the subcommittee supported and the Armed Services Committee supported a requirement that the Air Force go back and reevaluate its force restructuring.

But I ran for Congress and I'm a Member of the House of Representatives, and we're elected to make decisions. I'm not a member of a commission. I don't support commissions, and I'm disappointed that at the insistence of the other body, the Armed Services authorized another commission. I find it interesting that often we say we need a commission, we need a select committee, each time there is a difficult decision to be made. We ought to make them. That's what we get paid money for. We ought to make those decisions and not give it to a commission.

And what happens when we give it to a commission? Well, that's a bad idea. We don't support the commission's decision, and then that report sits on a desk.

The gentleman mentions that the time is short. We have but a few short months before the Commission's report is due back to the United States Congress. The report is due on February 1, 2014. That means that we have the short month of August, the short month of September, the short month of October, the short month of November, the short month of December, and the short month of January before the Commission reports back to the Congress, before the Congress can begin to act now two years after a botched report by, I would admit, the United States Air Force in the first instance.

The gentleman mentions that budgets are tight. I absolutely agree with him. All the more reason why if the Air Force now has a plan to wait more than another half year to look at a report to decide what we're going to do, we ought to see what the Air Force has

to say. If it makes sense, to do it. If not, to make them have it changed. But not wait for the Commission. I'm a Member of the House of Representatives, not a Commission.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for yielding to me. I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment. It seems as though this amendment attempts to reopen issues that were resolved in the 2013 bill, and would prohibit the Air Force from conducting authorized re-basing actions until April 2014.

This amendment appears to be not so great for the National Guard. The National Guard is depending on re-basing actions or remission or backfilling units that otherwise would lose aircraft. I think that needs to happen, and I don't think it necessarily needs to happen after the receipt of this report, which is due some time in the future.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's remarks, but the Air Force has a very bad track record of doing this every few years. And what they're doing is they're spending millions upon millions of dollars. They're talking about cutting costs, but all they're doing is moving planes around, re-basing them, spending more money on capital investment, and basically upsetting communities that have given their heart and shared everything they've had in support of our armed services over and over again. And I hope eventually that the Air Force can get their act straight and that they will be able to figure out a strategic and structural plan that will save taxpayer dollars. And that's what this is about. We are living in a time of limited resources. I know there are a lot of people out there who want to do Americans harm, and we have to have our national security forefront and center as our top priority. I just wish the Air Force would discontinue disrupting communities all around the country. I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. PALAZZO. 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:

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for or carry out a furlough of a dual status military technician (as defined in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

This is a very simple amendment that corrects what I believe was a simple oversight when exemptions were laid out for sequestration. In July of 2012, OMB offered an exemption for all military personnel accounts. I believe that decision was driven by a desire to relieve all uniformed deployable military personnel from the furloughs that were caused by sequestration's damaging defense cuts.

Unfortunately, a very specific group was left out of this exemption because of a technicality. Our Nation's National Guard and Reserve military technicians—or MILTECHs—are some of the most important assets we have to keeping our servicemen and -women safe. Just like any other servicemember, they proudly wear the military uniform to work, and are expected to abide by the very same standards. Perhaps most importantly, every one of them is deployable. MILTECHs are National Guardsmen and Reserve personnel. Many of them have deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and have been in harm's way all around the world.

These dual status technicians work every day in direct support of our warfighters. They supply our troops with the equipment they need to fight and win and return home safely. But because of a technicality, because they are paid out of a different account, these Guardsmen and Reservists have been on furlough for almost a month now.

All my amendment would do is ensure that these men and women receive the same treatment as our other uniformed personnel and are included in the furlough exemption. The Congressional Budget Office has verified that my amendment is budget neutral.

Let me say, I was one of the first on the House Armed Services Committee to sound the alarm about the damaging effects of these cuts to our national defense. I have supported several alternatives that would resolve the sequestration mess around our defense budgets and across the Federal Government. I have lain awake at night, worried about the damaging effects these cuts will have if we do not prioritize cuts and fix this problem. I hope we will see some consensus on a real fix to sequestration soon.

But the exception has already been made for the men and women who put their lives on the line every day to defend this Nation. And rightly so. My amendment simply ensures we include all of our deployable men and women in uniform in that exemption.

This legislation is supported by our enlisted and commissioned National Guard members and many other organizations. I ask that my colleagues support the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

□ 0015

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

This is a simple fix to a problem that is an oversight. And I will tell you, from the State of Florida's perception—I live in Florida—we are obviously prone to hurricanes.

Our National Guard are our first responders when it comes to a natural disaster like a hurricane. These dual status technicians are in a position to keep the men and women of the Florida Army National Guard up and flying those helicopters that are utilized across the gulf coast to rescue people.

Without these dual service technicians, without these women and men who actually repair and keep the equipment running, we are at risk, particularly in the State of Florida, but all along the gulf coast when we can't field the force to go out and protect us here at home, much less out in the world.

And our National Guard, and particularly the aviation unit in my hometown, that's affected, they're currently deployed in Europe. But the fact that they have the inability to keep their equipment maintained, and we're furloughing these dual service technicians, it puts us at risk. It hurts our readiness.

And so from a Florida perspective, I will tell you that it is imperative that we pass this. I really appreciate Representative PALAZZO from the great State of Mississippi bringing this forward.

Mr. PALAZZO. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the Representative from Florida. He brought up a good point: it's not just our dual-purpose technicians, our MILTECHs making sure our equipment that our warfighters need is operating. And many times they deploy with them to Iraq and to Afghanistan on multiple deployments and hot spots all around the world.

