



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 2011

No. 78

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, June 3, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 2011

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 2, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LYNN A. WESTMORELAND 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 5, 2011, 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.

PRESIDENT'S DEBT CEILING REQUEST FAILS

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, the peo-

ple's House spoke loud and clear: No debt limit increase without real spending cuts to promote job growth. Liberals wanted to increase the debt limit by \$2.4 trillion with no meaningful reforms. At a time when the Federal Government is borrowing 42 cents of every dollar it spends, the last thing Americans want to do is raise the government's borrowing limit recklessly killing jobs. Liberals in Congress need to attach real cuts to any increases they are seeking. That means for every dollar proposed to increase the debt limit, there should be one dollar in cuts. It makes sense.

Tuesday night's vote of 318-97-7 shows that the House is overwhelmingly in agreement with this debt limit increase being denied. Over 80 Democrats joined with the 237 Republicans to vote against the President's debt ceiling request. Adding more debt to our economy handicaps small business job creation and aggravates our country's debt crisis even further. This is a direct risk to senior citizens with the value of the dollar being put at risk. It's a threat to students who could be faced with overwhelming debt in the future.

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

MINE SAFETY

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a little more than a year ago, 29 coal miners lost their lives in the Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia. Our Nation watched with sadness as a small community felt the lash of the worst coal mining tragedy in this country in four decades.

Shortly after the tragedy, our Nation promised these families to get to the bottom of what happened and we promised to make sure that something like this would never happen again.

The good news is that we learned a lot about what caused this tragedy in the last year. Last month, an independent panel of experts appointed by the Governor of West Virginia released the results of a 13-month-long investigation. They concluded that the explosion was preventable. The panel said that the warning signs about dangerous conditions in the mine were ignored leading up to the tragedy. They found that the Massey Energy Company ignored basic safety precautions that the mining industry has recognized for more than a century. Repeated violations had become business as usual, something which the investigation called "a normalization of deviance," where unsafe behavior and conditions became normal at Upper Big Branch mine.

The report lays out how this tragedy unfolded. It may have ended with a sudden explosion, but it was a slow-motion disaster.

The company's inadequate ventilation system allowed explosive gases to build up. Workers were slogging in

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3917

neck-deep water that obstructed the air currents needed to ventilate methane gas. The mine's owners routinely illegally changed ventilation plans and used faulty engineering.

In the months before the explosion, miners asked Massey management 561 times to quench the explosive potential of coal dust by applying rock dust, yet Massey only took action 65 times, or 11 percent of the time they were requested to do so.

Water sprays on a mining machine were not properly maintained and failed to extinguish sparks, which allowed a fire to ignite.

Coal dust provided the fuel that allowed a localized fire to trigger a massive explosion that ripped through miles of underground tunnels where miners were working.

Finally, the report found intimidation. Miners were afraid to speak out about their safety concerns. They dared not stop coal production. Anyone who challenged management was considered a nuisance or a threat and their jobs were on the line.

These conclusions are chilling. This report makes it clear that the failure to effectively deal with a reckless operator occurred at many levels:

Our Nation's health and safety protections failed these 29 miners because of the many loopholes in the law that were exploited by the mine industry.

Regulators allowed the mine to operate in a badly engineered ventilation system and failed to force operators to use modern technology to prevent coal dust explosions.

And the mining industry failed these workers because they repeatedly refused to speak out against some of the worst actors within their industry, and have opposed legislation to curtail their misconduct.

The State investigation is also a call to action. The panel urges Congress to enact reforms to modernize mine safety technology, give regulators better tools, strengthen criminal provisions, and improve the rights of miners.

Mr. Speaker, with this report and its recommendations, Congress has been warned. We cannot abide by the status quo any longer. We cannot let Washington's pay-to-play politics paralyze legislative action once again. Congress has been warned. We cannot let mine operators game mine safety enforcement by paying lawyers instead of fixing chronic safety problems.

Congress has been warned. We cannot let miners live in fear of being fired for speaking out on behalf of their safety. Their voices save lives.

Congress has been warned. We cannot let decisions made in the boardrooms to put production over safety go unchallenged any longer.

There are responsible mining companies that operate without an avalanche of violations. There are operators who do not make deviant behavior a part of their corporate culture. We want these mine operators to join us to rework the rules that govern this industry.

In the end, though, getting mine reform done depends upon Congress. The responsibility rests squarely here. These disasters are preventable. This report is a very clear warning. We should not—we must not—wait for another tragedy before Congress owns up to its responsibility.

□ 1010

IN MEMORY OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS WILLIAM "SETH" BLEVINS

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for my district because today we're going to lay an American hero to rest, Private First Class William "Seth" Blevins. He was only 21.

Just before Christmas in 1989, on December 22, Steven and Trish Wagnoner Blevins got the best gift of all—a beautiful, healthy little boy. They lived in rural America, Sardinia, Brown County, Ohio. They were small business owners, working hard to make a living and working harder to make sure that their children achieve the American Dream. And they did their job with Seth. You see, Seth was a wonderful young man, a young man who loved our country so much he put the cloth of his country, a uniform, on and decided to protect our freedom no matter what cost or peril it was to him.

In 2008, he graduated from Eastern High School in Brown County. He played soccer, basketball, participated in the band, and was a member of the Eastern High School chapter of the National Honor Society, clearly a winning individual. He attended Ohio University and took courses at the University of Cincinnati prior to enlisting in the Army. He was a member of the Peace Lutheran Church in Arnheim.

His parents now feel an unbearable sorrow with the loss of their wonderful son, Seth, but so does his sister, Paige Blevins, his mother's fiancée, Brandon Black, his maternal grandparents, Will and Shirley Wagoner, and all of the aunts and uncles and cousins and friends, everyone in the community.

Seth was a member of the U.S. Army, 2nd Battalion, 27th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks in Hawaii—commonly referred to as the Wolfhounds—and he loved what he did. Unfortunately, on May 23, 2011, while so many Americans were planning their celebrations for Memorial Day, he was the victim of an improvised explosive device in Kunar Province, Afghanistan, participating in Operation Enduring Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget the bravery of our men and women in uniform that continue to serve our country and continue to serve it in harm's way. These are true American heroes—so many who have died, so many continue in the battlefield, so many that are injured. But today, I ask

this Chamber and America to recognize Seth Blevin's family and pray for them so that they can endure this heartache and find a way to overcome it.

Mr. Speaker, may Seth Blevins rest in peace, and may his family find peace.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT WALLACE LOH TO UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am a very proud alumnus of the University of Maryland. For more than a century and a half, the University of Maryland has represented the best of American ideals of public education. Now I am very proud to say that the University of Maryland tradition is in the capable hands of our new President, Dr. Wallace Loh, who was inaugurated this spring.

Wallace Loh came to the United States at the age of 15, alone, without family, with \$300 in his pocket, his parents life savings. Wallace Loh was born in Shanghai, China. His father, a diplomat, fled the Communist regime to Lima, Peru when Wallace was a very young man. He grew up in Lima until the age of 15, but it was here in this country that he pursued the education that would ultimately make him one of our most respected academic leaders.

President Loh comes to College Park from the University of Iowa, where he served as Provost and Executive Vice President. He brings to the University of Maryland more than three decades of hard work and accomplishment in higher education. His successful career as a scholar and administrator has taken him to Seattle University, the University of Washington, the University of Colorado-Boulder, Beijing University in China, and more. He also served as a top policy adviser to Governor Gary Locke, who will be our ambassador in China. Gary Locke, of course, was the Governor of Washington State. In that capacity, he led the State's effort to expand access to higher education for low- and middle-income students.

As a leading scholar in the legal field, Dr. Loh has also been elected President of the Association of American Law Schools. Wallace Loh holds a law degree from Yale University, a Ph.D from the University of Michigan, a master's from Cornell University, and a bachelor's from Grinnell College in Iowa.

I believe that the University of Maryland could not have chosen a more qualified leader to take our university into this century. Throughout his diverse career, President Loh has built a strong track record of creating academic excellence at every stop. What an extraordinary background Wallace Loh has for this increasingly integrated world, particularly as it relates to our relations with China, one of the

world's largest nations both in terms of people and its economy.

In his inaugural address, President Loh reflected on Barack Obama's statement that America has reached a "sputnik moment," a moment when our place as a world economic and innovative leader is increasingly challenged. Institutions like the University of Maryland are critical to our continued leadership in the world. As President Loh said, and I quote, "The American research university—a crowning achievement of American civilization—must respond to this sputnik moment. We are a premier research university"—speaking of the University of Maryland. He went on to say that "we must also become a premier innovation and entrepreneurial university."

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the University of Maryland is well-equipped to fill that role and do its part for our State and our Nation. And I have no doubt that Wallace Loh was exactly the right person to choose to lead the university at this time.

I want to wish Dr. Loh and the university the very best as it works with so many other extraordinary universities and colleges and educational institutions in the United States of America to make sure that we "make it in America." That is to say that we out-educate, we out-build, we out-innovate our competitors so that we can provide the kind of quality of life, the jobs that our people need, a growing economy for the future, for our children.

THANKING 26 REPUBLICANS WHO VOTED FOR MCGOVERN-JONES AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues in the House, on Memorial Day I had the privilege to speak to two different groups down in the Third District of North Carolina, which I represent. One of the events comes to mind down in Beaufort, North Carolina. There were well over 150 people there—most of them obviously were veterans or family of veterans, and a couple of families whose loved ones didn't come home from previous wars.

That brings me to the point that last week JIM MCGOVERN and I offered an amendment to create a formula to bring our troops home from Afghanistan, and I want to thank the 26 Republicans who voted for that amendment. We came within six votes of creating a formula for the President to bring our troops home before 2015.

Mr. Speaker, at these two events down in my district, I had veterans line up when I finished to come up to say, "We agree with you on your position to bring our troops home from Afghanistan." And even at one event I got a very strong applause when I mentioned the McGovern-Jones amendment and

how close we came to create a formula to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, they said to me, well, why did we go into Afghanistan? Bin Laden, he was responsible for 9/11, he's dead now. Al Qaeda, which had a large presence back in 2003, 2004 in Afghanistan, is now diminished. Now these are the veterans talking to me. I'm not a veteran. But my statement was, you're right. Our country is financially broke, we've spent over \$8 billion, we can't pay our bills, and yet Mr. Karzai—who's corrupt to begin with, the leader of Afghanistan—we always seem to find \$8 billion a month to send to him. It makes no sense.

So Mr. MCGOVERN and I and people on my side and his side, we're going to continue to work to create an atmosphere and environment to encourage President Obama not to wait until 2015.

□ 1020

That's exactly what Secretary Gates said to the Armed Services Committee, on which I serve: "In February of 2015, we will start bringing home our troops." Well, then, Mr. Speaker, how many more will have to die, lose their legs and their arms in the next 4 years? It's only 2011, and we're talking about 2015?

I can tell you our military has won the war many, many times. As you can see, this is a paper not even in my district, Greensboro, North Carolina, where Mr. HOWARD COBLE is from. This is an editorial a few weeks ago and it says, "Get Out," and there's a flag-draped coffin/transfer case being carried off the plane by soldiers or airmen.

So it is time that this Congress come together in a bipartisan way and bring our troops home.

I see the families down at Camp Lejeune, which is in my district. I talk to them. I listen to them. They think they have done their job. They think it's time to come home.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I do all the time on the floor of the House when I'm closing, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for His people in this great Nation. I will ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to Mr. Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for this great Nation.

And I will ask three times: God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. DOROTHY SHARPE JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a

lifelong friend, the Reverend Dr. Dorothy Sharpe Johnson, an accomplished pastor, educator and author who passed from labor to reward on 31 May 2011 after a long illness, a long illness that did not curtail her work.

A native of Wilson County, North Carolina, Dr. Johnson resided in Matthews, North Carolina, which is near the City of Charlotte, with her beloved husband of more than 50 years, Retired AME Zion Bishop Joseph Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was the fifth of eight children born to Mark Benjamin and Clara Farmer Sharpe. After finishing Speight High School at the age of 15, she went on to earn her bachelor's degree from North Carolina Central University, known at that time as North Carolina College at Durham. Later in life, she earned a master's degree in religious education and a Doctor of Divinity degree from the James Walker Hood Theological Seminary in Salisbury, North Carolina, on the campus of historic Livingstone College, and she received a Doctor of Ministry degree from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Charlotte.

Over the years, Dr. Johnson found many ways to serve her community as a public school teacher, school administrator, social worker, and even a seamstress. She was particularly devoted to her faith and church. In 1979, Dr. Johnson was elected by the AME Zion General Conference to oversee the youth mission. During her 8-year tenure, she worked to build a youth retreat that was eventually named in her honor and today serves as many as 575 youth at a time.

Dr. Johnson was a missionary supervisor with the AME Zion Church and was pastor of Indian Hill AME Zion Church in Fort Mill, South Carolina. Her work with the AME Zion Church took her around the world working in England and Puerto Rico, the Bahamas and across America as an outreach to her ministry. She published a great number of books that were inspired by her life experience and devotion to God. In addition to all of this, she was a devoted member of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, one of most profound statements I can make about this great American is that despite having a medical condition known as systemic lupus erythematosus for more than 40 years, including many surgeries and hospitalizations, she lived a productive life that cannot be surpassed by anyone. She was a good wife, mother, grandmother, sister, aunt, cousin, pastor, and friend. Dr. Johnson distinguished herself in so many ways and made a difference in this world.

The Johnsons are the proud parents of two adult sons, the Reverend Anthony Johnson, pastor of St. Matthew AME Zion Church of Rock Hill, South Carolina; and Timothy Johnson, a civil engineer in our great State. And they are the grandparents of two grandchildren, Angelica and Derrick, both of whom are honor students.

Dr. Johnson is also survived by four sisters, Barbara Jones, Trumilla Jones, Ernestine Wright, and Betty Coley; three brothers, Rudolph Sharpe, Eugene Sharpe, and a very good friend of mine, David Sharpe of Phoenix, Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great life. We extend condolences to her husband, Bishop Joseph Johnson, their sons, and all of their family and friends.

DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 318-97 a blank check on spending. We stopped the unconditional raising of the debt ceiling. The fact remains, we are in a debt crisis because Washington spends too much, not because it taxes too little.

America is drowning in debt, and we need to significantly reduce spending and make long-term reforms that encourage private sector job creation and move toward a balanced budget. Raising the debt limit without restoring financial accountability was unacceptable, and that's why I voted against this irresponsible debt limit increase.

I can't comprehend why this administration continues to push the same dangerous failed strategy that got us into this economic mess. The failure to increase the debt limit on the floor Tuesday would be enough evidence for the White House and Washington Democrats to conclude that Americans want Washington to stop signing a blank check, spending money we don't have and sending the bill to our children and our grandchildren—grandchildren that I personally have an opportunity every time I open my BlackBerry to see their faces and be reminded that it's for them that I speak and this House spoke on Tuesday evening.

Yet more than 100 House Democrats signed on to a letter publicly advocating for a debt limit increase without spending cuts and reforms. And unfortunately after meeting with the President yesterday, I'm not sure he's heard the people on this issue either.

According to the latest evidence, only 11 percent of Americans support a blank check raising of the debt limit and more spending. This vote demonstrates that President Obama and the House Democrats are far out of step with the rest of America and should join House Republicans in working to cut spending. The American people have said "no" to the Democrats and they're not going to take it anymore, not another blank check of more spending and more debt for the Obama administration.

It's the time now to think of the next generation and not the next election and take time to rip up a blank check of defeat for our country.

PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH ON AMERICAN SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we've learned a lot over the last several days about the Republican commitment to both national security and fiscal responsibility. Last week, after the party of limited government spending passed the \$690 billion defense authorization bill loaded with Pentagon pork, they jammed through a 4-year extension of key provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. With a last-minute rushed vote with virtually no debate, the party of small government authorized more wiretapping and more poking through Americans' personal records.

□ 1030

Now today, our ongoing debate over fiscal year 2012 Homeland Security appropriations shows us that the majority's penny-wise, pound-foolish approach is in all of its glory. This bill breaks faith with first responders, underfunding key firefighter assistance grants and State Homeland Security grants that primarily train and equip first responders. Important programs will be rolled into a block grant so that localities will be competing for dwindling Federal Homeland Security grants, this and more undermining our communities' ability to deal with all kinds of hazards, including potential nuclear, chemical, and biological attacks.

The bill cuts Homeland Security research and development programs by 40 percent, Mr. Speaker. So while terrorist organizations are busily mastering technologies, we will be eliminating very important research projects in biological and explosives detection and advanced cybersecurity. Shame on us.

Homeland Security already took a hit in fiscal year 2011. The majority, which claims to care about nothing more than the safety and security of the American people, wants to cut more than a billion dollars from last year's funding levels, and provides \$2 billion less than what the President has proposed.