But there's another purpose of our National Guard, and that's helping us here in the homeland. We're in the middle of hurricane season, and I know that Congressman NUGENT's Governor, my Governor, Phil Bryant, the Governor of Louisiana, have all sent a letter to the President of the United States asking for this exemption as well, because those are the first responders.

They're there before the storm, during the storm, and after the storm. So I thank him for bringing that important point up.

And I'd like to close by saying, again, in times of bitter partisanship and

gridlock, the one unifying trait of this Congress is that we keep our promises to the young men and women who tirelessly defend this Nation at home and abroad at great personal sacrifice.

A vote against this amendment is a vote to break faith with our military and their families. A vote for this amendment is a vote to uphold our promise to our military and their loved ones. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would, first of all, want to suggest that I appreciate the gentleman from Mississippi raising the issue relative to the Guard, as well as my colleague from the State of Florida, the Guard that protects us internationally as far as our military and international threats, as well as takes care of us at home.

The gentleman mentioned, given their portion of the country, that it is hurricane season. It is tornado season in the Midwest. It is flood season in the Midwest. It is earthquake season every day in the State of California, and we have wildfires out west. The Guard does terrific work.

I am very proud of the fact that, although Indiana has continued to decline relative to other States, and is now only the 16th largest State by population in this great Republic, the Indiana National Guard is the fourth largest Guard unit in the United States of America. And it's not just numerical; it is the quality of the men and women who serve, just as in the States of Mississippi, Florida, and throughout our country.

But I would, again, reference back to the observations I've made on all of the furlough amendments that have been made tonight. Everyone who does civilian work, whether it be at the Department of Defense or any other agency of this government, does important work; and we ought not to make that distinction.

The gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this did vote for the Budget Control Act that did create sequestration, that did create this problem.

I would suggest that what we ought to do is comprehensively begin to solve this problem and not move chairs around on this particular deck.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. 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:

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 carry out reductions to the nuclear forces of the United States to implement the New START Treaty (as defined in section 495(e) of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in light of the late hour, I'm going to synopsize my more full statement, if that's okay with everybody.

Recently, the House passed the FY14 NDAA, and in that document we included a provision that, before the $75 million that the White House had requested for implementation of the New START Treaty, they have to provide to the Congress the 1042 report, which was due 18 months ago, by law, that outlines how they're going to spend the money.

The White House has refused to submit that report to date. We put in the authorization language saying, give us the report and we'll give you the money. I went to Chairman YOUNG and asked him to include this in his appropriations bill. He said he would welcome the amendment. I hope that's still the case tonight, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and it's similar to one that the House has already approved on a different bill, specifically, the FY14 National Defense Authorization Act.

I wish this amendment wasn't necessary, but, the President's actions compel it.

Too often, this President acts as if he is above the law.

He ignores the law when it comes to his healthcare law, he ignores the enforcement of immigration laws, and he violates the Constitution to bypass the Senate to appoint unqualified or ideological individuals to important government positions.

Now he is applying this approach to defense policy.

The President's priority appears to be tearing down our nuclear deterrent, which is America's ultimate security guarantee.

And he is ignoring Congress and the law in doing so.

A clear example is his implementation of the New START treaty with Russia.

The President, in his budget request for fiscal year 2014, is asking for a blank check from Congress to implement the treaty with no questions asked.

This is not the way our Constitutional government was set up to work.

This amendment will force the President to follow the law and hold him accountable if he expects one dime of the American people's money to be appropriated.

The House, through the appropriation power, must have a chance to evaluate whether the implementation of a treaty, and the manner in which an Administration intends to implement a treaty, is in the US national security interest.

That is the reason the 1042 report was required in the FY12 NDAA in the first place.

I remind the House, this report is mandated by law.

Are we really comfortable in this House with letting the President ignore the law of the land as he sees fit?

Recently, the President announced a major new nuclear weapons policy before a modest crowd of Europeans.

He stated he will seek to reduce our deployed nuclear forces by a third—beyond the New START reductions we haven't yet put in place.

We need to put the brakes on this rush to zero.

This President is proposing dangerous and irreversible changes to our nuclear forces.

Congress must ensure we use caution when tinkering with the nation's ultimate insurance policy—our nuclear deterrent.

We know the President has been itching to announce further nuclear force cuts.

Based on the most recent arms control compliance report, it appears, yet another year is passing while the President will ignore significant Russian cheating—let me say that again, Russia is cheating on a major treaty with the United States—so that he can propose further reductions with Vladimir Putin.

And the President appears to have so little confidence in his proposal, he refuses to affirm that his reductions will follow the established precedent—what some call the Biden-Helms standard—of proceeding through a treaty or affirmative Act of Congress.

We must be wary; the Appropriations Power was never intended to be a blank check.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for his support and I urge the House to pass the Rogers amendment and send a signal to the President that we won't cut him blank checks while he tries to circumvent the Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment and would state my opposition to it.

We have a handful of amendments that have been made in order on the bill regarding our Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. This is one that urges maintaining the status quo, and others have pushed for a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons.

I firmly believe that a further reduction in the number of nuclear weapons in our inventory will not negatively impact our deterrence goal. Even under the recently ratified New START Treaty, both the United States and Russia will have more than 1,500 deployed warheads each.

Additionally, the treaty contains no limits on nonstrategic nuclear weapons or nondeployed nuclear warheads.

With regard to the amendment, I don't think it's responsible to prohibit the United States from carrying out the reductions prescribed by the New START Treaty. That bilateral strategic arms reduction treaty was passed

by a wide margin in the United States Senate, according to the Constitution, and it remains in force.

I think it is very bad policy to go back on an international treaty obligation that would, in fact, reduce the number of nuclear weapons in this world and would, again, reference back a quote that I read in my opening statement because, again, the gentleman is essentially saying let us maintain the status quo.

Over the last 12 years, it has gotten us a more expensive military that has grown more expensive, but has not gotten any larger. The reality that we face today gives us very difficult choices that we are going to have to make looking forward.

Our military is at a familiar crossroads, one they have been at before at the end of combat operations. The additions and subtractions to funding that we make today must be carried out with an eye to the future. The status quo will no longer get the job done, one, as far as our national security, the security of this world, or a responsible budget that does truly, looking forward, provide us with an affordable defense. And for those reasons, I do object to the gentleman's amendment and oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's observations. And while I may not agree with the New START Treaty, I am in no way trying to prohibit it being implemented. It is the law of the land.

However, we do have a constitutional obligation in this House to be responsible with taxpayers' dollars. And under the new treaty law that was signed by the President, he had 90 days to provide the Congress a report on how he was going to spend the money to implement it.

That's all we're saying in this amendment, is when he gives us the report by law that was due 18 months ago, we'll give him the money, but not until then.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I will consume.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment, which would eliminate all American military aid to Pakistan.

Since 9/11, the United States has given Pakistan over $25 billion, with over $17 billion going to their security forces. These funds have been, and continue to be, used to fight an internal war of suppression against the Sindi, the Baluch, and others who reject their corrupt and brutal domination by Pakistan.

Sadly, Pakistan also uses billions of American military aid to support terrorist attacks on its neighbors, including Afghanistan. And in this last decade, our generous gifts to Pakistan have been used to finance the killing of Americans, both military and diplomatic personnel.

We've been acting like suckers. No shame on Pakistan for being two-faced and murderous. Shame on us for being so stupid in financing a regime that obviously despises us and considers us its enemy.

It is a charade to believe that our aid is buying Pakistan's cooperation and hunting down terrorists when the Pakistani establishment not only gave safe haven to Osama bin Laden for 10 years, but jailed Dr. Afridi, the courageous man who pinpointed bin Laden and was instrumental in bringing justice to him for the mass murder of our fellow Americans on 9/11.

Dr. Afridi is an American hero; yet we have left Dr. Afridi to rot in a Pakistani dungeon. Shame on us for letting Dr. Afridi languish in misery and pain for helping us bring justice to Osama bin Laden and those he murdered on 9/11.

Pakistan is not a government to which we should be giving billions of dollars of aid. My amendment would cut off all aid because Pakistan has betrayed our friendship time and again. Any money we send them only strengthens their ability to act against us, to murder Baluch and Sindi and Sikhs, and to undermine moderate Muslims in Afghanistan, even as we withdraw in 2014.

At a time of tight budgets, we should reserve our aid for our friends and our allies and end assistance to a government that targets and kills Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Section 9114 of the bill specifies the certification required of the Secretary of Defense in order to execute the coalition support funds reimbursement to Pakistan. The Secretary of Defense must certify that Pakistan is cooperating with U.S. counterterrorism operations, not supporting terrorist activities against the U.S. or Afghanistan, taking measures to curb the export of IED materials, and preventing the proliferation of nuclear materials.

□ 0030

As mentioned earlier this evening, the relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult. It is a gray world. But maintaining that relationship is essential. It has helped the United States make progress against terrorism. And Pakistan has allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to the counterterrorism mission.

In June of 2012, Pakistan demonstrated its commitment to a stable and secure Afghanistan by reopening the ground lines of communications. I certainly regret that previously they had been closed. But this has eased tensions with the U.S. and improved logistical support for our troops.

I do think withdrawal of assistance at this time is likely to polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts within their military and their government, generally, and I don't think we need to aggravate a very sensitive relationship that can, in the future, be more productive to the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment but understand, because we're good friends, his passion and his very, very strong feelings which he expresses on any number of occasions and has done so eloquently tonight.

Some would argue this isn't true, but I believe Pakistan does remain a key U.S. counterterrorism partner. Their cooperation is essential. As we did during the war in Afghanistan, we're going to have to use air routes over Pakistan. We're going to have to use their maritime capabilities. We're going to have to use the land routes to get our troops and material out; otherwise, we're going to depend on Kyrgyzstan and Russia. It's going to be expensive. It will probably be $20 billion worth of expense to withdraw from Afghanistan if we don't have the cooperation of the Pakistanis.

The other issue is Pakistan is a nuclear power. I think we need to have a close working relationship with them to make sure that those weapons in the future never fall into the wrong hands.

So I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I associate myself with them. I strongly oppose this amendment but obviously respect the sponsor for his strong views as well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. As he mentioned, I do appreciate the passion that the author of this amendment has brought to this. Obviously,

there have been problems, and it is incumbent upon this country to make sure that this is an arm's-length and adult relationship that is, in the end, beneficial to our Nation.

So I certainly appreciate his objective but am opposed to his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman noted that this is a gray world. It is not a gray world in so many cases. This is not a gray world when people are killing Americans. This is not a gray world when someone organizes the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11 and then is given safe haven by someone who's claiming to be our friend. No, that's not gray at all.