Meantime, while we are nickel and diming our first responders, we are throwing \$10 billion every month, \$10 billion every month at a war in Afghanistan that is killing Americans, while doing very little, if anything, to advance our national security. Where are the budget cutters when it comes to appropriating that money? Where are all the hard questions and the tough scrutiny when it comes to funding a decade-long military occupation of Afghanistan that has failed in every conceivable way? Ten billion dollars a month on Afghanistan. For the price of about 6 days of fighting the war in Afghanistan, we could make up the difference between the President's Homeland Security request and the allocation in this bill. Six days.

The majority clearly has one set of standards for important domestic programs and quite another for military adventures abroad. If you want to wage a war, no questions asked. But if you want to support first responders, or educate small children, or preserve Medicare, you better duck, because the budget axe is aimed at the people's priorities.

I remind my friends in the majority that terrorists would strike us here on our shores, in our homeland, in our capital. An enormous military footprint that is stomping down in a sovereign country thousands of miles away, a country where Osama bin Laden wasn't hiding and al Qaeda is barely active, is not where we need to be putting our efforts.

Let's do the smart thing. Let's fully fund Homeland Security and let's save money and lives by bringing our troops home.

AMERICA'S CREDIT RATING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week the United States House sent a clear message to the White House that it's time to address our Nation's growing debt crisis and get serious with real budgetary reforms so that America can meet its budget and credit obligations at home and around the world. There's good reason why the dollar is still the world's gold standard when it comes to credit ratings and that the U.S. is seen as a wise investment around the world.

A first-rate credit rating, which the United States currently has, means there is nothing for lenders to worry about. It lets investors know how likely a borrower can pay back a loan, and that they will receive a good return on their investment. That's why I can't emphasize enough the importance of our Nation's credit rating. A downgraded credit rating would erode confidence in our economy and reduce certainty for businesses, investors at home, and abroad. We must work to ensure that this never happens by reforming spending and fixing our debt problem. Make it so that there is not one doubt when it comes to the creditworthiness of the United States.

In April, Standard & Poor's lowered the outlook on the United States' credit to negative. S&P's rationale: the U.S. has a large debt and deficit compared with other highly rated nations, and unlike with those other nations, "the path to addressing the debt and the deficit is not clear to us."

To be clear, this warning from the S&P was not over the debt limit debate, but because Washington has no plan to tackle its massive debt. Since 1975, there have been at least nine examples when clean debt limit bills have failed to pass in either the House or the Senate. And remember, in 2006 then-

U.S. Senator Obama voted against a clean increase of \$781 billion. In each case, days, weeks, or months later a debt limit was ultimately enacted.

So again, it's not about the debate. We've seen this discussion many times over the last several decades. But it is about world markets losing confidence in our ability to implement those needed reforms and address our growing \$14 trillion debt.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen the largest budget deficits in the history of the United States. This, along with our structural deficits due to insolvent entitlement programs and the rising cost of health care, is the reason we face serious issues regarding the confidence in our ability to make good on our commitments. In April, the United States kept its AAA rating. Unfortunately, as S&P warned, if we fail to act on these reforms, this could happen.

Raising the debt ceiling without significant structural spending reforms would send a signal to the world that America lacks the political will to restore fiscal sanity and meet our obligations. Unfortunately, many of our Democratic colleagues have continued to ask for a clean up-or-down vote on raising the debt limit, including most recently when more than 100 Democrats sent a letter to House leadership requesting an up-or-down vote on the issue. Earlier this week, that request was granted, and the legislation's failure demonstrates that any plan to raise the debt limit without dramatic steps to reduce spending and reform the budget process is unacceptable to the American people.

With any hope, we sent a clear message that it's time to stop with the political pandering and get serious about bringing about real budgetary reforms. It's unfortunate, however, Mr. Speaker. The problem has been identified. While tough decisions must be made, the solution is in our reach. What we lack is the political will to lead and take action.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't act boldly now, the markets will act for us very soon. The world is watching, and we can no longer afford to kick this can down the road. Our Nation's debt crisis offers us the political will to act, for the greatest threat to our economy and our children's future is doing nothing.

MOMS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT INTRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, for 5 months this Congress has debated how best to address the looming crisis of our national deficit. While the debate has often been partisan and polarized, one thing we Democrats and Republicans agree on is that addressing our national health care expenditures is a critical part of the solution.

A major component of the escalating health care costs in this country is maternity care. The cost of maternity care for mother and child in the U.S. is more than double that of any country in the world. But despite the exorbitant amount of money we spend on maternity care, the U.S. ranks far behind nearly all developed countries in maternal and infant outcomes.

Sadly, childbirth continues to have significant risks for mothers and babies, especially in communities of color. Many factors contribute to these poor outcomes and high costs. The most disturbing by far is the fact that there is a vast body of knowledge regarding best evidence-based maternity care, yet current U.S. practice does not follow that research. This results in the widespread overuse of maternity procedures, including cesarean sections and scheduled inductions, which credible evidence tells us are beneficial only in limited situations.

Unfortunately, the overuse of these practices results in longer maternity hospital stays and multiple costly procedures that contribute to making combined mother and infant childbirth charges our most costly hospital and Medicaid expenditures.

To address these poor outcomes and high costs, today I am introducing the Maximizing Optimal Maternity Services for the 21st Century Act. The MOMS for the 21st Century Act will create a national focus on optimal maternity care by establishing an inter-agency coordinating committee to ensure Federal agencies are promoting the best evidence-based maternity practices in their programs.

□ 1040

The bill also authorizes an extensive media campaign to educate consumers on how to achieve the healthiest maternity outcomes, including the importance of maternity practices such as smoking cessation programs in pregnancy and group model prenatal care.

These and other noninvasive practices have been shown to produce considerable improvement in outcomes with no detrimental side effects but, regrettably, they are significantly underused in this country.

Furthermore, the bill will expand research on best maternity practices and will direct collection of data on maternity shortage areas. It will also facilitate the development of more interdisciplinary maternity care workforce by bringing together maternity care providers to develop core curricula across maternity professional disciplines, and it establishes a loan repayment program for maternity care providers who commit to work in underserved areas.

Finally, the MOMS for the 21st Century Act will support the education of a more culturally and linguistically diverse workforce by authorizing grant programs for maternity professional organizations to recruit and retain minority providers.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better for mothers and newborns. As a country, we must reach beyond our self-imposed boundaries to embrace and prioritize an evidence-based model of maternity care that will save lives and save money.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring and helping to pass the MOMS for the 21st Century Act.

HONORING PRIVATE JEREMY FAULKNER

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning with sadness but with great pride to honor one of Georgia's proud sons who gave his life, the ultimate sacrifice, on March 29 in Kunar province, Afghanistan, in support of operation Enduring Freedom.

Private Jeremy Faulkner was a man known for having a huge heart and always sticking up for the underdog. Jeremy grew up in Stockbridge, Georgia, and joined the Army after attending Griffin High School. This is a time in life when many young men struggle with their future, but Private Faulkner answered the call and chose a life of service in the United States Army to make a difference in the world and to keep our Nation safe.

He gave up his red Dodge Ram for a new kind of vehicle with the U.S. Army 101st Airborne and learned a whole new meaning of the word "mudding" at basic training. Private Faulkner had already earned a combat ribbon, was an expert marksman, and had discussed with his mother, Judy, the possibility of making a career out of military service.

Private Faulkner was in his 11th month of deployment and days away from promotion to Private First Class when his unit was ambushed. Just a few short weeks before his anticipated return home, he had expressed a desire to join the Wings in the Wind Christian ministry upon his return as a way to share his testament from the seat of a motorcycle.

In perhaps a prophetic phone call to his stepfather, Private Faulkner mentioned to his stepfather, Tony Berry, his request that if anything should happen to him that the Wings in the Wind and Patriot Guard Riders would be present at his procession. No one expected just how soon that procession would be needed.

Through three counties, crowds of strangers lined the streets escorting Private Faulkner home as a testament to the community's support of Jeremy and his family. As Jeremy requested, the Wings in the Wind and Patriot Guard Riders roared to accompany dozens of police and fire department vehicles in an inspiring procession fit for such a young hero.

As former Rhodes scholar Elmer Davis put it so simply, “The Nation will remain the land of the free only so long as it is the home of the brave.”

Our Nation owes Private Jeremy Faulkner a debt of gratitude for his bravery, and I am proud to stand here and thank him for sacrificing his life for strangers like me and my family as well as the rest of the United States of America.

So to Jeremy’s family and especially to Jeremy, thank you.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand shoulder to shoulder with the legitimate aims of Syrian people in their quest for freedom and democracy.

Ever since the Syrian people rose up to demand their rights and dignity from the Assad regime, they have faced brutal repression. Their nonviolent protest movement has been met with repressive force, and this has been a disgrace on the world scene.

The human rights abuses of the Assad regime are unthinkable, and they are historic and generational. It is torturing its own people at this time, including even children.

I was shocked and outraged by the story of Hamza al-Khatib. He was a 13-year-old boy who was killed and tortured and his body was returned to his family on May 25 with clear signs of torture and brutality. He had a broken hand; his genitals were cut off and severed. This young man, only 13 years old, will never see his family again because he has gone on.

But what happened to him the Syrian people can’t forget, and his example has inspired people to stand up for democracy. Over the past 3 months, a familiar pattern has emerged. People organize public demonstrations to demand their God-given rights. Inevitably, the government forces overreact and kill peaceful protesters. Funerals for the deceased garner even larger demonstrations, which are then repressed ever more brutally by the government.

The emergency situation in Syria today reached a new level when tanks rolled into Daraa. Since that time, hundreds of peaceful demonstrators have been killed. Just this morning, this very morning, Syrian forces killed 15 people when they shelled the town of Rastan. Fifty-eight people have been killed there in the past 3 days alone. Over a thousand have been killed since democracy protests began.

Mr. Speaker, it’s truly unfortunate that the Assad regime missed the historic opportunity that it had right before it to set a new pattern in the Arab Spring, a pattern that above all respects human rights. Instead, it chose to become an enemy of its own people.

By murdering its own people and violating their fundamental right to secu-

rity and liberty, the Assad regime has lost any and all legitimacy to govern. Legitimacy is gained through the consent of the governed, not brutal repressive crackdowns, jailings, and torturing.

While we don’t know yet how events will ultimately unfold in Syria, I want to commend the activism of Syrian Americans. Syrian Americans are doing everything they can to support their friends and their families. For example, just last week the Syrian American Council organized a day of action to support freedom and democracy in Syria. Some 400-plus Syrian Americans came all across the country to come to Washington, D.C., to lobby their Representatives in Congress, to demonstrate at the Syrian Embassy, and to organize committees to plan future initiatives.

That’s how democracy works, Mr. Speaker; people coming together with their common concerns to peaceably petition their government. That’s what makes America great, and that’s what sets us apart from places like Syria under the Assad regime. Syria could be a great bastion of liberty, but not with this illegitimate regime.

I stand with the patriotic Americans in steadfast opposition to the grotesque human rights abuses of the Assad regime and once and for all call upon it to respect the rights, dignity, and democratic aspirations of its people. The world will not forget Hamza al-Khatib, Mr. Speaker. We won’t forget the legitimate yearnings for liberty and justice from the people of Syria or anywhere in the world.

□ 1050

AMERICANS HAVE SPENDING FATIGUE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Quarterly today has a headline that says, “Some House Republicans Showing Signs of War Fatigue.” Unfortunately, this headline comes just the day after the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee has approved another \$119 billion for our overseas wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. That’s \$10 billion a month and \$2.3 billion each week.

By the most conservative estimates, we have now spent over \$2 trillion in direct and indirect costs in Iraq and Afghanistan. Most of this money has gone into nation building rather than stopping or defending against any real threat. We have turned the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid, and the American people are tired of it. They want us to stop rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan and start taking care of our own people. We are spending billions and billions that we do not have—that we are having to borrow—on people who do not appreciate it unless they are on our payroll.

Alfred Regnery, publisher of the conservative American Spectator magazine, wrote last October that “Afghanistan has little strategic value” and “the war is one of choice rather than necessity.” He added that it has been “a wasteful and frustrating decade.”

The American people do not want, nor can we afford, endless, permanent wars. Nor do they want 11 or 12-year wars that last about three times as long as World War II.

You can never satisfy governments’ appetite for money or land. They always want more.

Every gigantic bureaucracy always wants to expand its mission so it can get more funding. Every government agency always exaggerates the threats or problems it is confronting so it can get more money.

The Pentagon is a gigantic bureaucracy that will do everything within its tremendous power to keep getting more and more money from the taxpayers. But there have to be limits somewhere, and fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by all the hundreds of billions we have poured, and continued to pour, down these Iraqi, Afghan, Libyan rat holes.

The American people and conservative Republicans all over this country are saying enough is enough. They want us to stop rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan and paying for a useless war in Libya and start rebuilding the United States of America.

We are almost \$14 trillion in debt and headed much, much higher very, very soon. Soon, we will be printing so much money that our Social Security and other pensions will be worth very little. We have got to get our fiscal house in order. We have got to stop spending hundreds of billions all over the world and start taking care of our own people.

Georgie Anne Geyer, the conservative foreign policy columnist, wrote a few months after the Iraqi war started many years ago that “Americans will inevitably come to a point where they have to choose between a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe.”

Mr. Speaker, the American people reached that point a long time ago. Hopefully, the Congress will soon follow their lead.

AMERICA’S HOUSING CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, gas prices that rose above \$4 a gallon triggered the Wall Street meltdown and housing crisis that continue to plague our country. We’re in the same boat today again with gas prices going over \$4 a gallon, so be prepared.

I rise today to talk about that housing crisis that is devaluing our housing stock across our country and destroying neighborhoods and communities across the Nation.

Last week, the New York Times ran a piece I wish to place in the RECORD highlighting one more twist in this crisis. According to their front page expose, the big banks and mortgage companies have profited even more from the foreclosure crisis by amassing giant “real estate empires” that span across our country. So not only do six banks now control two-thirds of the banking system of this country, they’ve also become real estate magnates, too. When is too much too much?

The impact on communities has been devastating. The numbers are simply shocking. In my community alone, over 6,700 more homes are in some type of foreclosure filings. While thousands of America’s families are being thrown out on the street, the big Wall Street banks have nearly doubled the number of houses they’ve taken through foreclosure since the crisis began 5 years ago. That represents nearly 900,000 homes. That’s 900,000 more families whose American Dream ended in foreclosure.

Sadly, this doesn’t include those who are barely hanging on. Approximately one in four mortgaged homes are still underwater, where families owe more than the home is worth.

After taking billions of dollars from our taxpayers, we might expect that the Wall Street banks would want to help people stay in their homes and help more vacant properties be taken off the market. Well, that’s not what I’m hearing from local realtors. I spoke with a group of them over a week ago. They keep running up against a brick wall any time they even try to do a workout with one of these banks. They continue to have difficulty accessing credit for qualified, willing buyers. More and more, I hear how it’s only our local banks and our credit unions that are making any effort to make this troubled housing market function.

Wall Street walked away with billions in bailout money, and then walked away from the housing mess they created. But they want even more. All the while they are sitting on top of huge profits and taking enormous tax breaks. The six largest banks in the country, including Wells Fargo, Bank of America and JPMorgan Chase, together paid an approximate tax rate of only 11 percent of their pretax U.S. earnings in 2009 and 2010, less than half of what other businesses pay. I wish someone in this place could explain why this is allowed to go on.

We need to understand that this foreclosure crisis is far from over. In the first quarter of this year alone, approximately 215,000 more properties were in foreclosure across our country, and another 700,000 properties were either in foreclosure filings, received default notice, bank repossession or scheduled auction. As these banks continue to agglomerate these properties that are becoming vacant, neighborhoods across our country are being devalued and continue to disintegrate.

Every Member here knows what I’m talking about.

There are some signs that our economy is slowly improving. But, boy, we aren’t out of the woods yet. Moody’s is predicting that housing prices across our Nation will continue to fall by as much as 5 percent by this year’s end—I should say 5 percent more. We cannot sit on our hands and hope the situation gets better. Revival of the housing sector and the jobs it creates has always played a crucial and leading role in any economic recovery. We need to work to help struggling families stay in their homes, protect neighborhoods from being riddled with vacant structures and get our economy moving again by arresting the continuing decline in our vital housing assets built up over decades coast to coast.

Importantly, revitalizing and reoccupying the troubled housing stock would put millions of Americans to work. And isn’t it over time to do exactly that?

[From the New York Times, May 22, 2011]

AS LENDERS HOLD HOMES IN FORECLOSURE,
SALES ARE HURT

(By Eric Dash)

EL MIRAGE, AZ.—The nation’s biggest banks and mortgage lenders have steadily amassed real estate empires, acquiring a glut of foreclosed homes that threatens to deepen the housing slump and create a further drag on the economic recovery.

All told, they own more than 872,000 homes as a result of the groundswell in foreclosures, almost twice as many as when the financial crisis began in 2007, according to RealtyTrac, a real estate data provider. In addition, they are in the process of foreclosing on an additional one million homes and are poised to take possession of several million more in the years ahead.