The Pakistanis decided a long time ago that they consider us their enemy. When they took Osama bin Laden and gave him safe haven from us and took our money while they were doing it and used it to finance terrorist groups that have murdered American soldiers in Afghanistan, no, that's not a gray world. That's black and white. And we should stand up for the principle that people who are killing Americans will not receive American military aid, and we can proclaim this tonight in this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to join me in standing up to make sure that the world knows that when they kill Americans, they're not going to be treated like they're our friends. We're not that stupid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. STOCKMAN. 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:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act may be used for United States military exercises which include any participation by the People's Republic of China.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

This is an important amendment in that the Chinese have demonstrated time and time again that they're willing to take our tactics and our technology. Coming up in 2014, President Obama has invited the Chinese to participate in a RIMPAC exercise, the world's largest international maritime exercise. Right now, the Chinese plan to use these exercises to increase their knowledge about our tactics.

The participation in these military exercises is particularly concerning at this time when China is hacking our computers, stealing our weapons plans, and escalating the pressure in the South Sea of China. China's behavior does not appear to be even on the radar of the administration. I'm really concerned now that they're becoming belligerent in the Pacific area of the rim. They're declaring rights to land. And we're going to, by participating with the Chinese, make it look like we're siding with the Chinese in helping the Chinese allies and against the United States.

At this time, I yield to my friend, the cosponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by my good friend from Texas.

The Chinese Communist Party is a gangster regime that rules over a billion subjects. It is the world's worst human rights abuser and does not deserve the recognition nor the legitimacy that comes with participating in military exercises with the Armed Forces of the United States.

As the greatest threat to world peace and stability, the last thing we should be doing is helping them fine-tune their military and their familiarization with the strengths and weaknesses of America's Armed Forces.

The Chinese military is the armed wing of the Communist Party in that country. For decades, China has occupied Tibet, East Turkistan, and threatened the democratic nation of Taiwan with total annihilation. The Communist Party uses force to control its population. Thousands of Falun Gong practitioners who do nothing more than promote yoga and meditation have had their organs ghoulishly ripped from their bodies before they were executed so that those organs could be sold. The moral depravity of the Chinese Communist Party cannot be overstated.

China is aggressively using military expansion to back up territorial claims against India, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, and other countries. The Chinese military is guilty of even more aggression in cyberspace, as we have just heard from my colleague from Texas. They have stolen dozens of our defense systems. They have vast amounts of intellectual property they've stolen, as well as the business records for many of our companies. The damage has been estimated in the trillions of dollars.

Any cooperation with the Chinese military only weakens our own moral credibility and discourages our allies in the face of threats from Communist China. We should be drawing a clear distinction between us and the Chinese military, not helping them train to become even more efficient.

I call on my colleagues to vote for Congressman STOCKMAN's terrific amendment, again, making sure that we stand up and are counted when there is a threat to the freedom and stability of the world.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment seeks to block funds for our military to participate in any exercise in which China participates as well. The Chinese President confirmed last month in meetings with President Obama his navy's attendance to participate in the rim of the Pacific, known as RIMPAC, in 2014. An invitation to participate had been extended to China during then-Secretary of Defense Panetta's visit to that country in September of 2012.

RIMPAC is the world's largest international maritime exercise, where 28 countries and more than 40 ships and submarines work together. In 2012, not all participants were our traditional allies. Russia and India, for example, were participants.

I believe the amendment is shortsighted and attempts to place an unneeded stumbling block in the path of a relationship that is tenuous. I would suggest that the Secretary would not have extended the invitation if the Department and the United States Navy did not feel that there would be a benefit to be gained by these exercises with Chinese participation. I refuse to believe, as a Member of the United States Congress, that the Department would take such a position.

The United States gains maritime knowledge and renewed relationships with other navies of the world and considers participation in this exercise as crucial to their mission. RIMPAC participation has gained an ever-greater meaning with the Defense Department's rebalance to the Asia Pacific, and I do think that this amendment should not be adopted by the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the military works for Congress, not the other way around. So if we direct the military to do something, they do it. If they object, they're not going to object and say, We're not going to do it. We're the body that controls the military, and we're responsible for this Nation's future.

It's so obvious what we're doing is giving away our secrets. I can tell you right now that they've stolen the plans to the F–22. They're building more F–22s than we are.

They're not part of the negotiation for nuclear weapons right now. We only negotiate with Russia. We have no idea how many weapons they have. We have

no idea how many nuclear weapons they have. We are blindsided by what they're doing. They're shooting down satellites, and they could blind us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and would agree with his assertion that we do have civilian command of the Department of Defense and the United States Navy; and, God bless the United States Navy, they follow orders. But also having dealt with the Navy for some number of years as a member of this subcommittee, I would suggest to my colleagues, if the Navy had reservations or had some concerns, we would have had a whiff of that objection and concern wafting from the Potomac to this particular building, and I have not sensed that myself.

I would yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me associate myself with Mr. VISCLOSKY's remarks. I think there's some benefit for us to have a joint military exercise. They may learn something about us; we may learn something about them.

I can assure you the committee isn't in a state of denial. We know the Chinese are very aggressive, setting out a strategy for a blue navy. I think these joint exercises may be extremely beneficial to us in terms of their naval strategy, and to be part of an overall Pacific rim program gives us a pretty good opportunity to take a look at their capabilities.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mr. TURNER. 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:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the strategic delivery systems (as defined in section 495(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code) of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restrict President Obama from unlawfully divesting our Nation's strategic delivery systems.

Since the enactment of the New START Treaty in 2010, the President has continued to jeopardize the security of the United States by unilaterally pursuing policies and international agreements that call for the drastic reduction of our Nation's nuclear deterrent. Not only are these proposed policies and agreements harmful to the United States, but also they are in violation of standing laws such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which states that international agreements cannot limit or reduce the military forces of the United States unless enacted pursuant to a treaty or congressional-executive agreement.

□ 0045

It is unfortunate that amendments such as this one have become necessary, as the President chooses to ignore the role of Congress when negotiating arms reductions.

As recently as last month, President Obama delivered a speech in Berlin in which he outlined his plan to further reduce nuclear warheads by as much as one-third. Since that time, the administration has given no indication that he would seek to negotiate or seek Senate ratification of a formal treaty as required by law. Instead, the administration continues to engage directly with the Russian Federation while averting a formal treaty process in coordination with the Senate.

These drastic reductions by the President are ill conceived and have only encouraged the further proliferation of nuclear weapons by countries like Russia, China, and North Korea, which continue to expand their nuclear weapons programs.

This amendment seeks to rein in the President's misguided policies by ensuring that none of the appropriated funds be used to reduce the strategic delivery systems of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. We have had a number of amendments in this vein this evening. Again, I would allude back to some of my earlier comments that we have proposals and discussions and consideration taking place, and I don't think it's our duty to stop all of that from happening.

The fact is, none of these weapons have ever been used in the United States or elsewhere on the planet Earth. I would hope, as an institution, we would take this much time to consider the asymmetrical threats that have occurred against this country and its citizens and our allies across the country, such as the attack on the USS Cole, the U.S. embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya, and the events of 2001.

I think about the instability and the strategic challenges we face now in Egypt, in Syria, in Libya, in North Africa; the continuing challenge of Iran, which supports terrorist organizations with regional and global aims; the effort that we are going to have to put into the prioritization of an Asia-Pacific region focus, with a particular emphasis on China and North Korea; and the instantaneous and continual attack by cyber against our Nation and our assets.

Again, as far as deliberation and consideration, I don't think we should simply be here all evening saying no, no, no. The President obviously, if there is any further reduction according to a treaty, would have to have that ratified through the United States Senate.

So I do oppose the gentleman's amendment and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. With all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana, I won't question his historical description of the issues of the use of nuclear weapons, although I find it confusing.

I will say that this amendment and its terms are not about the issue of the use of or even the number of weapons the United States or Russia might have. This is about the Constitution and the laws of the United States. All this says is that the President has to follow the Constitution, make certain that he seeks Senate ratification of any formal treaty, or that he conform with the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which would prohibit him unilaterally taking action.

The concern and the reason why this amendment is necessary is because the President felt the need to actually leave this country and go to another country and announce his attention, perhaps, to undertake unilaterally—both as President, and unilaterally, without even getting a bilateral agreement with another nation—his intention of further reducing our nuclear weapons.

This amendment is not about numbers, it's about the law. It's about our Constitution, it's about upholding it, and requiring that the President of the United States conform to it in something certainly as important as our national security.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 113–170.

Mrs. WALORSKI. 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:

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 transfer or release to the Republic of Yemen (or any entity within Yemen) a detainee who is or was held, detained, or otherwise in the custody of the Department of Defense on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, in May, the President declared a renewed intention to transfer detainees from Guantanamo. He also announced he was lifting his self-imposed suspension on the transfers of detainees to Yemen. I believe it's a dangerous policy, both for our troops fighting terror overseas and for our citizens living in the homeland.

The amendment I am offering prohibits any funds in the defense bill from being used to transfer Gitmo detainees to Yemen. This amendment is similar to an amendment I offered in this House past during consideration of the FY14 NDAA.

I believe this amendment is needed because detainees at Guantanamo Bay represent some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world. After Yemen was the starting point for the foiled airline bombing over Detroit, the Obama administration correctly decided not to transfer these terrorists back to this troubled nation.

Detainees at Gitmo pose a real threat to our national security. In addition, transfers to Yemen should be prohibited because the country has become a hotbed for terrorist activities. The Director of National Intelligence testified in 2011 that AQAP remains the affiliate most likely to conduct a transnational attack. AQAP remains resolute on killing as many Americans as they can if we don't stop them first.

It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S. The Christmas day Detroit bombing attempt, the ink cartridge bomb plot, the radicalization of the Fort Hood shooter all can be traced back to Yemen.

Lastly, we should not transfer detainees to Yemen because of their poor track record of securing its prisons. Let's look at the facts. A Yemeni citizen, the convicted mastermind of the USS Cole bombing who took the lives of 17 American sailors, was being held by Yemeni authorities when he escaped from prison in 2003. Luckily, he was recaptured, but he was able to escape again from Yemeni custody in 2006 with 22 other terrorists. Why would we risk another jailbreak by people who intend to do us harm?

Just this morning I woke up to headlines describing how 500 prisoners escaped from an Iraqi prison after their comrades launched a military-style assault to free them. Many of these prisoners were senior members of al Qaeda who were convicted and received death sentences. Unfortunately, it's an example of what happens when the U.S. delegates its national security interests to other countries. This is a commonsense amendment with the purpose of protecting Americans.

I believe it's prudent that this Congress receive the Department of Defense's report on factors that contribute to re-engagement so that informed choices about future transfers can be made. That report is mandated by law and is still currently overdue.

In 2012, the DIA reported that the combined suspected and confirmed re-engagement rate of former Gitmo detainees has risen to almost 30 percent. I ask my colleagues to consider the national security implications of transferring detainees to Yemen and join me in support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. May I inquire of the balance of my time, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlelady has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Walorski amendment to prohibit transfer or release of Guantanamo Bay detainees to Yemen.

Mr. Chairman, over the weekend, hundreds of convicts, including senior members of al Qaeda, broke out of Iraq's Abu Ghraib jail. The Abu Ghraib prison break perfectly demonstrates that most countries cannot credibly secure highly dangerous terrorists, including Yemen. Indeed, Yemen has a particularly bad record of prison breaks involving al Qaeda terrorists.