Five years after the housing market started teetering, economists now worry that the rise in lender-owned homes could create another vicious circle, in which the growing inventory of distressed property further depresses home values and leads to even more distressed sales. With the spring home-selling season under way, real estate prices have been declining across the country in recent months.

“It remains a heavy weight on the banking system,” said Mark Zandi, the chief economist of Moody’s Analytics. “Housing prices are falling, and they are going to fall some more.”

Over all, economists project that it would take about three years for lenders to sell their backlog of foreclosed homes. As a result, home values nationally could fall 5 percent by the end of 2011, according to Moody’s, and rise only modestly over the following year. Regions that were hardest hit by the housing collapse and recession could take even longer to recover—dealing yet another blow to a still-struggling economy.

Although sales have picked up a bit in the last few weeks, banks and other lenders remain overwhelmed by the wave of foreclosures. In Atlanta, lenders are repossessing eight homes for each distressed home they sell, according to March data from RealtyTrac. In Minneapolis, they are bringing in at least six foreclosed homes for each they sell, and in once-hot markets like Chicago and Miami, the ratio still hovers close to two to one.

Before the housing implosion, the inflow and outflow figures were typically one-to-one.

The reasons for the backlog include inadequate staffs and delays imposed by the lenders because of investigations into foreclosure practices. The pileup could lead to \$40 billion in additional losses for banks and other lenders as they sell houses at steep discounts over the next two years, according to Trepp, a real estate research firm.

“These shops are under siege; it’s just a tsunami of stuff coming in,” said Taj Bindra, who oversaw Washington Mutual’s servicing unit from 2004 to 2006 and now advises financial institutions on risk management. “Lenders have a strong incentive to clear out inventory in a controlled and timely manner, but if you had problems on the front end of the foreclosure process, it should be no surprise you are having problems on the back end.”

A drive through the sprawling subdivisions outside Phoenix shows the ravages of the real estate collapse. Here in this working-class neighborhood of El Mirage, northwest of Phoenix, rows of small stucco homes sprouted up during the boom. Now block after block is pockmarked by properties with overgrown shrubs, weeds and foreclosure notices tacked to the doors. About 116 lender-owned homes are on the market or under contract in El Mirage, according to local real estate listings.

But that’s just a small fraction of what is to come. An additional 491 houses are either sitting in the lenders’ inventory or are in the foreclosure process. On average, homes in El Mirage sell for \$65,300, down 75 percent from the height of the boom in July 2006, according to the Cromford Report, a Phoenix-area real estate data provider. Real estate agents and market analysts say those ultra-cheap prices have recently started attracting first-time buyers as well as investors looking for several properties at once.

Lenders have also been more willing to let distressed borrowers sidestep foreclosure by selling homes for a loss. That has accelerated the pace of sales in the area and even caused prices to slowly rise in the last two months, but realty agents worry about all the distressed homes that are coming down the pike.

“My biggest fear right now is that the supply has been artificially restricted,” said Jayson Meyerovitz, a local broker. “They can’t just sit there forever. If so many houses hit the market, what is going to happen then?”

The major lenders say they are not deliberately holding back any foreclosed homes. They say that a long sales process can stigmatize a property and ratchet up maintenance and other costs. But they also do not want to unload properties in a fire sale.

“If we are out there undercutting prices, we are contributing to the downward spiral in market values,” said Eric Will, who oversees distressed home sales for Freddie Mac. “We want to make sure we are helping stabilize communities.”

The biggest reason for the backlog is that it takes longer to sell foreclosed homes, currently an average of 176 days—and that’s after the 400 days it takes for lenders to foreclose. After drawing government scrutiny over improper foreclosures practices last fall, many big lenders have slowed their operations in order to check the paperwork, and in two dozen or so states they halted them for months.

Conscious of their image, many lenders have recently started telling real estate agents to be more lenient to renters who happen to live in a foreclosed home and give them extra time to move out before changing the locks.

“Wells Fargo has sent me back knocking on doors two or three times, offering to give renters money if they cooperate with us,”

said Claude A. Worrell, a longtime real estate agent from Minneapolis who specializes in selling bank-owned property. "It's a lot different than it used to be."

Realty agents and buyers say the lenders are simply overwhelmed. Just as lenders were ill-prepared to handle the flood of foreclosures, they do not have the staff and infrastructure to manage and sell this much property.

Most of the major lenders outsourced almost every part of the process, be it sales or repairs. Some agents complain that lender-owned home listings are routinely out of date, that properties are overpriced by as much as 10 percent, and that lenders take days or longer to accept an offer.

The silver lining for home lenders, however, is that the number of new foreclosures and recent borrowers falling behind on their payments by three months or longer is shrinking.

"If they are able to manage through the next 12 to 18 months," said Mr. Zandi, the Moody's Analytics economist, "they will be in really good shape."

UNCERTAINTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Department of Labor will release the monthly jobs report for May. While I am hoping to be surprised that we get news that massive job creation got underway in May, I'm not going to get my hopes up. I'm not getting my hopes up because economic growth is being restrained. It is being restrained because there is still too much uncertainty in the economy. And greater uncertainty in the economy means less job creation in the economy.

Uncertainty exists because of the threat posed to job creators by the taxes, the mandates and the government takeover of private industry. Uncertainty exists because of the 24-month spending binge of President Obama, NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID. Job creators see the future tax increases that will be needed if we continue spending money we don't have to the tune of approximately 40 cents out of every dollar.

Uncertainty exists because of the Obama administration's decision that restricts exploration for and the production of American energy both on land and from deepwater sources.

That's why the House of Representatives has spent the first 5 months of the 112th Congress passing legislation to rid the economy of this uncertainty and create private sector jobs. The House has passed legislation to repeal the government takeover of health care. It has passed a budget resolution that puts our Nation on a fiscally sustainable path while saving and strengthening important programs like Medicare and Social Security for future generations—which if they are left alone, if they are left unreformed, they will go bankrupt. And the House has passed several pieces of legislation aimed at overturning the Obama administration's actions that block production of American energy.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, we have tried it President Obama's way, attempting to spend and regulate our way to economic prosperity. And what have the American people gotten in return? They have gotten a national debt of \$14.2 trillion, and 26 straight months of unemployment at 8 percent or higher.

The American people know you cannot purchase prosperity; you must create it. That's what the people of Texas sent me here to do, to get our economy back on track.

JOB CREATION

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss some of the major challenges that face our Nation. We face a spending crisis, a debt crisis, a jobs crisis; and in order to solve those, the best thing we can do is focus on jobs because creating jobs will empower families, it will increase our economic power, and it will improve our government budget situation.

From my many travels around my district in Ohio, from Franklin County to Madison County to Union County, it has become clear that both individuals and businesses need more certainty when it comes to health care costs, energy costs, taxes, and regulation.

I visited Stanley Electric in London, Ohio, and they would like to expand. They have temporary workers they would like to make permanent full-time workers, but government regulations out of Washington are preventing them from doing that.

I held a jobs roundtable in Hilliard with small businesses, and from those small businesses I heard that we need Congress to get out of the way of job creators. We need to bring more certainty to the banking system so that they will start lending to small businesses. Capital and credit need to be available if small businesses are going to create jobs.

They asked us to change the culture in Washington so that people here understand that government does not create jobs; small business owners and entrepreneurs create jobs. We need to allow those local employers to focus their resources on hiring and to growing their businesses. If we allow them, business can and will create jobs. We just need to give them the incentives, and innovation will be there. Business owners need the flexibility to invest back in their businesses, and they need the ability to keep more of what they have earned if they do well.

I held a jobs forum in my district at Ohio State University's Fisher College of Business to discuss with central Ohio job creators what they need to invest and create jobs. A number of good ideas came out of that forum.

Dwight Smith, who is with Sophisticated Systems in Columbus, Ohio, said

that Ohio and the Nation need to do a better job of putting together job training with unemployment. He said whole categories of jobs are being eliminated in this economy, and we need to make sure that the people that are out there are looking for jobs that are here today and are going to be here tomorrow. I think that is a great idea. We need to focus on training and preparing our workforce for jobs that are here today and here tomorrow. We need to tie our workforce development dollars together with our unemployment programs so they work together well.

Kathy Ivan, the owner of Fabric Farms, a small business owner in my district, was very concerned about the onerous small business regulation of the 1099 provisions that were in the health care bill. I am glad to say that particular portion of the health care bill has been repealed, but we have to take further steps to make sure that business owners have certainty with regard to health care costs and energy costs so that they will be willing to hire new employees.

John Ness of ODW Logistics shared that government "has stepped on the hands and needs to stay out of the way" of small business owners. We need to remove the obstacles for these business owners, and the United States Government needs to make tax rates competitive with the rest of the world. John Ness is in a global business, and America's tax rates are making him less competitive.

Dr. Michael Camp, who is with the OSU Center for Entrepreneurship, spoke about the importance of accelerator projects, and how collaboration with Ohio's Third Frontier can yield positive results.

We have a lot of work to do; but if we can stay focused on getting government out of the way and giving businesses more certainty, you'll see businesses creating a lot of jobs. Those are just a few of the great ideas that were shared at my jobs forum, and I will continue to work on those ideas and other ideas and reach out so that we can grow our economy because the best way to solve our problems is through creating jobs.

CONGRATULATIONS TO OAK POINT INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the students at Oak Point Intermediate School in Eden Prairie, Minnesota, for collecting an impressive \$42,474.24 for the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society's Pennies for Patients program this year. That's more than any other school in the country.

Every year, Mr. Speaker, elementary and secondary school students bring their spare change to the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society's Pennies for Patients program, and they donate

them as a part of that program to find a cure for leukemia, lymphoma, and other blood cancers. Leukemia causes more deaths than any other cancer in children and young adults under the age of 20. Thanks to this program, schools across the country have been collecting important resources to fund valuable research and provide patient care.

Programs like Pennies for Patients teach young students how they can impact the lives of their peers and the communities they live in.

I am incredibly proud of the students at Oak Point for all of their hard work and their service, and I congratulate them. I hope they have a great time at their much-deserved pizza party next week.

TACKLING THE DEBT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the greatest Nation ever in the history of mankind—a Nation that many countries look to as a leader, a leader in strength, in security, in success. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot lead from behind. We are behind on repaying our debts in a major way, all the while creating even more debt.

Rather than focusing on raising the debt ceiling, Mr. Speaker, we should be putting all of our energy into reducing the debt. These overdue bills are bad for job creation and bad for our economy. As Admiral Mullen recently said: Our debt is the most dangerous threat to our national security. I could not agree more.

If Congress continues to spend money as it has in the past, we will only become more reliant upon foreign countries to buy up our debt, making our economy secondary to theirs. It is dangerous. It is irresponsible. It is unforgivable.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has taken our already weakened economy and turned it completely upside down, while allowing for the largest budget deficit in the history of the United States. The great cost of the stimulus bill, multiple government bailouts, and ObamaCare have pushed our country over the edge. I beg of my colleagues to not let this great Nation hit rock bottom before we make tackling the debt our first and foremost priority. Jobs, our economy, and our future depend upon it.

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 11 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend Dr. John Sloop, First Presbyterian Church, Harrisonburg, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come in prayer knowing that You love us and are very much concerned about what goes on in this Chamber today as these Members seek to be good stewards of the trust placed in them by "we the people."

We confess our human frailty and pray to be delivered from taking up today's agenda out of pure self-interest or peer pressure, but rather lead us, Lord, "to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God."

Father, grant each Member wisdom in their thinking on the issues, courage in their convictions, and above all, grace in their attitudes toward one another.

And when this day is done, may each one hear the Master say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Now, Father, with deep respect for the faith traditions of all Members, I offer this prayer in the name of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

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 gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

HONORING REVEREND DR. JOHN SLOOP

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce and welcome the Reverend Dr. John Sloop, Senior Pastor of First Presbyterian Church in Harrisonburg, Virginia, a church that has grown to over 1,100 members and over 500 attendees for Sunday services. Dr. Sloop has served the First Presbyterian Church and the Harrisonburg

community since he received his calling in 1986.

Dr. Sloop is passionate about seeing the Presbyterian Church renewed and growing again, and he has been actively involved in Presbyterian for Renewal, the Presbyterian Coalition, the Confessing Church movement, and has served on the board of the Presbyterian Outreach Foundation.

Dr. Sloop and his wife of 41 years, Gwen, are the proud parents of three children and two sons-in-law and have been blessed by five grandchildren. We welcome Dr. Sloop's family and other guests who join us today.

And I am honored to call Dr. Sloop a constituent and a friend, and I offer the thanks of this entire body today for his delivering the opening prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

OFFICER KEVIN WILL PAGE II

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while Washington lives on in ignorant bliss regarding immigration, the American border remains wide open for the good, the bad, and the ugly. Often, outlaws that enter our country illegally are criminals with no respect for the law of any nation.

This past Sunday, hours before the crack of dawn, twice-deported illegal Johoan Rodriguez drove through a police barricade and ran over and killed Houston Police Officer Kevin Will while he was working an accident scene.

Rodriguez's immigration status was far from the only crime he committed that day. Rodriguez, a purported member of the MS-13 gang, was driving three times the legal limit drunk and was charged with driving while intoxicated, possession of cocaine, evading arrest, and manslaughter. The crime was so violent that Officer Will's body was dragged down the road before the killer stopped and was apprehended.

Deportation is no deterrent to criminals like Rodriguez, because as long as our border remains wide open in both directions, criminals will simply return to the United States and kill Americans. Meanwhile, Officer Will will be buried today.

And that's just the way it is.

LEAVE MEDICARE ALONE

(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, when it comes to their idea of eliminating

Medicare as we know it, the Republicans are holding a bad hand. But instead of folding like a smart card player would, they have decided to go all in.

Yesterday, the Republican majority voted to deem their radical Medicare plan as passed into law, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of Americans oppose them. At a time when Big Oil is making record profits and gouging consumers at the pump, the Republican majority has voted to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in America: our children, our seniors, our students, and our disabled.

At a time when millions of Americans are struggling to just get by, the Republican majority has voted to provide massive tax cuts for the very rich. It's not fair and it's not right.

The American people are paying attention, Mr. Speaker. They are making their voices heard, including at the ballot box. I urge my Republican colleagues to listen and to abandon their reckless policies. Leave Medicare alone.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS CLIFF BEATTIE

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, just days after Memorial Day, to pay tribute to a brave man from Medical Lake Washington, who lost his life defending our country. Thirty-seven-year old Sergeant First Class Cliff Beattie was killed in Baghdad on May 22 when he was attacked by an improvised explosive device.

He died supporting Operation New Dawn in Iraq. He died protecting our country. He died fighting for a better, freer, safer America.

While we mourn the loss of this American patriot, I rise today to remind everyone that his memory will never be forgotten. We shall remember his legacy, his love and patriotism today and every day.

Sergeant First Class Beattie leaves behind his parents; his wife, Karen, who is also in the Army; his 17-year old daughter and 13-year-old son, who loved their father deeply. But he also leaves behind something that is more intangible: a legacy of honor for the bravery he displayed and the life he gave in the name of America.

May God bless Sergeant Beattie's family and all of our brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

□ 1210

COMMENDING CHICAGO HOUSE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the work of Chicago House, an organization in my district that provides housing support services and job training to people affected by HIV/AIDS.

I commend Chicago House not just for saving the lives of thousands of Chicagoans and pulling them out of poverty, but also for saving money. Chicago House is a perfect example of the type of program we should be investing in.

Yes, we have to make a small investment up front, but programs like Chicago House take these funds and use them to train the jobless and provide employment rather than simply giving them a handout. Training individuals and securing employment for them is a double win, because not only do they no longer need subsidies, but they are also contributing to the tax base.

We have to make a distinction between spending and investing. Yes, we have to cut spending but we must be careful to maintain our investments and programs like Chicago House that save lives and dollars.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF GOVERNOR BILL CLEMENTS

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join fellow Texans and Americans all across this great country in mourning the loss of a true conservative icon, former Texas Governor Bill Clements. As those of us who were touched by the Governor join together today in his honor to celebrate his life, may we all reflect on his many achievements and generosity as a dedicated entrepreneur, philanthropist, and public servant for the great State of Texas.

Governor Clements was the first Republican to serve as Texas governor since Reconstruction when he took office in 1979. His skillful leadership attracted Texans to the modern Republican party and modern day conservatism, paving the way for large Republican gains across my State in the following years. Governor Clements also laid the groundwork for Texas' economic viability by recruiting business and international trade to diversify our State's economy.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Governor Bill Clements; however, his life is being celebrated today. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Rita, and all of his family and friends as they celebrate his life's accomplishments and mourn this great loss, not only to America but to the great State of Texas.

God bless Texas.

GOP NO JOBS AGENDA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has ignored the need for a strong jobs agenda and, worse, they have pushed budget plans that would only further depress the economy and harm the unemployed.