In December 2011, several al Qaeda militants escaped from an Aden prison. In 2006, 23 al Qaeda militants broke out of a Sanaa jail and established the core leadership of al Qaeda in Yemen, a group which has since metastasized into al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

Given Yemen's terrible track record, it seems obvious that we should not consider transferring a single detainee to Yemen. Yet President Obama is so ideologically committed to fulfilling his misguided promise of closing Guantanamo Bay that I fear he may try.

Mr. Chairman, recidivism among the transferred Gitmo detainees is a huge problem. According to the Director of National Intelligence, the latest report, 97 of the 603 transferred Gitmo detainees have re-engaged in terrorism. A further 72 are suspected of re-engaging. Nearly one-third of all transferred Gitmo detainees are either confirmed or suspected of getting back in the fight. Clearly, Congress needs to get involved and set acceptable boundaries on the President.

As a Navy pilot with combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, I can tell you that our troops' job is already difficult enough. We don't have to fight the same people twice.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this is the first instance that my friend and colleague from Indiana and I are participating in a debate on an amendment on the House floor, which is why I respectfully and regretfully have to oppose her amendment, as well-intentioned as it is.

I do not believe that we should impose on ourselves the legal and moral problems arising from the prospect of indefinite detentions at Guantanamo. Working through civil courts since 9/11, hundreds of individuals have been convicted of terrorism or terrorism-related offenses and are now serving long sentences in Federal prison. Not one has ever escaped custody.

But we're told we cannot bring these detainees to the United States for trial or custody. And we are told in three other instances in the bill that we cannot close Guantanamo. But I think the rationale for establishing Guantanamo in the first instance was a misplaced idea that the facility could be beyond the law—a proposition rejected by the Supreme Court. As a result, continued operation of this facility creates the impression in the eyes of our allies and enemies alike that the United States selectively observes the rule of law. With this amendment, now we would have a fourth restriction within this bill, and I think that is not the best policy for this country to pursue.

For that reason, respectfully, I do oppose the gentlewoman's amendment, and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire on the balance of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Indiana has 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. With all due respect to my esteemed colleague from Indiana as well, this amendment isn't about whether Gitmo stays open or Gitmo closes. This amendment is specifically about not allowing transfers of highly dangerous terrorists to the country of Yemen because Yemen has proved it is not capable of holding these terrorists.

The job of this Congress and what we're talking about with this amendment is protecting the American people, which is what we're charged with.

I would respectfully ask our body to approve and support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 113–170.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 113–170.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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:

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

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, transfer, or prepare to divest, retire, or transfer, C–23 aircraft assigned to the Army.

(b) The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing and increasing the amount made available for ''Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Army'' by $34,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to provide our National Guard with the aircraft it needs to perform its missions effectively and efficiently.

The National Guard relies on C–23 Sherpa aircraft for a variety of uses, and they're especially important for missions stateside. These small cargo aircraft transported relief supplies and personnel after Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina. They support special operations missions and training, and they aid the Guard in fighting wildfires.

These planes are flexible, they can be put into use quickly and—this is important, Mr. Chairman—they're less expensive to operate than other options.

□ 0100

Despite opposition from the National Guard Association of the United States and from Governors around this country, the Army now wants to eliminate use of the Sherpa. The C–130 planes they propose using instead are almost two times as expensive to operate. Plus, eliminating the Sherpa would require that the Guard rely on the Air Force for the use of planes. This would add up to a week to access planes, cutting off the Guard's ability to be responsive and flexible. Additionally, the Sherpa is extremely popular with the Special Operations community.

Last year, the House voted to prohibit the Sherpa's retirement. My amendment would uphold current law and prevent the retirement, divestment, or transfer of C–23 aircraft. It would also ensure their continued viable operation, preventing the Army from getting around the law by mothballing the Sherpa into ''flyable storage.''

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. Let's listen to the men and women of the National Guard and support their success to the fullest extent possible.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment.

The Army has made it clear to our committee that it does not want to retain C–23s, the Sherpas, the workhorses, that have been doing some remarkable work for over 30 years, or acquire any replacement platform. In fact, the Army is already taking steps to put the aircraft out of operation while stopping short of full retirement.

At the beginning of fiscal year 2013, the Army National Guard was operating 34 of these Sherpas. As of July, 14 of those had been turned into Fort Sill, Oklahoma, where they are being maintained in semi-flyable storage. That tells you something. The remaining aircraft are scheduled to be turned into Fort Sill by the end of October of this year.

Because this amendment only applies to fiscal year 2014, the aircraft likely will be out of operation before this amendment would take effect. Unfortunately, because the C–23s will already be in storage by the time this amendment takes effect, it is unlikely it will accomplish its intent.

We do not believe that taking funds from other critical readiness programs to apply to the C–23 operations is the best use of the Army's increasingly limited resources. Thus, reluctantly, I oppose this amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the comments of the chair. However, if we are talking about limited resources, it makes so much more sense to use planes that are less expensive. Give the men and the women of the National Guard the flexibility and the aircraft that they need.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 113–170.

Ms. HANABUSA. 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:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

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

In the President's budget the past 2 years, there has been a push to phase in substantial TRICARE fee increases. Even the TRICARE For Life program, the promise of life-long health care many were given when they first joined the military, has been the subject of proposed enrollment fees.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and other Congressional defense committees, have declined to grant the authority for these fee increases.

My amendment would do nothing more than ensure that the funds in this act are not made available to implement any new enrollment fees in the TRICARE For Life program.

Year after year, we hear from the Department of Defense that health care costs of our soldiers and veterans are spiraling out of control and that TRICARE is crippling the DOD with its rise in costs. Yet, Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 fiscal years, the Pentagon has found a way to reprogram hundreds

of millions of dollars from defense health accounts to higher priorities. These reprogramming actions totaled $708 million last year in 2012 and $500 million in the prior year in 2011.

DOD has explained that the surplus was due to ''uncertainty about medical inflation and health care use, and the impact of continual benefit changes and efficiency initiatives.'' If there is uncertainty about costs, the assertion cannot be made that added fees are necessary for even our most senior veterans.

DOD's own documents prove military health care costs are not exploding. The combined personnel and health care costs are less than one-third of DOD's budget and the same as they've been for 30 years. The overestimation of cost growth that has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars being reprogrammed by DOD the past 2 years is proof that costs are not growing as much as anticipated. In fact, they are not growing at all.

The relatively low cost of health care and strong benefits are the foundational elements and they are necessary not just to recruit, but also to sustain an all-volunteer force. Significant cuts to the critical incentive packages that sustain a top-quality career force will undermine long-term retention and readiness.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment and uphold our commitment to the brave men and women of our armed services, as well as the millions of veterans in need of health care today. Again, I reemphasize this amendment is to prohibit funds to be used to add any enrollment fees to the TRICARE For Life program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would begin my remarks by suggesting that I deeply appreciate the gentlewoman's concern and her commitment to make sure everyone who has taken that oath of office and put on the uniform of the United States of America receives the health care benefits they deserve and that they have earned.

But I would point out, as I have on a number of occasions this evening, that we have got to start looking ahead and begin to make some very difficult decisions.

I would quote again from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments that has noted that over the last decade, rather than getting larger and more expensive, the military has just grown more expensive. This reality makes our future choices even more difficult, and it is imperative that Congress joins with the Department in working through these decisions in an arm's length relationship, but also as a partner.

The Department has made recommendations, one of which we are debating at this moment, that are very difficult decisions to have to make. On the other hand, we have to begin to not reflectively reject these recommendations out of hand.

I understand what the gentlewoman is trying to do with her amendment, but she does rightfully describe it as saying that no funds shall be used to implement an enrollment fee. Is that enrollment fee 25 cents? Is that enrollment fee $1? Is that enrollment fee $2? Is that enrollment fee $250 for an individual and $500 for a family? We are going to have to consider the pressure that the budget is under.

The gentlewoman has indicated that the Department has reprogrammed money, and that means that, in fact, costs have not gone up. The fact is I do believe that the Department has, if you would, underexecuted and overrequested moneys in past years.

The subcommittee mark in the bill we are debating tonight cut $400 million from the request of $15.8 billion based on the execution history. We would not have done that if we thought we had endangered anyone's health. And in fact, these costs are going up.

The cost of military medical care has risen almost by triple in the past 12 years, rising from $19- to $56 billion. If the increase continues at this rate for another decade, coupled with sequestration, military health care could consume close to 20 percent of all defense spending.

According to a report published by the Congressional Budget Office entitled ''Long-Term Implications of the 2013 Future Years Defense Program,'' the annual cost to the Department's health care program could grow from $51 billion in fiscal year '13 to $65 billion in 2017 and $90 billion by 2030.

If we continue to block enrollment fees for TRICARE For Life, defense funding for this program will place other programs at risk. The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments estimates that pay and benefits for each Active Duty servicemember grew by 57 percent in real terms between 2001 and 2012, or 4.2 percent annually.

I am not suggesting our servicemembers do not deserve adequate compensation for the risks they take in the defense of this country, but we have to understand what the growth of those costs means for the overall budget and the future implications. Operation and maintenance costs per Active Duty employee grew by 34 percent.

I oppose the amendment respectfully because I am worried that if we don't address the rising cost of health care now there will be even a smaller pool of resources to make our military ready in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the ranking member, however, the facts are as stated: DOD has reprogrammed $708 million last year alone and $500 million in the prior year. These have been from the health accounts.

In addition to that, we must look at the fact that the DOD budget as to personnel and health costs are less than one-third of the DOD budget, and that has been a consistent percentage for the past 30 years.

The health care fund has been the one that has been taking the hit every time. It has been the bogeyman to say that is where we are going to have to cut and that is what is rising the costs out of control, it is spiraling out of control. But that is, in fact, not true.

I think that to threaten health care or to not give our men and women in uniform, and the veterans, in particular, the security with which they joined the military for—these are one of the benefits they looked for—by not being able to ensure them that, especially health care, is the worst that we can do. When we don't have the evidence that this is where we should cut, we should not cut and add any additional enrollment fees.

As I stated, this amendment is to prevent any funds to be used to increase any enrollment fees for the TRICARE For Life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

May 1, 2013:

H.R. 1246. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office.

H.R. 1765. An Act to provide the Secretary of Transportation with the flexibility to transfer certain funds to prevent reduced operations and staffing of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

May 17, 2013:

H.R. 1071. An Act to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.

May 24, 2013:

H.R. 360. An Act to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

June 3, 2013:

H.R. 258. An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military decorations or medals.

June 25, 2013:

H.R. 475. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

July 12, 2013:

H.R. 324. An Act to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

H.R. 1151. An Act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2383. An Act to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''.

July 18, 2013:

H.R. 251. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, arid for other purposes.

H.R. 254. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

H.R. 588. An Act to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

June 3, 2013:

S. 982. An Act to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking certain actions to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam, and for other purposes.