My constituents need a real job agenda in Washington now. Yet my Republican colleagues continue to promote efforts to do the opposite. On May 11, the Committee on Ways and Means approved a Republican bill that would end employment as we know it, deceptively calling it the JOBS Act. This act would eliminate the guarantee of Federal payment for temporary extended unemployment benefits on July 6.

This plan would take \$32 billion now in the Federal unemployment trust funds intended for extended unemployment benefits and ship the money to the States in block grants. It would also set unreasonable qualifying requirements to receive benefits and allow for the permanent diversion of regular unemployment funds with waivers.

More than 4 million Americans could lose extended benefits under this plan? This is unacceptable.

I assume that the floor vote on this was postponed because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle received a message of disapproval from the American people. But more than abandoning this misguided bill, we need a stronger effort to increase jobs and improve our economy. The American taxpayers want and deserve more now.

SUPPORT WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. SHERMAN. We will soon vote on an amendment which I offered last night. It simply says that none of the funds in this appropriations bill can be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution, which is the law of the land, Public Law 93-148. The law of the land states that the President can deploy troops but then must seek congressional authorization and must withdraw within 60 days if he doesn't get it.

Why do we need to add to this bill a provision that says the President can't spend money in violation of existing law? Because the President has asserted that resolutions of the United Nations or discussions with Members of Congress substitute for congressional authorization.

Why are we voting on this now? It has been ruled by the parliamentarian to be germane. We are voting now because Congress should take a stand before we take our 1-week break.

Even if you agree with everything that is happening in Libya, and we all long for democracy and the rule of law in Libya, this is a vote about democracy and the rule of law in the United States. This is our chance to simply

say the President, even the President, must follow law.

Please join with me, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MCGOVERN in supporting the Sherman amendment.

DON'T GUT HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING FOR NEW YORK

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

Mr. MEEKS. The Homeland Security appropriations bill, which will be on the floor in just a few minutes, is a bad bill for America and an especially bad bill for New York, but it cuts funding for New York substantially.

Almost 10 years after the attack on New York, we tracked down and killed Osama bin Laden, but the threat to the city of New York has not dissipated. New York is a prime target for terrorists because of what it symbolizes, a vibrant economic atmosphere where entrepreneurs can flourish, and a land of opportunity and freedom that serves as a gateway for the "poor and the huddled masses." Unfortunately, this bill takes a hacksaw to the city's counterterrorism and security efforts.

According to Mayor Bloomberg, this bill would jeopardize the continuity and operations of counterterrorism programs in New York City that New York City has under way. Cutting more than \$100 million in Homeland Security funding for New York is not only nonsensical, it is dangerous. As my friend PETER KING has said, this bill puts New York "at risk."

These cuts place an unconscionable burden on New York, and I will therefore vote against the bill.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF DODD-FRANK

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss yet another negative impact the Dodd-Frank Act is having on the U.S. economy and job growth.

As agencies here in the United States are scrambling to meet the unrealistic deadlines proposed by this act, and as community banks struggle under a mountain of new regulations that strangle our economic recovery, we have also done great damage to the competitiveness of the United States in the international financial marketplace.

Other nations have yet to even consider the stringent regulations similar to the ones proposed in Dodd-Frank. Most important are the new proposed regulations that will require over-the-counter derivatives to be traded and cleared on exchanges.

G-20 nations have stated a goal for the end of 2012 as the implementation date of any global derivative reforms. Our earlier upcoming deadline of July 16, 2011, for U.S. implementation of the

derivatives reforms, puts the U.S. financial market at a significant global disadvantage and will further disrupt our economic recovery and job growth. Let's repeal these damaging economic provisions and let's get America back to work again.

FEMA SAFER GRANTS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am deeply concerned about my community's ability to address its emergency response needs.

FEMA SAFER grants are designed to assist cities with maintaining first responders on the street. The challenge is that FEMA has a stipulation that cannot have employees in layoff status.

The cities that are most in need of these funds are financially challenged. It is difficult for them to avoid laying off employees when they have no funds in the budget to retain them, as required by the FEMA grants.

This is a situation that people in my community are being confronted with. The city of Cleveland applied for and received two grants from FEMA.

Due to State-level budget cuts, Cleveland needs these FEMA grants now more than ever. FEMA should be granted the authority to waive the no-layoff clause. This way the funding system would be better able to live up to the intent of the grant, and our streets and communities would be safer.

SUPPORT MEDICARE

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Medicare. It's a decades-old promise that my grandmother made to my mother and that I make to my son. For the last 5 months Republicans have played political theater with our Nation's most pressing issues, putting tax breaks for millionaires and oil companies ahead of the health care of our seniors.

Just yesterday, in procedural silliness, it was yet another act by the Republican majority's quest to end Medicare and jeopardize the health of our seniors. Yet again Republicans told our seniors loudly and clearly that they are willing by any means necessary to end Medicare, and that's just wrong.

They have also tried to trick our seniors into believing that their budget plan wouldn't affect them today, but that's wrong too. The fact is the end of Medicare would mean that our seniors and individuals with disabilities would pay \$12,500 in health care costs. The plan would force seniors to pay nearly \$6,800 out of their own pockets in the first year alone.

So I am going to urge all of us and our colleagues on the other side to stop

the political theater, to stand with the American people, to stop their quest to end Medicare and support our seniors.

How about creating jobs instead of ending Medicare?

□ 1220

AMERICA'S FISCAL CHALLENGES

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and this country face two great fiscal challenges. One is long term, and one is urgent and immediate. Long term, we know we have to restore balance to our budget, and negotiations are under way in an effort to accomplish that.

There are significant differences in approach. Do you follow the outlines of the Ryan budget, which basically cut taxes for very wealthy Americans in the hope that will create jobs and pay for that by slashing or ending Medicare? Or do you proceed along the outline in the Obama budget which essentially would put everything on the table, including the Pentagon and including revenues?

But either way, the urgent and immediate responsibility is that we pay our bills. And either side that engages in a game of chicken with the obligation of this country to maintain its full faith and credit is playing with fiscal fire and using a loaded gun for a game of Russian roulette. That gun is pointed at the heart of the American economy.

America pays its bills. We must do that and do whatever is required in order to maintain our reputation for doing so.

THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to ask the President to appoint a Presidential appointee to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is law. It is to protect the American people. That nominee so far has been Professor Elizabeth Warren who has acted as an adviser. The CFPB has earned praise from the banking community for working to simplify and improve mortgage foreclosure forms. This consumer protection board will protect the American people from predatory lending, from foreclosures, and from excessive rates on your credit card.

But, yet, Republicans in the Senate, in the other body, want to make ridiculous accusations to hold the hostage position and take this individual into a hostage position and to suggest that

she could not counsel with a State attorney general to help that State attorney general fight against mortgage foreclosures.

When have you forbidden a Federal representative, a Federal representative of the United States Government, from talking to the States to be helpful? What is the purpose of the Federal Government other than to be helpful?

It is time to stop the charade and stand with the American people. Get someone working on that consumer board to protect the American people from reckless and unfair mortgage practices.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOODING

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to empathize and to stand with those in my home State of South Dakota who are experiencing flooding along the Missouri River. Up and down the Missouri River, people continue to hope for the best and to prepare for the worst as floodwaters continue to rise, and are going to rise, to record levels over the coming days and weeks.

I was in our State capital of Pierre and in the Fort Pierre area this past weekend with residents helping sandbag with my family and surveying the looming damage. While the forecasts for flooding grow grim, neighbors continue to help neighbors, and an unshakeable sense of community remains strong. I also commend the hard work of the South Dakota National Guard for swiftly responding to the call of those that are in need.

Many of those affected have worked tirelessly over the past week on short notice to protect their homes. Even so, thousands could be displaced for months until the water recedes, not knowing if they'll even have a home they can go back to.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that our thoughts and that our prayers would be with all of those who have been affected by these floodings and natural disasters in South Dakota and across our great country.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2017.

□ 1225

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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 2, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 92, line 7.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BALDWIN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, develop, or procure any vessel of the Coast Guard Offshore Patrol Cutter class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines of the vessel are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of this section if only one domestically operated entity exists to design, develop, or procure the main propulsion diesel engines.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would prohibit funds from being used to design, develop or procure Coast Guard Offshore Patrol Cutters unless the main diesel engines are manufactured in the United States and made by American workers. To address any concerns that this could be a single-source contract, this provision may be waived to ensure competition and best value to the American taxpayer.

The Coast Guard plans to build and procure 25 or more Offshore Patrol Cutters in the coming years. And I fully support this acquisition program. However, I believe that the Coast Guard should be required to purchase engines manufactured in the United States made by American workers.

For some reason, though, the Coast Guard has a history of buying ship engines from foreign manufacturers. We also know that the Coast Guard has a history of designing ship platforms which give preference to overseas manufacturers, resulting in major contracts going to foreign manufacturers.

This practice is driving American manufacturers out of business.

Although Congress required that vessels for the Coast Guard be manufactured in the United States starting back in 1993, in recent years, the Coast Guard has continued to procure vessel engines from foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, this is just plain wrong. The Offshore Patrol Cutter is a 25-ship class, one of the Coast Guard's largest cutter classes. Making these ships here in America would generate a

lot of U.S. manufacturing jobs for many years to come. But absent some direction from this Congress, I believe that the Coast Guard will continue to send American manufacturing jobs overseas. With unemployment at 9 percent, Mr. Chairman, we can no longer tolerate this situation. Let's bring these jobs back home. Let U.S. manufacturers compete for taxpayer dollars.

I want to offer at least one specific example of the Coast Guard's current shortsighted procurement policy—the contract that they gave to MTU, a German manufacturer, for the May propulsion diesel engine of the first National Security Cutter.

This vessel, the US CGC *Bertholf*, suffered a catastrophic failure, including an explosion and destruction of the piston and connecting rod that had to be replaced. Now, in its solicitation for this replacement, the Coast Guard noted that "a number of the critical parts are only currently available from the MTU factory in Germany, where these engines are manufactured. These critical parts must be specifically manufactured and have a lead time of 6 to 8 weeks from receipt of order. In addition, these parts must pass through U.S. Customs, which may entail additional delays."

□ 1230

The Coast Guard purchased these repairs on a sole-source basis from Germany at an estimated cost to the taxpayer of \$265,000. U.S. manufacturers never had a chance to compete for these engines and any repair work necessary down the road.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is just plain wrong.

Getting Americans back to work is my number one priority, and I believe my colleagues would agree with me on this. I know full well these are challenging economic times in my home State of Wisconsin and across the Nation.

Recently, I visited a manufacturing plant located in my district. Workers there are confused. They don't understand why any branch of the Federal Government, much less a branch of homeland defense, would choose to give a major contract to a foreign competitor. The workers I spoke with share the worries of working families across the country: Will they be able to support their families? Will their children have the same opportunities they had, or will they see their jobs shipped overseas?

At the end of the day, this is about doing what is right by our fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, isn't keeping capable, hardworking Americans working the essence of homeland security?

In matters of national security in particular, I believe we should ensure that American workers build what we need to keep America safe.

My amendment is a small, but very needed change to the current Coast Guard procurement process. It will

strengthen the U.S. diesel manufacturing base and create many well-paying American jobs.

Mr. Chairman and my fellow colleagues, we have a choice. We can continue funneling good-paying jobs overseas, or we can allow my amendment to move forward, putting the best interests of America's working families and our national security first.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

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

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law modifies existing powers and duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. 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 under this Act may be used by the Transportation Security Administration to purchase clothing that is not 100 percent domestic in origin.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, we have all witnessed an absolute employment disaster in this country. Last month, we found that the manufacturing sector slowed again. In fact, the number of Americans involved in producing goods is near its lowest point since World War II.

Meanwhile, we have some things that we can do to change that, and I have a great example to share with you today. This is a TSA uniform. This uniform is manufactured in Mexico. Imagine that, manufactured in Mexico. A company in the United States, VF Imagewear, got a contract last February 2010 for \$98 million. It promptly outsourced the sewing of this uniform to Mexico.

So how many jobs were lost in this particular undertaking? It is estimated

that 465 jobs for Americans was lost because this contract was outsourced to Mexico.

This amendment is really quite simple. It basically will demand that the Transportation Security Administration purchase clothing manufactured here in the United States. It is, therefore, our economic security. It is also important for our national security.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a nonpartisan issue. It's pretty darn simple, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if a change in existing law requires a new determination.

I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone wish to speak on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. 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 new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a non-competitively bid contract to an Alaska Native Corporation, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian Organization in an amount in excess of the competitive bidding threshold.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, in 1949 over disputes on land grants, the Congress decided to create what are called Alaska Native Corporations. There are some 200 of them that exist today. When they started out, they received moneys that were small in nature, but nonetheless helpful.

Over the course of decades, what has happened here is an abuse by our Federal employees by using this particular technique, contracting with the Alaska Native Corporation, in order not to competitively bid contracts. They are

sole-source contracts. So as a result, by not competitively bidding these contracts, the taxpayers are the big losers. Let me give you just one example.

There was a contract let to the Alaska Native subsidiary that shared the lead on a \$1.1 billion contract to manage missile and weapons research in Huntsville, Alabama. Two other inexperienced subsidiaries received contracts without competition worth nearly a billion dollars to provide guards to Army bases. Now, this is pretty simple, colleagues. A billion dollar contract, you run it through the ANC. The result is you don't have to competitively bid it. And what happened here is the work was passed on to Wackenhut, and they overpaid by 25 percent on the contract compared with deals for the same work awarded through competitive bids, auditors later found.

So here is a billion dollar contract; you run it through the ANC; you spend 25 percent more of taxpayer dollars. This is real money. We are talking \$250 million overspent because the ANC was used.

Now, you may say, but at least it is going to Alaska Natives. Well, my friends, it is not going to Alaska Natives. What happens, for the most part, is the Alaska Native shareholders receive about \$305 per year as a result.

Now, let's look at just one contract for the Sitnasuak. There was a contract for \$220 million. There was \$14 million worth of profits. Each of the shareholders received \$305. But guess what? The people that received most of the money were the nonnatives that were hired. In fact, the consulting firm based in the Bethesda home of James Nunes, a nonnative hired to help run the corporation, he received the tidy sum of \$6.4 million last year; his CFO, \$1 million; his executive vice president, \$470,000; and his COO, \$430,000. So that's where the money went.

□ 1240

My amendment would level the playing field and essentially treat all section 8(a) businesses the same. My amendment would prohibit the use of funds in this act to be used to award noncompetitively bid contracts to ANCs, Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in an amount in excess of the competitive bidding threshold that other section 8 participants are subject to. That is for a \$6.5 million manufacturing contract. If it's under 6.5, you don't have to competitively bid. If it's over 6.5, you would have to.

Again, Members, this is an affront to the American taxpayers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I make a point of order against the amendment because

it proposes to change existing law, and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. It therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law requires a new determination.

I request a ruling from the Chair.

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

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very challenging process that we are going through. It is challenging because we are addressing homeland security in the backdrop of the crisis in Libya, of the Arab Spring, of the demise and end of Osama bin Laden by the brilliance of the Navy SEALs, of the intelligence community, of President Obama, and of course in the backdrop of domestic disasters: from Texas fires to tornadoes from New England to Alabama to Missouri.

But there is something that we can do.

We can recognize that there was no appointment made for 9/11. No notice was given to us on 9/11. There were indicators of individuals learning to fly or to take off but not landing. So post-9/11 we came up with the enhanced concept of ensuring that we had Federal Air Marshals. I'm glad for that. Yet I think it is important now, in the neighborhood that we're living in, in the climate that we're living in and in the interests of terrorists—lone wolves, franchise terrorists—to attack our mobility or transit systems, which include aviation, for us to focus on ensuring that there is no undermining of the utilization strategically of air marshals to protect the American public. I can just cite, Mr. Chairman, the incidences that have occurred in the backdrop of Libya: individuals domestically charging the pilot door, passengers having to bring down disturbed individuals. The air skyways, if you

will, are both exciting and potentially troubling and dangerous.

My amendment ensures that the Federal Air Marshals are effectively using their funds to deploy personnel on inbound flights that are considered high risk by the Department of Homeland Security and that there is no limitation on that ability. They are one of our first lines of defense in defending the cockpit and aircraft cabin against terrorist attacks. As the ranking member on a Transportation subcommittee, I have worked over the years and have sponsored legislation to see that we have enough air marshals and that they will receive all the requisite training to effectively secure aircraft.

Make no mistake, the threat to our aviation system from aircraft inbound to the United States from foreign airports is serious and dangerous just as it is on our rail system. On Christmas Day 2009, we saw the underwear bomber try to ignite PETN and destroy a plane over Detroit. We need air marshals. As I indicated, the demise of Osama bin Laden has caused many to rise up and to begin to think: What is their next effort in attack, if you will, on the issue of aviation security?

While my amendment deals with the threat on inbound aircraft to the U.S., its ultimate impact will be to ensure that air marshals are assigned to the highest risks. I also intend to move forward on my FAMS legislation, which will provide training and increased productivity but also personnel. Yet this clearly goes to the heart of the problem: Protect the American public. Protect them as they travel domestically. Protect them as they travel internationally.