June 13, 2013:

S. 622. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and July 24 on account of personal matters.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 22 and today on account of medical mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 24, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2303. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting The Fiscal Year 2012 Inventory of Contracts for Services for the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2304. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Stability Oversight Council 2013 Annual Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2305. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Singapore pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2306. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Israel pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2307. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Avolon Aerospace Leasing Limited (Avolon) of Dublin, Ireland, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2308. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2309. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2012 Financial Report to Congress for the Food and Drug Administration required by the Medical Device User Fee Amendments of 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2310. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Facilitating the Deployment of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications; Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment [PS Docket No.: 11-153] [PS Docket No.: 10-255] received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2311. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of Wireline Competition Bureau Data Practices, Computer III Further Remand Proceedings; Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review — Review of Computer III and ONA Safeguards and Requirements [WC Docket No.: 10-132] [CC Docket Nos.: 95-20, 98-10] received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2312. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Critical Habitat Map for the Fountain Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0064] (RIN: 1018-AZ68) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2313. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for Six West Texas Aquatic Invertebrates [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0029] (RIN: 1018-AX70) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2314. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Six West Texas Aquatic Invertebrates [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0004] (RIN: 1018-AZ26) received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2315. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing One Distinct Population Segment of Broad-Snouted Caiman as Endangered and a Second as Threatened With a Special Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2010-0089; 4500030115; 1113F116] (RIN: 1018-AT56) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2316. A letter from the Branch Chief, Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Buena Vista Lake Shrew [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2009-0062; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AW85) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2317. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Attorney General concerning enforcement actions taken by the Department under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, Public Law 104-65, as amended by Public Law 110-81, codified at 2 U.S.C. Sec. 1605(b)(1) for the semi-annual period beginning on January 1, 2011 and July 1, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2318. A letter from the Acting Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inadmissibility of Consumer Products and Industrial Equipment Noncompliant With Applicable Energy Conservation or Labeling Standards [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0004] (RIN: 1515-AD82) received July 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2319. A letter from the Acting Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibitions and Conditions on the Importation and Exportation of Rough Diamonds [USCBP-2012-0022] (RIN: 1515-AD85) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2320. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report to Congress on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2321. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — July 2013 (Rev. Rul. 2013-15) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2322. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''National Coverage Determinations for Fiscal Year 2012''; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLF: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2787. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRENSHAW: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2786. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2792. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 315. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy (Rept. 113–174). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2788. A bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 2789. A bill to delay enrollment in qualified health plans in State or Federally facilitated Exchanges until 1 year after final rules are published establishing the verification and other procedures to be used to implement section 1411 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and carrying out sections 6055 and 6056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2790. A bill to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2791. A bill to prohibit the export from the United States of certain electronic waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to permit the Government of the District of Columbia to determine the fiscal year for the Government of the District of Columbia, to amend such Act to make local funds of the District of Columbia available for use by the District at the beginning of the District's fiscal year at the rate of operations provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year if neither the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill nor a District of Columbia continuing resolution for the year does not become law prior to the beginning of such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 2794. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who are still prisoner, missing, or unaccounted for, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2795. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Army from imposing excessive fees for the use of Army-controlled real property at water resources development projects with respect to concessionaires operating facilities making restaurant, gasoline, or marine engine sales at marinas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2796. A bill to expand the workforce of veterinarians specialized in the care and conservation of wild animals and their ecosystems, and to develop educational programs focused on wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions and to make additional contributions to the Homeless Veterans Assistance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2798. A bill to amend Public Law 106-206 to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 2799. A bill to establish the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, recreational shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 2800. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DAINES):

H.R. 2801. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2802. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 418 Liberty Street in Covington, Indiana, as the ''Fountain County Veterans Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2803. A bill to establish a research, development, and technology demonstration program to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in combined cycle and simple cycle power generation systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 2786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 2787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 2790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

Congress shall have the power to make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 2796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 2802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to establish Post Offices.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 176: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 259: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 281: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 286: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 321: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 337: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 436: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 445: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 460: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 495: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ENYART, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Pierluisi, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 508: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 523: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 525: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 555: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 574: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 647: Ms. TITUS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 685: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 690: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 718: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 721: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 792: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 818: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 842: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 888: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 892: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1014: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1020: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1091: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 1094: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1099: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1153: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1173: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1176: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1250: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1252: Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. POLLS.

H.R. 1255: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1309: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1310: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1351: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1354: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1358: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1373: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1409: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1429: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1431: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1449: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1527: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1531: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1566: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1572: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1588: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1620: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1698: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1717: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1726: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1775: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1781: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1814: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1816: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1825: Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1852: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1867: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1875: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1908: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1918: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1923: Mr. COBLE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1926: Mr. KEATING and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1950: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1985: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2000: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2009: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 2022: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2026: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2027: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2030: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2044: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2046: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2094: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2122: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2134: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2141: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2144: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2208: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2238: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2247: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2285: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2300: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2305: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2328: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BARR, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2361: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2413: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2415: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2429: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BARR, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2446: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2449: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. DESANTIS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2500: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2502: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2504: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2519: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2520: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2559: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2561: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2619: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2632: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2633: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 2644: Mr. HONDA and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2646: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2656: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2663: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2677: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2682: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 2683: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2703: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2725: Mr. YODER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2752: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2756: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2760: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2773: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2777: Mr. ROONEY.
H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mrs. NOEM.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. BASS, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 36: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 47: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 71: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 109: Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Res. 136: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 166: Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 227: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 231: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 247: Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 254: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. CLARKE.
H. Res. 284: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 293: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 304: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 314: Mr. BARR.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative WAXMAN, or a designee, to H.R. 1582 the Energy Consumers Relief Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.