If you ever for a moment doubt the potential of havoc, then you just need to look to that Christmas Day—to that unexpected act of the so-called “underwear bomber,” or, if you will, of the shoe bomber, of some years past. Then, if you want to bring it closer to home, you go back 3 or 4 weeks ago and see the series of incidences that required passengers and flight attendants to be engaged.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It is in the form of a limitation that no funds should be used to limit the enhanced utilization, which will require creative thinking and the ability to use resources effectively. The bill actually says that we should have two FAMS inbound: two undesignated, unnoted individuals who can provide a cover and a buffer from what has to be a very bad climate.

Let me thank the Federal Air Marshals as well for their service. Let me thank those under Homeland Security for their service, including my friends at the Transportation Security Administration. They are in a tough, tough neighborhood.

I close by simply saying there will be an amendment on the floor dealing with collective bargaining for TSOs. In my capacity on that committee, let me say that collective bargaining has no

impact on the great work of the TSOs. So I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise before you and my colleagues to take the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1017, “Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.” Mr. Chair, I am offering a limitation amendment that prohibits any funds in the Homeland Appropriations Act from being used to interfere with the deployment of federal air marshals.

My amendment would ensure that the federal air marshals are effectively using their funds to deploy personnel on inbound flights that are considered high-risk by the Department of Homeland Security's risk models.

Mr. Chair, I believe that federal air marshals are the last line of defense in defending the cockpit and aircraft cabin against terrorist attack.

As a Member of the Transportation Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have worked over the years and sponsored legislation to ensure that we have enough air marshals and that they receive all the requisite training to effectively secure aircraft.

On January 5, 2011, I introduced House Resolution 71, the Federal Air Marshals Augmentation Act of 2011. A measure that directs the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (DHS) for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to increase the number of federal air marshals by at least an additional 1,750 above the number of such marshals as of January 31, 2010, to ensure increased transportation security for inbound international flights.

This bill doubles the number of inbound international flights with air marshals onboard, without reducing domestic coverage. Makes criminal investigator training mandatory for all air marshals. Codifies the FAMS Office of the Ombudsman, and directs the Ombudsman to implement personnel policies as previously recommended by the DHS OIG and the GAO. This bill also requires semiannual reports to Congress on this augmentation implementation and on personnel incidents and issues.

Make no mistake—the threat to our aviation system from aircraft inbound to the United States from foreign airports is serious and dangerous.

On Christmas Day 2009, we saw the underwear bomber try to ignite P-E-T-N and destroy a plane over Detroit.

And following the demise of Osama bin Laden, there were numerous suspicious activities even on domestic aircraft where passengers were attempting to open cabin doors in flight or otherwise disrupt flights.

Are we sufficiently prepared for addressing the terrorist threat to aviation?

While my amendment deals with the threat on inbound aircraft to the U.S., its ultimate impact will be to ensure that air marshals are assigned to the highest-risk flights.

It simply directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance air marshal coverage on inbound high-risk flights in accordance with the Department's risk model.

This is an allocation of people issue, not a funding issue, and this amendment is budget neutral.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support amendment 130 to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012.

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—273

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the gentlelady's amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I want to commend our colleague from the authorizing committee, a leader of the authorizing committee, for focusing on the deployment of air marshals to maximum effect. I want to offer support for her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of striking language that would limit UASI funds to the top 10 cities at risk.

Since 2003, Missouri-05, my district, has received over \$70 million in UASI funding. Recently, I was informed by DHS that due to the fiscal year 2011 budget cuts, which I did not support, half of the cities that received UASI funding, including Kansas City, Missouri, would lose their funding. This means that Kansas City will not be receiving the funding that we have relied on for the last 7 years.

Limiting FY12 UASI funding to the top 10 cities would, again, detrimentally harm my district. UASI funding in Kansas City has been used for equipment and vehicles to support six rescue teams in four area fire departments. Vehicles and equipment have also been used to support special tactical law enforcement teams, allowing for the response to events where chemicals or special hazards are present as well as a regional multi-band emergency radio that allows for interoperability.

□ 1250

Funding has been used for a regional patient tracking system that enables hospitals and EMS agencies to manage multiple victims from an emergency event. The funding also allows for special mobile units that allow local public health agencies to transport equipment and set up medicine dispensing sites.

Yesterday, The Kansas City Star ran an op-ed I wrote decrying the devastating impact the loss of UASI funds will have not only on Kansas City but the entire State of Missouri. Kansas City has relied on these funds to prevent, protect, and respond to both manmade and natural disasters. Eliminating these funds would greatly hinder the region's ability to continue to enhance these preparedness capabilities. Just 2 weeks ago, three UASI-

funded search and rescue vehicles were sent from my community, Kansas City, Missouri, to Joplin, Missouri, to search for survivors after the devastating tornado. Sadly, to date, as of this morning, 134 Missourians have lost their lives to this devastating disaster. However, due to the hard work of Missouri first responders, 144 missing individuals were located. We put the safety and security of our constituents in the hands of first responders, and it would be unconscionable for us to take away the tools they need to continue to save lives.

As the Representative of the Missouri Fifth District, it is my job to work to protect the citizens of my district, and it is my goal to ensure that first responders in Kansas City are given the resources they need to keep our homes secure. As I have said many times, the U.S. budget is a moral document, a bold testimony to our national priorities. It is my priority to fight to provide UASI funding to the Kansas City area. This is why I stand in support of UASI funds and the amendment to restore this funding to more than the top 10 cities that has been offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

An amendment by Mrs. LUMMIS of Wyoming.

An amendment by Mr. CARTER of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. SHERMAN of California.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) 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 273, noes 150, not voting 9, as follows:

Adams	Gardner	Oliver
Akin	Gibson	Owens
Alexander	Gohmert	Pascarell
Altmire	Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)
Amash	Goodlatte	Paul
Andrews	Gosar	Paulsen
Austria	Gowdy	Perlmutter
Baca	Graves (GA)	Peters
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Baldwin	Green, Al	Petri
Barrow	Griffin (AR)	Pingree (ME)
Bass (NH)	Griffith (VA)	Platts
Benishek	Grijalva	Poe (TX)
Berkley	Guthrie	Polis
Bilbray	Hall	Pompeo
Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Posey
Bishop (GA)	Hanna	Price (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Quayle
Black	Hartzler	Quigley
Blackburn	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Heck	Reed
Bonner	Heinrich	Rehberg
Boren	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Boswell	Higgins	Renacci
Boustany	Himes	Reyes
Bralley (IA)	Hinchesy	Richmond
Broun (GA)	Hirono	Rigell
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Rivera
Buchanan	Holden	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Holt	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Hoyer	Rohrabacher
Butterfield	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney
Camp	Hurt	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Canseco	Jackson (IL)	Ross (FL)
Capito	Jackson Lee	Royce
Capps	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cassidy	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Jones	Scalise
Chabot	Kaptur	Schmidt
Chandler	Kildee	Schrader
Ciциlline	Kind	Schweikert
Clarke (MI)	King (IA)	Scott (SC)
Clay	Kissell	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kline	Scott, Austin
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott, David
Coffman (CO)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Lamborn	Sewell
Cole	Landry	Shimkus
Cooper	Langevin	Shuler
Costa	Lankford	Simpson
Costello	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Courtney	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cravaack	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Crawford	Latta	Southerland
Crenshaw	Levin	Stark
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Stearns
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Stivers
Cummings	Loeb sack	Stutzman
Davis (CA)	Lucas	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Luetkemeyer	Terry
Davis (KY)	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lungren, Daniel	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	E.	Tiberi
DeLauro	Mack	Tipton
Denham	Matheson	Tonko
DesJarlais	Matsui	Tsongas
Deutch	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Upton
Dicks	McCollum	Van Hollen
Dingell	McCotter	Walberg
Doggett	McDermott	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Wasserman
Doyle	McHenry	Schultz
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Waters
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Watt
Edwards	Rodgers	Webster
Ellison	Mica	Welch
Emerson	Michaud	West
Farenthold	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Farr	Miller (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Finler	Miller (NC)	Wittman
Fleischmann	Miller, Gary	Wu
Fleming	Moore	Yarmuth
Forbes	Mulvaney	Yoder
Fortenberry	Murphy (CT)	Young (AK)
Fudge	Murphy (PA)	Young (FL)
Gallely	Noem	Young (IN)
Garamendi	Nugent	
	Nunnelee	

NOES—150

Ackerman	Grimm	Pallone
Aderholt	Guinta	Payne
Bachus	Gutierrez	Pearce
Barletta	Harper	Pelosi
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Barton (TX)	Hayworth	Pitts
Bass (CA)	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Becerra	Herger	Rangel
Berg	Hinojosa	Ribble
Berman	Honda	Richardson
Biggert	Huelskamp	Roby
Bishop (NY)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Issa	Roskam
Brooks	Jenkins	Rothman (NJ)
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Roybal-Allard
Burgess	Jordan	Runyan
Calvert	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cantor	Kelly	T.
Capuano	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Carney	Kingston	Schiff
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Lance
Chu	Lance	Schock
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Coble	Lee (CA)	Sessions
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	Lipinski	Shuster
Conyers	Long	Sires
Crowley	Lowey	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lynch	Speier
Dold	Maloney	Sullivan
Dreier	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Marino	Thornberry
Ellmers	Markey	Tierney
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Eshoo	McClintock	Velázquez
Fattah	McKeon	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Walden
Flake	McNerney	Walsh (IL)
Flores	Meehan	Waxman
Foxx	Meeks	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Moran	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Nadler	Wolf
Gerlach	Napolitano	Womack
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Woolsey
Granger	Olson	
Green, Gene	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—9

Chaffetz	Lofgren, Zoe	Neal
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Rush
Giffords	Myrick	Schwartz

□ 1329

Mr. SIREs, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. BONO MACK, Messrs. MEEKS, PENCE, PITTS, SERRANO, Ms. LEE, Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, WAXMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. PAYNE and CARNEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. COURTNEY, LARSON of Connecticut, WESTMORELAND, TERRY, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, COFFMAN of Colorado, TIPTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. HALL, DESJARLAIS, MULVANEY, ROSS of Arkansas, WEBSTER, CHANDLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. ELLISON, UPTON, BUCHANAN, ROE of Tennessee, BENISHEK, COLE, MACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Messrs. PETERSON, BURTON of Indiana, BROUN of Georgia, HANNA, NUNNELEE, PAULSEN, WALBERG, DUNCAN of South Carolina, CRAWFORD, LABRADOR, FLEMING, CRAVAACK, GOSAR, AMASH, QUAYLE, CASSIDY, LUCAS, PAYNE, RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. SEWELL, Messrs. GOHMERT,

GUTHRIE, KLINE, FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. MCCOTTER, HARRIS, JONES, GALLEGLY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. SMITH of Texas, HURT, RIGELL, DAVIS of Kentucky, REHBERG, ROHR-ABACHER, CRENSHAW, ALEXANDER, BOREN, ALTMIRE, CAMPBELL, BOUSTANY, MCINTYRE, SHIMKUS, VAN HOLLEN, WALZ of Minnesota, JACKSON of Illinois, BONNER, POE of Texas, YOUNG of Indiana, GRAVES of Missouri, MICA, GOWDY, SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, SIMPSON, LATTA, BISHOP of Utah, LAMBORN, and HUIZENGA of Michigan changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—218

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Graves (GA)
Aderholt	Cole	Graves (MO)
Alexander	Conaway	Griffin (AR)
Amash	Connolly (VA)	Griffith (VA)
Austria	Cravaack	Grimm
Bachmann	Crawford	Guinta
Bachus	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barletta	Culberson	Hall
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Hanna
Bass (NH)	Denham	Harper
Benishek	DesJarlais	Harris
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Biggert	Dold	Hastings (WA)
Bilbray	Dreier	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Duffy	Heck
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Black	Duncan (TN)	Herger
Blackburn	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Bonner	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Bono Mack	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Flake	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Hunter
Brooks	Fleming	Hurt
Broun (GA)	Flores	Issa
Buchanan	Forbes	Jenkins
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Johnson (IL)
Buerkle	Foxx	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Burton (IN)	Galleghy	Jordan
Calvert	Gardner	Kelly
Camp	Garrett	King (IA)
Campbell	Gibbs	King (NY)
Canseco	Gibson	Kingston
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)
Capito	Gohmert	Kline
Carter	Goodlatte	Labrador
Cassidy	Gosar	Lamborn
Chabot	Gowdy	Landry
Coble	Granger	Lankford

Latham	Petri	Sessions
Latta	Pitts	Shimkus
Lewis (CA)	Poe (TX)	Shuster
Long	Pompeo	Simpson
Lucas	Posey	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Quayle	Southerland
Lungren, Daniel	Reed	Stearns
E.	Rehberg	Stivers
Mack	Reichert	Stutzman
Marchant	Renacci	Sullivan
Marino	Ribble	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Rivera	Thornberry
McClintock	Roby	Tiberti
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tipton
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Mica	Rokita	Walsh (IL)
Miller (FL)	Rooney	Webster
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	West
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Royce	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Runyan	Wilson (SC)
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Nugent	Scalise	Womack
Nunes	Schilling	Woodall
Nunnelee	Schmidt	Yoder
Olson	Schock	Young (AK)
Palazzo	Schweikert	Young (FL)
Paulsen	Scott (SC)	Young (IN)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	
Pence	Sensenbrenner	

NOES—204

Ackerman	Farr	McGovern
Altmire	Fattah	McIntyre
Andrews	Filner	McNerney
Baca	Fitzpatrick	Meehan
Baldwin	Frank (MA)	Meeks
Barrow	Fudge	Michaud
Bartlett	Garamendi	Miller (NC)
Bass (CA)	Gerlach	Miller, George
Becerra	Gonzalez	Moore
Berkley	Green, Al	Moran
Berman	Green, Gene	Murphy (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Nadler
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Napolitano
Boren	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Boswell	Heinrich	Owens
Brady (IA)	Higgins	Pallone
Braley (PA)	Himes	Pascrell
Brown (FL)	Hinchey	Pastor (AZ)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Paul
Capps	Hirono	Payne
Capuano	Hochul	Pelosi
Cardoza	Holden	Perlmutter
Carnahan	Holt	Peters
Carney	Honda	Peterson
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Castor (FL)	Inslie	Platts
Chandler	Israel	Polis
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Clarke (MI)	(TX)	Rahall
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Cleaver	Jones	Richardson
Clyburn	Kaptur	Richmond
Cohen	Keating	Roskam
Conyers	Kildee	Ross (AR)
Cooper	Kind	Rothman (NJ)
Costa	Kissell	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Lance	Ryan (OH)
Critz	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	T.
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	LaTourette	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Levin	Schiff
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
DeGette	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Scott, David
Dent	Loeb sack	Serrano
Deutch	Lowe y	Sewell
Dicks	Lujan	Sherman
Dingell	Lynch	Shuler
Doggett	Maloney	Sires
Donnelly (IN)	Markey	Slaughter
Doyle	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Emerson	McCullum	Stark
Engel	McCotter	Sutton
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS) Visclosky
Tierney Walz (MN)
Tonko Wasserman
Towns Schultz
Tsongas Waters
Van Hollen Watt
Velázquez Waxman

Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nummelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul

Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schweikert

Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (LL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—17
Andrews
Bass (CA)
Chaffetz
Cole
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Lofgren, Zoe
Manzullo
McCollum
Myrick
Neal
Pence
Rush
Schock
Schwartz
Shuler
Sullivan

NOT VOTING—10

Akin Lofgren, Zoe
Chaffetz Manzullo
Frelinghuysen Myrick
Giffords Neal

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1332

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) 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 238, noes 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—238

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bueshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy

Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette

Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bueshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1336

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. PENCE, on rollcall No. 391 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) 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 242, noes 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—242

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bueshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)

LoBiondo Peterson
Long Petri
Lucas Pitts
Luetkemeyer Platts
Lummis Poe (TX)
Lungren, Daniel Pompeo
E. Posey
Mack Price (GA)
Marchant Quayle
Marino Rahall
Matheson Reed
McCarthy (CA) Rehberg
McCaul Renacci
McClintock Ribble
McCotter Rigell
McHenry Rivera
McKeon Roby
McKinley Roe (TN)
McMorris Rogers (AL)
Rodgers Rogers (KY)
Meehan Rogers (MI)
Mica Rohrabacher
Miller (FL) Rokita
Miller (MI) Rooney
Miller, Gary Ros-Lehtinen
Mulvaney Roskam
Murphy (PA) Ross (AR)
Neugebauer Ross (FL)
Noem Royce
Nugent Runyan
Nunes Ryan (WI)
Nunnelee Scalise
Olson Schilling
Palazzo Schmidt
Paul Schock
Paulsen Schweikert
Pearce Scott (SC)
Pence Scott, Austin

NOES—180

Ackerman Frank (MA)
Andrews Fudge
Baca Garamendi
Baldwin Gonzalez
Bass (CA) Green, Al
Becerra Green, Gene
Berkley Grijalva
Berman Gutierrez
Bishop (GA) Hanabusa
Bishop (NY) Hanna
Blumenauer Hastings (FL)
Boswell Heinrich
Brady (PA) Higgins
Braley (IA) Himes
Brown (FL) Hinchey
Butterfield Hinojosa
Capps Hirono
Capuano Hochul
Cardoza Holt
Carnahan Honda
Carney Hoyer
Carson (IN) Inslee
Castor (FL) Jackson (IL)
Chu Jackson Lee
Cicilline (TX)
Clarke (MI) Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B.
Clay Kaptur
Clever Keating
Clyburn Kildee
Cohen Kind
Connolly (VA) Kissell
Conyers Kucinich
Cooper Langevin
Costa Larsen (WA)
Costello Larson (CT)
Courtney Lee (CA)
Critz Levin
Crowley Lewis (GA)
Cuellar Lipinski
Cummings Loeb sack
Davis (CA) Lowey
Davis (IL) Lujan
DeFazio Lynch
DeGette Maloney
DeLauro Markey
Deutch Matsui
Dicks McCarthy (NY)
Dingell McCollum
Doggett McDermott
Donnelly (IN) McGovern
Doyle McIntyre
Edwards McNerney
Ellison Meeks
Engel Michaud
Eshoo Miller (NC)
Farr Miller, George
Fattah Moore
Filner Moran

Sensenbrenner Sessions
Shimkus Shuster
Simpson Simpson
Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX) Smith (TX)
Southernland Southernland
Stearns Stearns
Stivers Stivers
Stutzman Stutzman
Sullivan Sullivan
Terry Terry
Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
Thornberry Thornberry
Tiberi Tiberi
Tipton Tipton
Turner Turner
Upton Upton
Walberg Walberg
Walden Walden
Walsh (IL) Walsh (IL)
Webster Webster
West West
Westmoreland Westmoreland
Whitfield Whitfield
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Wolf Wolf
Womack Womack
Woodall Woodall
Yoder Yoder
Young (AK) Young (AK)
Young (FL) Young (FL)
Young (IN) Young (IN)

Weiner Weiner
Welch Welch
Chaffetz Chaffetz
Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen
Giffords Giffords
Israel Israel

Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Woolsey Woolsey
Wu Wu
Yarmuth Yarmuth
Loftgren, Zoe Loftgren, Zoe
Manzullo Manzullo
Myrick Myrick
Neal Neal

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1340

Ms. HAYWORTH changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) 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 264, noes 157, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—264

Ackerman Cleaver
Alexander Cleyburn
Altmire Coble
Andrews Cohen
Baca Connelly (VA)
Baldwin Conyers
Barletta Cooper
Barrow Costa
Bartlett Costello
Bass (CA) Courtney
Bass (NH) Cravaack
Becerra Critz
Berg Crowley
Berkley Cuellar
Berman Cummings
Biggart Davis (CA)
Bilirakis Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA) Davis (KY)
Bishop (NY) DeFazio
Bishop (UT) DeGette
Black DeLauro
Blackburn Dent
DesJarlais DesJarlais
Deutch Deutch
Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
Dicks Dicks
Dingell Dingell
Brown (FL) Doggett
Dodd Dodd
Donnelly (IN) Donnelly (IN)
Camp Doyle
Edwards Edwards
Ellison Ellison
Emerson Emerson
Engel Engel
Eshoo Eshoo
Farr Farr
Fattah Fattah
Filner Filner
Fincher Fincher
Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann Fleischmann
Clarke (MI) Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY)
Clay Clay

Kucinich Kucinich
Lance Lance
Langevin Langevin
Lankford Lankford
Lipinski Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
Latham Latham
LaTourette LaTourette
Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
Levin Levin
Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
Lipinski Lipinski
LoBiondo LoBiondo
Loeb sack Loeb sack
Lowey Lowey
Lujan Lujan
Lynch Lynch
Maloney Maloney
Marino Marino
Markey Markey
Matheson Matheson
Matsui Matsui
McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY)
McCotter McCotter
McDermott McDermott
McGovern McGovern
McHenry McHenry
McIntyre McIntyre
McKinley McKinley
McNerney McNerney
Meehan Meehan
Mica Mica
Michaud Michaud
Miller (MI) Miller (MI)
Miller (NC) Miller (NC)
Miller, George Miller, George
Moore Moore
Moran Moran
Murphy (PA) Murphy (PA)
Nadler Nadler
Napolitano Napolitano
Oliver Oliver
Owens Owens

NOES—157

Adams Adams
Aderholt Aderholt
Akin Akin
Amash Amash
Bachmann Bachmann
Bachus Bachus
Barton (TX) Barton (TX)
Benishek Benishek
Billbray Billbray
Bonner Bonner
Bono Mack Bono Mack
Boustany Boustany
Brady (TX) Brady (TX)
Brooks Brooks
Broun (GA) Broun (GA)
Buchanan Buchanan
Bucshon Bucshon
Burgess Burgess
Calvert Calvert
Campbell Campbell
Cansco Cansco
Cantor Cantor
Carter Carter
Cassidy Cassidy
Chabot Chabot
Coffman (CO) Coffman (CO)
Cole Cole
Conaway Conaway
Crawford Crawford
Crenshaw Crenshaw
Culberson Culberson
Denham Denham
Dreier Dreier
Duffy Duffy
Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN)
Ellmers Ellmers
Farenthold Farenthold
Flake Flake
Flores Flores
Fortenberry Fortenberry
Foxy Foxxy
Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ)
Gallegly Gallegly
Gardner Gardner
Garrett Garrett
Gingrey (GA) Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte Goodlatte
Gosar Gosar
Gowdy Gowdy
Granger Granger
Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
Graves (MO) Graves (MO)

Pallone Pallone
Pascrell Pascrell
Pastor (AZ) Pastor (AZ)
Paul Paul
Payne Payne
Pelosi Pelosi
Perlmutter Perlmutter
Peters Peters
Peterson Peterson
Petri Petri
Pingree (ME) Pingree (ME)
Platts Platts
Poe (TX) Poe (TX)
Polis Polis
Price (NC) Price (NC)
Quigley Quigley
Rahall Rahall
Rangel Rangel
Reed Reed
Rehberg Rehberg
Reichert Reichert
Reyes Reyes
Ribble Ribble
Richardson Richardson
Richmond Richmond
Rivera Rivera
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam Roskam
Ross (AR) Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ) Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
Runyan Runyan
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda Sanchez, Linda
T. T.
Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes Sarbanes
Scalise Scalise
Schakowsky Schakowsky
Schiff Schiff
Schmidt Schmidt

Schrader Schrader
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
Scott, David Scott, David
Serrano Serrano
Sewell Sewell
Sherman Sherman
Shuler Shuler
Shuster Shuster
Simpson Simpson
Sires Sires
Slaughter Slaughter
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Speier Speier
Stark Stark
Sutton Sutton
Terry Terry
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Tiberi Tiberi
Tierney Tierney
Tonko Tonko
Towns Towns
Tsongas Tsongas
Turner Turner
Upton Upton
Van Hollen Van Hollen
Velázquez Velázquez
Visclosky Visclosky
Walden Walden
Walz (MN) Walz (MN)
Wasserman Wasserman
Schultz Schultz
Waters Waters
Watt Watt
Waxman Waxman
Weiner Weiner
Welch Welch
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Woolsey Woolsey
Wu Wu
Yarmuth Yarmuth
Young (AK) Young (AK)
Young (FL) Young (FL)

NOES—157

Griffin (AR) Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA) Griffith (VA)
Guinta Guinta
Guthrie Guthrie
Hall Hall
Harper Harper
Harris Harris
Hartzler Hartzler
Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA)
Heck Heck
Hensarling Hensarling
Herger Herger
Huelskamp Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
Hunter Hunter
Hurt Hurt
Issa Issa
Jenkins Jenkins
Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
Jordan Jordan
King (IA) King (IA)
Kingston Kingston
Cassidy Cassidy
Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL)
Kline Kline
Labrador Labrador
Lamborn Lamborn
Landry Landry
Latta Latta
Lewis (CA) Lewis (CA)
Long Long
Lucas Lucas
Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
Lummis Lummis
Lungren, Daniel Lungren, Daniel
E. E.
Mack Mack
Marchant Marchant
McCarthy (CA) McCarthy (CA)
McCaul McCaul
McClintock McClintock
McKeon McKeon
McMorris McMorris
Rodgers Rodgers
Meeks Meeks
Garrett Garrett
Miller (FL) Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary Miller, Gary
Mulvaney Mulvaney
Murphy (CT) Murphy (CT)
Neugebauer Neugebauer
Noem Noem
Nugent Nugent
Nunes Nunes

NOT VOTING—11

Austria Giffords Neal
 Burton (IN) Lofgren, Zoe Rush
 Chaffetz Manzullo Schwartz
 Frelinghuysen Myrick

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1344

Mr. WITTMAN changed his vote from
 “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 393,
 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from California (Mr. SHER-
 MAN) 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 amend-
 ment.

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 de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 208, noes 213,
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—208

Adams Davis (KY) Hirono
 Akin DeFazio Holt
 Amash Dent Honda
 Andrews Doggett Huelskamp
 Baca Dold Huizenga (MI)
 Bachmann Doyle Inslee
 Baldwin Duffy Jackson (IL)
 Bartlett Duncan (SC) Jackson Lee
 Bass (CA) Duncan (TN) (TX)
 Bass (NH) Edwards Johnson (IL)
 Becerra Ellison Johnson (OH)
 Benishek Emerson Jones
 Berg Farr Jordan
 Bilirakis Filner Kaptur
 Boswell Fincher Keating
 Brady (PA) Fitzpatrick Kind
 Braley (IA) Flake Kline
 Brooks Forbes Kucinich
 Broun (GA) Foxx Labrador
 Buchanan Frank (MA) Landry
 Burgess Franks (AZ) Langevin
 Burton (IN) Gallegly Larsen (WA)
 Camp Garamendi Larson (CT)
 Campbell Garrett Latham
 Capuano Gerlach Lee (CA)
 Carnahan Gibson Lewis (GA)
 Carson (IN) Gingrey (GA) LoBiondo
 Cassidy Gohmert Loebsack
 Castor (FL) Goodlatte Lujan
 Chabot Gowdy Lummis
 Chu Graves (GA) Lynch
 Cicilline Griffin (AR) Mack
 Clarke (MI) Griffith (VA) Maloney
 Clarke (NY) Grijalva Markey
 Clay Guthrie McClintock
 Cleaver Gutierrez McGovern
 Coffman (CO) Harris McHenry
 Cohen Hartzler McIntyre
 Connolly (VA) Heinrich McNerney
 Conyers Hensarling Michaud
 Costello Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)
 Cummings Hinchey Miller (MI)
 Davis (IL) Hinojosa Moore

Mulvaney Rohrabacher
 Nadler Rooney
 Napolitano Ross (FL)
 Nugent Royce
 Olver Ryan (OH)
 Pallone Ryan (WI)
 Pastor (AZ) Sanchez, Linda
 Paul T.
 Paulsen Sarbanes
 Pearce Schakowsky
 Peters Schmidt
 Petri Schrader
 Pingree (ME) Scott (VA)
 Pitts Scott, Austin
 Platts Sensenbrenner
 Poe (TX) Serrano
 Posey Sherman
 Price (GA) Slaughter
 Quayle Smith (NJ)
 Quigley Smith (WA)
 Rangel Southerland
 Reichert Speier
 Renacci Stearns
 Ribble Stutzman
 Richardson Sutton
 Rigell Terry
 Roe (TN) Tierney

NOES—213

Ackerman Fudge
 Aderholt Gardner
 Alexander Gibbs
 Altmire Gonzalez
 Austria Gosar
 Bachus Granger
 Barletta Graves (MO)
 Barrow Green, Al
 Barton (TX) Green, Gene
 Berkley Grimm
 Berman Guinta
 Biggert Hall
 Bilbray Hanabusa
 Bishop (GA) Hanna
 Bishop (NY) Harper
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (FL)
 Black Hastings (WA)
 Blackburn Hayworth
 Blumenauer Heck
 Bonner Herger
 Bono Mack Higgins
 Boren Himes
 Boustany Hochul
 Brown (FL) Holden
 Bucshon Hoyer
 Buerkle Hultgren
 Butterfield Hunter
 Calvert Hurt
 Canseco Israel
 Cantor Issa
 Capito Jenkins
 Capps Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, Sam
 Johnson, Sam Kelly
 Carter Kildee
 Chandler King (IA)
 Clyburn King (NY)
 Coble Kingston
 Cole Kinzinger (IL)
 Conaway Kissell
 Cooper Lamborn
 Costa Lance
 Courtney Lankford
 Cravaack LaTourette
 Crawford Latta
 Crenshaw Levin
 Critz Lewis (CA)
 Crowley Lipinski
 Cuellar Long
 Culberson Lowey
 Davis (CA) Lucas
 DeGette Luetkemeyer
 DeLauro Lungren, Daniel
 DesJarlais E.
 Deutch Marchant
 Diaz-Balart Marino
 Dicks Matheson
 Dingell Matsui
 Donnelly (IN) McCarthy (CA)
 Dreier McCarthy (NY)
 Eilmlers McCaul
 Engel McCollum
 Eshoo McCotter
 Farenthold McDermott
 Fattah McKeon
 Fleischmann McKinley
 Fleming McMorris
 Flores Rodgers
 Fortenberry Meehan

Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Watt
 Webster
 Welch
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters

Waxman
 Weiner
 Woodall

Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (TX) Lofgren, Zoe Payne
 Chaffetz Manzullo Rush
 Frelinghuysen Myrick Schwartz
 Giffords Neal

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 Members are reminded they have 1
 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1347

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

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 de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 183, noes 234,
 not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—183

Adams Dreier Jordan
 Aderholt Duffy King (IA)
 Akin Duncan (SC) Kingston
 Amash Duncan (TN) Kline
 Austria Ellmers Labrador
 Bachmann Fincher Lamborn
 Bachus Flake Landry
 Bartlett Fleischmann Lankford
 Barton (TX) Fleming Latham
 Bass (NH) Flores Latta
 Benishek Forbes Lewis (CA)
 Berg Fortenberry Long
 Bilbray Foxx Lucas
 Bilirakis Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Ross (AR) Gallegly Lummis
 Rothman (NJ) Gardner Lungren, Daniel
 Roybal-Allard Garrett E.
 Runyan Gibbs Mack
 Ruppertsberger Bono Mack Marchant
 Sanchez, Loretta Boustany Gohmert McCarthy (CA)
 Scalise Brady (TX) Goodlatte
 Schiff Gosar McClintock
 Schilling Broun (GA) Gowdy McHenry
 Schock Buchanan Granger McIntyre
 Schweikert Bucshon Graves (GA) McKeon
 Scott (SC) Buerkle Griffin (AR) McMorris
 Scott, David Burgess Griffith (VA) Rodgers
 Sessions Burton (IN) Guinta Mica
 Sewell Calvert Guthrie Miller (FL)
 Shimkus Camp Hall Miller, Gary
 Shuler Campbell Harper Mulvaney
 Shuster Canseco Harris Neugebauer
 Simpson Cantor Hartzler Noem
 Sires Carter Hastings (WA) Nugent
 Smith (NE) Cassidy Hayworth Nunes
 Smith (TX) Chabot Hensarling Nunnelee
 Stark Coble Herger Olson
 Stivers Coffman (CO) Herrera Beutler Palazzo
 Sullivan Cole Huelskamp Paul
 Thompson (CA) Conaway Huizenga (MI) Paulsen
 Thompson (MS) Crawford Hunter Pearce
 Thompson (PA) Crenshaw Hurt Pence
 Thornberry Culberson Pitts
 Tiberi Davis (KY) Jenkins
 Tipton Denham Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
 Van Hollen Dent Johnson, Sam Pompeo
 Walz (MN) DesJarlais Jones Posey

Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ross (FL)

Royce
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
 Tipton
 Walberg
 Webster
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bass (CA)
 Chaffetz
 Courtney
 Frelinghuysen
 Giffords
 Honda
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Manzullo
 Moore
 Myrick
 Neal
 Pingree (ME)
 Rush
 Schwartz
 West

□ 1350

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 395, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated for:

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 395, I intended to vote "yea." After the time to change my vote had expired I noticed my vote had been recorded as "nay."

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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. GINGREY of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, 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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2055, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 288

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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, 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: (1) proceedings under section 2 of this resolution; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The proceedings referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows: (a) after disposition of any amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole, the Chair shall put the question on retaining the title beginning on page 25, line 14 (Department of Veterans Affairs); and (b) after disposition of the question under subsection (a), the Chair shall put the question on engrossment and third reading of the text comprising those portions of the bill (as perfected) (1) retained by the House pursuant to subsection (a) and (2) not subject to proceedings under subsection (a).

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 2055, the Clerk shall conform title and section numbers and make related corrections to cross-references in the event a portion of the bill is not retained pursuant to section 2 of this resolution.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. For the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which 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. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 288 provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2055, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2012. This rule provides for ample debate and opportunities for the Members of the minority and majority party to participate in that debate. The rule places no limitation on the number of amendments that may be considered as long as they comply with the House rules.

Similar to the open rule that was passed yesterday on the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, the only differences are in section 2 of this rule: it does allow for a separate vote on a title addressing the Department of Veterans Affairs. In doing so, we are delivering on the Speaker's promise to reduce the so-called omnibus bill and give Members the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on Cabinet-level Departments contained in the bill.

Part of the Speaker's and Rules Committee chairman's commitment is to have a more open and transparent process. In the end, that is what this does. This is an open rule that allows for debate and for amendments.

NOES—234

Ackerman
 Alexander
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barletta
 Barrow
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Biggert
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boren
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Butterfield
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chandler
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Critz
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fitzpatrick
 Frank (MA)
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gerlach
 Gibson
 Gonzalez
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holden
 Holt
 Hoyer
 Hultgren
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 (TX)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kissell
 Kucinich
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 LaTourette
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Marino
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCotter
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNeerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Michaud
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Olver
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Petri
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rivera
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Stivers
 Sutton
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

I think every Member of the Congress was elected by a group of people in their district, citizens in their district, and they assumed that that Member would be able to come and debate and offer amendments to bills at will. Sometimes that is not the case, but it is the case this particular time. Every one of us who comes here, Republican or Democrat, liberal, moderate or conservative, comes with a desire of affecting public policy in a real way. The only way that can happen is when the process is more open and more honest and more transparent, and that is what this rule does for this particular bill. It has been a long time, yesterday being one of the first times, but a long time since we have considered an appropriation bill with an open rule.

This bill has truly been, I would say, a bipartisan effort. It is one of the first times, and I am very delighted to present the underlying bill through this rule because it is such a bipartisan effort. Even the rule itself was adopted by unanimous consent by the Rules Committee, which is something I have not experienced in my first 5 months here. So that, too, is something very, very different.

I think that is the way the process should work. I think we have got to work together. We have problems in this country, and they are deep problems. If we don't work together, we will never solve them. I think this may be a start of something that might be a little different than the way it has been.

The Democrats on the Appropriations Committee said these things about this bill: the bill sufficiently funds critical military construction, family housing and quality-of-life improvements for our brave men and women in uniform and their families. The bill meets the needs of our military veteran communities for the coming year.

That really states the purpose of this bill, and so to me, it has met the needs not only in the eyes of Democrats but also Republicans.

□ 1400

Further, the care for our veterans and service men and women is not a partisan issue. It's not. It's proven out in this particular rule and this bill.

I would like to stress that there are many programs funded at previous levels or above previous levels that have kept the promise made to our men and women in uniform. It increases the Veterans Affairs budget for things like veterans' benefits and health programs by \$8.7 billion to \$127.7 billion. It includes the full funding for VA compensation and benefits: education benefits, vocational rehabilitation, and housing programs. It contains \$52 billion in advance funding for the VA. The same level passed in the House budget resolution for medical services, medical support, and compliance and medical facilities. This advance funding will ensure that our veterans have full

access to their medical care needs regardless of where we stand in our annual appropriations process.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Appropriations Committee has worked to provide us with a fiscally responsible appropriations bill that promises to meet the needs of our military construction and our promises to the American veterans. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my good friend from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for yielding the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, as he has said, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2012 provides \$144 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, military construction projects, and other agencies and programs.

This bipartisan effort—and Mr. WEBSTER underscored that, and I echo his sentiments in that regard—brought Democrats and Republicans together to craft legislation that provides the necessary funds for important military construction projects as well as improves the quality of life for veterans and military families.

One of our colleagues who no longer serves here would be very proud of this measure. He and Mr. DICKS and others worked together for years. I know Ike Skelton spent the greater portion of his career working to improve the quality of life for veterans and military families, so I pay homage to him that I have the privilege of presenting this measure on the floor.

This measure increases overall funding for veterans' health and benefits programs, ensuring that servicemen and -women who have dedicated themselves to our country will continue to receive the benefits they deserve.

This legislation provides \$14 billion in military construction for a wide range of new, upgraded and improved housing projects for members of the military and their families. This funding also includes important upgrades for military medical facilities and Defense Department education facilities located both here at home and on bases around the world.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is provided a total of \$128 billion in budget authority, an increase of almost \$9 billion over last year. This legislation ensures full funding for essential VA compensation and benefits programs in areas like education, vocational training and housing assistance. It also includes \$52 billion in advance funding for the VA, ensuring that veterans will continue to have full access to their medical care needs regardless of where Congress stands in the annual appropriations process. This underlying legislation includes funding for important national programs and activities, such as Arlington National

Cemetery, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am a little disappointed to see that the majority included, unfortunately, a political and possibly divisive amendment regarding project labor agreements.

In February 2009, President Obama issued an executive order to allow Federal agencies to consider requiring the use of project labor agreements in connection with large-scale construction projects. This executive order did not mandate the use of these agreements. In fact, the order explicitly states that Federal officials have the option to determine if these agreements are right for a project.

Unfortunately, the committee adopted an amendment to the underlying legislation that prohibits funds from being used to implement this order, effectively blocking agencies from even considering such labor agreements. These labor agreements are useful to promote the economy and efficiency in Federal procurement practices. A project labor agreement is a pre-hire agreement that establishes the terms and conditions of employment for a specific construction project, and it can be a useful tool to ensure coordination on large-scale projects involving multiple employers.

The executive order still allows for competition in contracts and sub-contracts, contains guarantees against strikes and similar job disruptions and provides mechanisms for management and labor cooperation; but while the executive order does not mandate the use of project labor agreements, the language adopted by the committee rules out that possibility altogether. The executive order ensures that construction projects are built correctly the first time, on time and, as a result, on budget.

Frankly, this is an inappropriate and unnecessary politicization of this appropriations bill, and I believe, in the end, it will simply add cost to the taxpayer through a less efficient procurement process.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I am also troubled by the provision regarding Guantanamo Bay detainees. This legislation—indeed, all of the appropriations bills—are going to include provisions to prohibit funds to renovate, expand or construct facilities in the United States in order to house Guantanamo Bay detainees. Let me say the same thing I said during last year's appropriations cycle when similar language was included:

The language in this bill is not going to solve the problem of what to do with the indefinite detention of individuals at Guantanamo Bay. The debate over Guantanamo is missing the larger picture, and that is the need to reform our entire detention policy.

As I have maintained, the problem is the policy, not the place. Without a

system of justice to deal with suspected terrorists wherever they are held, we are left with a broken system that has been a significant recruiting tool for al Qaeda and other groups which threaten our security. We need to deny them that image of America. We need a judicial process that accomplishes three things: one, protects our national security by holding and prosecuting those who have committed crimes or who pose a threat to our country; two, upholds international standards of human rights; and three, strengthens our Nation's image as a country that upholds the rule of law and does not resort to arbitrary justice even while under threat.

The underlying legislation is the second appropriations bill this cycle to contain provisions relating to Guantanamo. I expect that the remaining bills will also include this language. At some point soon, we are going to need to move beyond trying to legislate this matter into appropriations bills and, instead, deal with establishing new and appropriate policies and guidelines to bring our national security needs in line with our historic national values.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation contains essential funding for critical military construction programs and for our Nation's veterans. It is fitting that we consider this legislation so soon after Memorial Day when the sacrifices made by so many servicemen and -women are still on our minds. Veterans deserve our thanks and our admiration, and we owe them the necessary resources to meet their health care, education and housing needs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1410

Mr. WEBSTER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my friend, my fellow Floridian and Rules member, Mr. WEBSTER, for the opportunity to speak in support of this rule and also in support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 2055, which appropriates funds for military construction and for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, Florida's Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, is home to over 116,000 veterans, one of the highest veteran populations of any district in America. The funds we're talking about here today have a direct effect on the lives of the men and women who have proudly served our Nation in uniform. This bill provides full funding for VA and health and educational benefits. It also funds vocational rehabilitation training for those troops who come home from war with service-connected disabilities.

Thanks to programs like VetSuccess, these veterans can work with job counselors to develop the skills necessary to find meaningful civilian employment. These programs also help connect veterans who are unable to work and give them additional training to allow them to be independent living in America.

Given the number of veterans living in my district, I'm lucky enough to have visited a large number of VA health and benefits facilities throughout my district. During these trips, I have had the opportunity to see and visit with a number of physicians, nurses, and staff which these funds help keep on the mission of protecting and taking care of our veterans on a daily basis. I've also had the opportunity to speak with the true American heroes, those who answered the call of duty and put their lives on the line to protect our country, our way of life, and our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation owe our veterans a debt that can never be repaid. However, as Members of Congress, we can ensure that we keep our promises to our troops. H.R. 2055 fully funds the benefits that give our veterans back a small measure of what they truly deserve.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I am proud of this rule. We are continuing to make the 112th Congress the most open, transparent Congress the American people have seen in years. In fact, this may be the first rule that I've seen that was a voice vote unanimously approving the rule. I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this underlying legislation that this rule will bring to the House floor.

I spoke about visiting hospitals within my district. At Haley Hospital, the VA hospital in Tampa, I've had the opportunity to meet a number of those who have had serious traumatic brain injuries, amputees, those that have the ability to try to get their lives back on track after giving so much to this Nation.

I had them point to the stars on my chest here that indicate that I have three sons serving, and they were more concerned about me as a dad than their own physical infirmities that they're fighting to try to overcome. As the father of three sons who are currently serving in the United States Army, we've been blessed as a family and as a Nation, and as my oldest son came back from 15 months in Afghanistan in combat, but for the grace of God he came back whole, not like so many others who have served this country and given so much.

H.R. 2055 is a good bill, and this rule is a good rule. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support them both.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that during the Rules Committee hearing, Mr. SANFORD BISHOP, the ranking member of the subcommittee, raised a concern about the consequence of requiring separate votes on various parts of the bill. We feel that this is a serious issue, and we intend to continue to monitor the process closely as we consider the remaining appropriations bills.

I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the

distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this rule and need to take a moment to explain why, because I know many Members, especially Members of the minority, appreciate the openness of the amendment process. My concerns lie elsewhere with this rule; namely, that this rule for the first time requires a separate vote in the House on title II instead of following the regular order process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this procedural change sets a very bad precedent for the Appropriations Committee and for the House as a whole. Our committee currently has 12 subcommittees which cover every agency and program we fund through discretionary appropriations. Over the years that I have served on this committee, those jurisdictions have been changed—broadened, narrowed, switched places. And we have even created new subcommittees to address a current need, such as the Homeland Security subcommittee following the terrible events of 9/11.

There have also been realignments based on political dynamics, such as the abolition of the old VA-HUD subcommittee which had forced veterans, housing, and NASA programs to all compete within the same bill and same allocation for annual funding. We now fund Veterans Affairs with Military Construction.

If the majority is unhappy with the current subcommittee makeup, or believes an agency should stand alone for individual approval, they have every tool available to them to change the jurisdictions. We need not change the way we consider these bills on the floor and complicate a fairly straightforward process Members are already familiar with.

As ranking member of this committee, I must also focus on the impact this change would have on our entire process, especially our process of reconciling these bills with the other body. The theoretical defeat of a title compromises the position of the House in conference committee negotiations. Now I don't think that will happen on the MilCon-VA bill.

However, in some instances, the House may reject a title. In that circumstance, how does the House proceed to conference with the Senate on that particular bill? We cannot just decline to fund an entire title and then go on to negotiate its terms with the Senate. Striking a title of an appropriations bill will limit the House's ability to negotiate anything in that title by limiting the scope of that conference to only measures approved by both Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the open amendment process this rule provides but do wish that we would stick to true regular order for consideration of this bill.

I want to just also add that this is a good bill. It could be a little better, but

I think this is a bill that should be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1420

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, so soon after commemorating Memorial Day and honoring our Nation's veterans, we all can be pleased by the level of bipartisan support provided in this legislation for essential veterans programs. We all know that they deserve the very best support our Nation has to offer, and I am pleased to note that Democrats and Republicans came together to craft legislation that provides the necessary resources for veterans and their families.

As I pointed out, I wish that the language relating to project labor agreements was not in this bill. I believe that President Obama's executive order gives, rightly, Federal officials flexibility in determining the most cost-efficient method of completing large-scale construction projects. The executive order simply provides options, and the language in the bill by the majority closes those options off. This is going to be, in my view, inefficient and costly and shouldn't be included in the underlying legislation.

So, too, must this Congress deal reasonably with the issues that I spoke of regarding Guantanamo Bay. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the United States upholds the rule of law, remains true to the great foundational ideals of our democracy, and has flexibility in its counterterrorism policies to ensure an effective national security strategy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, as you heard me say earlier, my Republican colleagues and I are committed to providing a more open, transparent and accountable process here. Today's bill is a monumental step towards that right direction, and it's an example of a big desire within our own Speaker's heart to change the way things work here in Washington.

The underlying bill has bipartisan support. It went through the regular order; it provided an open rule to allow Republicans and Democrats alike to bring up their ideas and debate them; and even some that have been brought up by the minority here, those are brought up in a way that we will have an opportunity to amend at a later date.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Can the gentleman explain why all of a sudden the new majority has decided to have a separate vote on one Department and risk the possibility of going

to conference, say, with Military Construction but not with the Veterans Affairs? What is the purpose for this, especially with an open rule when you can vote on any provision in the bill?

Mr. WEBSTER. In doing so, we are delivering on the Speaker's promise to reduce so-called "omnibus" bills to a smaller, more understandable bill that gives Members the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on Cabinet-level Departments contained in the bill.

I will tell you that I experienced the same thing. I used to be a leader of a group in Florida which was known as the House of Representatives. And as Speaker there, we did the same thing. It was the first time ever, and I always knew, a lot of people with questions, can you divide up the different appropriations and send them to a Senate who may have a smaller—yes, you can. And basically all we did was break up the conferences. The conferences stayed exactly the same. The Members were appointed, and two bills, let's say, instead of one were sent to a particular conference while the Senate added their one. And then they were combined at a later date and passed as a general appropriation act.

So it can work, I promise you. I know it's new; I know it's different. You probably would question that there is something behind it—

Mr. DICKS. Do you think it's a good idea?

Mr. WEBSTER. I do believe it's a good idea. And the reason I believe it's a good idea is because I think there was some angst about looking at a large package at one time, and this is just an opportunity to break it up. I don't think it changes anything. I think it gives us an opportunity to actually scrutinize in a better way.

Mr. DICKS. Well, you could have another subcommittee. You could have a subcommittee do Veterans Administration and one do Military Construction. Anybody thought about that?

Mr. WEBSTER. I don't know.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. WEBSTER. Reclaiming my time, I will start where I left off.

The vote on the rule, which provides an open and transparent process, which makes no limitations on amendments, where ideas and policies will rise and fall on their merits and their bases and debate and so forth, is an awesome opportunity for this House to speak its will, not just an up-or-down vote on one bill, but an up-or-down vote on amendment after amendment in order to perfect the bill.

The clash of ideas is a good thing. And as we debate these ideas and we hear them on the floor of the House and then we have an opportunity to vote on them, it makes a good bill a better bill. This is what the American people expect from their elected officials. It is an expectation that is fulfilled by the rule and produced in the underlying bill. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this bill.

For over two centuries, our U.S. military has protected America from both our enemies and the enemies of our friends. The valor and dignity and courage of our men and women in uniform remain strong. From Valley Forge to Desert Storm, from San Juan Hill to Operation Enduring Freedom, the fighting spirit of American soldiers shines throughout history.

It is due to the lives selflessly lived and lost in defense of our country that we have the privilege to stand here today free and grateful. So thank you, veterans. And I, too, am glad that this happened just a few days after Memorial Day because it is a great way to remember the people that have given their lives for our country.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2017.

□ 1426

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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (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, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 92, line 7.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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 implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, in April, a draft executive order was circulated

that would force companies as a condition of applying for a Federal contract to disclose all Federal campaign contributions. In my view, if implemented, this executive order would lead to a significant politicalization of the Federal procurement process. Instead of a company being evaluated and judged on its merits, their past work experience, their ability to complete the government contract in question, this executive order would introduce the potential that they would be evaluated politically as opposed to professionally.

It's never a good idea, Mr. Chairman, in my view, to mix politics with contracting. My amendment would prevent the President from implementing the proposed disclosure requirements.

Congress actually considered something similar to what the President is proposing in the 111th Congress, the so-called DISCLOSE Act. It's instructive to me that that Congress—the majority of which in both Houses was controlled by our friends on the other side—decided not to implement such a requirement. Frankly, I think doing so now by executive order is effectively legislating through the executive branch.

The executive order in question that's being considered would not in fact lead to more objectivity in the bidding process, and it could potentially chill the constitutionally protected right of people to donate politically to whatever candidate, political party, or cause that they chose to do so.

It's worth noting that nothing in this amendment would affect the current Federal disclosures under the law. We're not trying to change things; we're not trying to let people do something they can't do now. We're simply trying to make sure that political contributions and political activities never move into the contracting process. Pay-to-play has no place in the Federal contracting process, and requiring the disclosure of campaign contributions for government contracts does just that.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully urge that the amendment be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Cole amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The amendment before us is a legislative attempt to circumvent a draft Executive order which would provide for increased disclosure of the political contributions of government contractors.

The draft Executive order being developed by the Obama administration would require Federal contractors to disclose more information about their political contributions than they currently provide. Particularly, those contributions given to third-party entities.

Some have said they oppose this effort because additional information could be used nefariously to create some kind of enemies list. In other words, they argue that companies should not disclose more information because people in power could misuse that information to retaliate against them.

I just think there are fundamental problems with this premise. Under this logic, all campaign disclosures would be bad, not just the new ones. Government contractors already disclose contributions and expenditures by their PACs and those who contribute to them. Contributions by the officers and directors of government contractors are also required to be disclosed. Should we eliminate those provisions, too? Of course not. The information is required to be provided already in law, and the Executive order that the amendment would circumvent simply enhances the quality of that information.

More than 30 groups, including non-partisan, nonprofit organizations like Democracy 21, the Project on Government Oversight, Public Citizen, many others have concluded that the draft Executive order would enhance transparency and decrease corruption. And these aren't the only groups that support the Executive order.

Two weeks ago, a coalition of institutional investors and investor coalitions collectively managing more than \$130 billion in assets also wrote to express their support. In their letter, they explained that corporate political activity presents significant risks to shareholder value. And transparency allows investors to put together in a more complete picture the various risks to our investments.

So, Mr. Chairman, as the Los Angeles Times said in a recent editorial, disclosure is the solution, not the problem. I believe that is the case.

I urge Members to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I rise in support of the Cole amendment, and the reason why I do is twofold.

Number one, I do think there are some questions about what are the motives. Why should you have to tell the Federal Government absolutely everything in our society today when you're just bidding on a contract? I see some good in it, and the gentleman mentioned the L.A. Times article. I think it makes some good points. But I also see how there is a double-edged sword, that there's too much information that's out there.

But the other thing is this is a major change and a possible encroachment on your constitutional right of First Amendment freedom of speech as to whom you give.

So if we are going to make this the law of the land, public policy, it really should go through the legislative process—hearings and testimony—and let everybody have something to say about it instead of just one more Executive order from the administration.

So I think we should adopt the Cole amendment.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I too am concerned about this amendment, especially when these campaign contributions are given secretly. You know, our system has been improved by having public disclosure of political contributions. I think the more the public knows about where the money is coming from, the better off the citizenry is.

So I just support the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, who gave a very complete description of why we're against this amendment, and I urge its defeat.

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

Mr. COLE. 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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the new construction, purchase, or lease of any building or space in the District of Columbia except where a contract for the construction, purchase, or lease was entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Under this amendment, no funds would be made available by this act for the new construction, purchase, or lease of any building or any space in the District of Columbia except where a contract was entered into before the date of the enactment.

Now, in the District of Columbia right now, the Federal Government had exactly 304 leases at the start of this year. These leases cover more than 23.6 million square feet. This bureaucracy has grown beyond the bounds of being reasonable.

The Federal Government, in addition to the 23.6 million square feet that it leases, also owns 109 buildings in the District of Columbia, and that doesn't even include all of the Department of

Defense buildings because those are administered by other than the GSA. The 23.6 million square feet come at a cost of around a billion dollars every year to the taxpayer.

Here we are in financially troubling times, and we need to send a message back to America we know you're tightening your belts. We know that States and municipalities are having to tighten their belts, and we get it here, also.

The Appropriations Committee and the chair is to be applauded. They have done a wonderful job on this bill. There is an amount zeroed out for new building space in a specific area of this bill. It takes that good step and goes one step further and says no funds made available in this act can be used in any way for construction, for lease or building out any space in the District of Columbia.

It also should be noted that every cubicle, every desk we add in the District of Columbia ends up requiring States and municipalities to add space there. They have to put somebody in that space, because every time we add a desk with a bureaucrat behind it in the District of Columbia, they have to justify their existence. They have to create requirements for people back in the States or in the municipalities to respond so that they can justify their existence in the District of Columbia.

The Federal funds that might be used for new construction or new leases to add to the 23.6 million square feet of space already under lease and the 109 buildings, not even including the Department of Defense buildings, that money could be better spent reducing the Federal deficit or protecting our homeland in other ways.

□ 1440

Let's let America rebound. Let's let America build back before we build or lease one more square foot in Washington, DC.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any funds in this bill to be used for new construction, purchase, or lease of a new building or space in Washington, D.C., in fiscal year 2012, the life of this bill. If adopted, this amendment, as I read it, would or could do several things.

First of all, it would not allow DHS to renew leases in the Washington, D.C., area, which means the leases would lapse, leaving DHS employees without offices to work in, and subjecting the Federal Government to lawsuits because the lessors would have no choice but to begin litigation for damages, to include costs to evict and lost rent.

The amendment might require DHS to break current construction con-

tracts due to a lack of funds if a new purchase or lease is required. It would not permit the GSA to condemn facilities that the DHS occupies if that were necessary. Therefore, it would force DHS to maintain occupancy until follow-on leases might be executed in 2013, or further down the road, or alternative space could be identified and prepared for use.

The amendment, as I read it, might not permit DHS even to reconfigure its current facility space to provide seats for the new staff being hired, particularly for some of these new functions that are going to require reconfiguring, such as cybersecurity and intelligence missions.

And then we need to ask, Mr. Chairman, what happens if a DHS facility in D.C. has a fire or a flood and we can't use it? This amendment would prevent, as I read it, rebuilding if a new construction contract was required as part of that rebuilding, as of course it might well be.

So the questions just go on and on. This is not a well-advised or wise amendment. It's far-reaching. It has negative implications. I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DICKS. If I could ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), the sponsor of the amendment, a question.

Why just the District of Columbia? You know, there are Federal buildings in Virginia and Maryland, surrounding the whole area. Why just the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, the intent is that since this is where so much construction and leasing has been done, that that's where it needs to stop, that the bureaucracy here in Washington has expanded to the point that this was a good place to draw the line. If the gentleman is wishing to extend that across the country, you know—

Mr. DICKS. I am not interested in that. I just want to make that clear. But I was interested why just the District of Columbia when this whole area here has many different government buildings, both in Maryland and in Virginia, which are proximate to the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would like to add those to this amendment, I would be glad to accept that.

Mr. DICKS. Let me also ask the gentleman on the point that Mr. PRICE made about leases: Do you see that a situation would occur that if a lease is expired once this amendment was enacted and signed into law—I doubt that it will be—but that an agency couldn't redo a lease? And what would you do in that situation if you couldn't build of-

fice space or you couldn't lease office space? You would have to leave the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the leases were appropriately drafted, then normally they would have an option for additional time. That under this amendment would mean that that was a contract entered into prior to the enactment of this bill. So that wouldn't be a problem. If it is a major lease expiring, then heaven forbid but they would actually have to come back to Congress, and it would be a form of sunset, for them to justify why they need to have a new lease. I think it's a great way of having oversight over groups that don't have their own building. We've leased a massive 23.6 million square feet of space. Let's sunset some of that or otherwise justify why you need another lease.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, I feel that Mr. PRICE has the better argument here, and I urge defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

Mr. ISSA. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Sec. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations that will result in private sector job losses to United States companies.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. This is a critical amendment. If not now, then when? If not on this bill, then when are we going to get to looking at American job creators in a positive way? There is no question if this amendment is held to a point of order that it will be seen again and again by those of us who care about jobs in America.

The Web site that my committee launched, AmericanJobCreators.com, has already seen countless examples, in the thousands now, of different ways in which regulatory excesses have in fact cost jobs. Moreover, what we're seeing is a pattern of no cost-benefit analysis being done in any way, shape, or form on new regulations.

Promulgating regulations if they don't cost jobs, if they are a net benefit to the economy, wouldn't be a problem,

at least not overall. But in fact, we have had the EPA administrator, the former Minerals Management Service, now Ocean Energy, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and countless more before our committee, each of whom seems to be muddled about cost-benefit on the regulations they create. They often say, of course we do cost-benefit. Then if you say, well, what do the cost-benefits show on a particular regulation, they are never familiar with it.

It is in fact very clear that we know that we're costing jobs. The estimate by the Small Business Administration, I repeat the estimate by the U.S. Small Business Administration is that regulations cost \$1.75 trillion, or about \$8,000 per employee, perhaps as much as \$10,000 per employee.

Not every regulation that costs money needs to in fact not happen. But it certainly should be a decision of the Congress, and not an unelected individual somewhere in a well-windowed office with beautiful carpeting deciding on their own to have guidance or rule-making that costs American jobs.

The Department of Homeland Security is in fact one of the most insular organizations. They have proven not to know or care what America needs, only that they must do what they choose to do. This is an agency that is so, so, so excessive that they even found that sending FOIA requests to political appointees who redacted or simply didn't send them out was okay. That's the kind of thing that we need to deal with here in appropriations, and if not in appropriations, in broader legislation.

My amendment simply seeks to force back to Congress the responsibility for regulations that cost jobs. If a study is done and it doesn't cost jobs, it would go forward. The fact is that most of our laws require some cost-benefit analysis. But since they're able to do it without ever formalizing it, or waive it because they say they don't believe it would happen, we don't have that kind of fact. An amendment like this simply says if you're going to cost American jobs, come back to Congress.

With that, I urge passage of this amendment. I strongly believe that with 9 percent unemployment, and in California 11 percent, and more in other areas, it's time for us to say don't pass a new regulation that costs jobs unless you're willing to bring it back to Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1450

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

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

The rules state, in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation

bill shall not be in order if it changes an existing law. The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. ISSA. I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I believe that, in fact, you will rule, if allowed to, on this point of order. It is unfortunate that our rules allow appropriators to legislate when they want to but don't allow us to bring sensible reform when we believe it is necessary. I am not legislating; I am limiting.

But I recognize that the ruling is inevitably going to go against us. I will endeavor to bring this to the attention of the body at every opportunity and will be drafting a bill that would change the whole regulatory format.

I would hope those who say on a technical basis they cannot support us today, even though they know that regulations are costing American jobs every day, will support legislation that would change this across government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to talk about an important immigration enforcement program.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ensure that appropriate funds are provided for the 287(g) program in this bill. The Federal Government must have well-equipped partners to address interior enforcement concerns.

However, the bill does not state specifically all funds for the 287(g) program, which would allow for robust law enforcement capacity.

I want to ensure the record reflects that the administration's request is \$68,321,000 and that this bill supports the President's request.

Citizens nationwide are rightfully demanding secure U.S. borders and enforcement of our immigration laws. The desire, Mr. Chairman, in many places across the country to strengthen interior enforcement points to an overwhelming perception throughout the Nation that the Federal Government is not as effectively as possible addressing serious security concerns such as the pernicious criminal activity related to illegal immigration in the border region.

We need to better empower States and local law enforcement, and the 287(g) is a very important program.

In 1996, Congress enacted section 287(g) as an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide

necessary immigration enforcement assistance to State and local law enforcement entities. It authorizes the Department of Homeland Security to enter into agreements with State and local law enforcement, equipping them through thorough training to perform important immigration enforcement functions.

Local law enforcement agencies are often closest to the problem. To date, Immigration and Customs Enforcement has trained more than 1,240 State and local officers nationwide pursuant to section 287(g) programs. Since 2006, the 287(g) program, according to ICE, has resulted in the identification of more than 200,300 "potentially removable aliens—mostly at local jails." Sixty-nine separate local law enforcement agencies participate in the program in 24 States, including Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia; and ICE, it appears, has worked very diligently since 2009 to fix concerns with the program by strengthening public safety and improving consistency.

In my home State of Nebraska, there is interest at the local level. The City of Fremont, in particular, has voiced enthusiasm for this program and could directly be impacted by an increase of funds available to help secure their community.

Ensuring full funding for the 287(g) programs preserves a high spirit of federalism in empowering States to work together with the Federal Government on a critical homeland security matter.

Mr. Chairman, America has been, for a long, long time, a just and generous Nation in regards to immigration policy, opening her arms to persons, particularly those facing social, economic or even political persecution, who wish to come here and make a new contribution in a new community to the well-being of their own lives. This should remain the hallmark and spirit of sound immigration policy, but uncontrolled borders are a serious threat to the United States' national security; and with lax interior enforcement authority, we risk our ability to remain a just and generous Nation in regards to immigration policy. So section 287(g) plays a critical role in this process and should be funded at the administration's request.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Nebraska raises some excellent points, and I strongly support robust enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws. That includes partnership with the States and local law enforcement through the 287(g) program.

As the gentleman from Nebraska noted, 287(g) is an important tool among many and gives ICE a force multiplier for immigration enforcement.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his attention to this important program, and I will continue to work with him as we move this bill forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, at this point I was planning to offer to the House and to the committee for its consideration, as we consider one of the most important appropriations measures that the House will consider, and that's for our homeland security, I was prepared to offer an amendment here at this juncture to limit some of the funds that are made available to the Transportation Security Administration.

My intent is, I think, well founded in having had the opportunity to review TSA's operations, actually one of the individuals responsible for creating TSA back after the events of 9/11, when we had to put in place a transportation security measure and operation for the Nation which we didn't have prior to that.

When we set up TSA, and particularly where we provided for a new way of aviation passenger screening, we actually created two models: one, a private sector model, which is the Federal setting of guidelines and all of the rules for conducting screening and then Federal operation of the screening; but also a second model, which was Federal Government setting the rules and the protocols for operation but using private screeners.

We set up five models of different-sized category airports to test this and see how it would work, testing the all-Federal model against the Federal model with private operators. I can tell you that after testing this several years, after operational testing not by me but by the Government Accountability Office, they found, in fact, that the private screeners performed statistically significantly better than the other screeners.

TSA wasn't happy with these findings, and it captured a great deal of the market and activity, so they did everything they could to distort some of the findings and change the way the airports were tested.

□ 1500

Even so, about 16 airports now operate with private screeners under Federal supervision. Tomorrow our committee, and this is the Transportation Committee, our Investigations and Oversight Committee will reveal the most comprehensive report of looking at these operations, and we are comparing apples and apples to see which one runs better and more cost effectively for the taxpayer.

Without a doubt, this report will show the substantial savings. In fact, within 5 years, if we converted 38 of the top airports to Federal operations,

again, Federal oversight with private screening, we could save \$1 billion.

And I was prepared to try to transfer earlier in the bill double the amount of money. There's \$144 million in here for private screening operations under Federal supervision that we currently have, and double that amount of money which could have gotten us much more passenger screening and do it much more cost effectively for the taxpayers. And actually most of our initiatives, positive initiatives, have come from these private screening models. In any event, that was my intent.

At this point in the bill, I can only take money from the overall screening activity or limit it. It's my understanding that after I strike the last word, I'll have an opportunity to offer an amendment that will, in fact, limit the amount of money for the all-Federal screening model—not taking it out of TSA, but giving discretion to the administrator and hopefully applying it. Once again, we restart the private screening under Federal supervision. Actually, as I speak, all 16 airports continue, but we restart opening it to other airports.

I want to make certain that we have the funds available to accomplish that goal. And that's the purpose of my amendment. So I'm not taking away from the overall money to TSA. I'm limiting the amount of money that can be used. And now we have a Federal screening force, I'm told, of some 41,000, give or take 500, screeners. This bill authorizes up to 46,000 I'm told. So we stay within the caps.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. ____ Of the amount made available for screening operations under the heading: "Transportation Security Administration—Aviation Security", not more than \$2,760,503,458 may be used for screener personnel, compensation, and benefits.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has not been recognized on his amendment yet. The Chair will recognize an opponent following that debate.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, maybe the gentleman can clarify, but my understanding was that the 5-minute address we had just heard was addressing the amendment.

The CHAIR. No, the gentleman rose to strike the last word. After yielding back, he then offered his amendment. So the gentleman from Florida will be recognized now on his amendment. He had not offered it before.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I do want to apologize to the members of the committee because we want to make certain that if we offer the amendment that it was in the proper form as originally drafted. It was on a previous page. And I understand from the Parliamentarian that we could only do a limitation at this particular stage. So that's why I had the time to explain and striking the last word, my position and some of the history of my involvement with this. It's not that I'm just a Johnny-come-lately on the floor to do some mischief with TSA. It's that I helped to actually create the agency. I want it to be effective. I want taxpayer money to be properly expended.

But when I see the results—and I've seen the way the TSA operates. They started with 16,500 screeners on 9/11. And what failed on 9/11 was not the private screeners. It was the Federal Government, because the Federal Government failed to put in place the rules, the protocols, the standards and the levels of operation. They were stalling for years, I found out, and never put them in place. And that's something we had to do.

But what we did is, again, we set up two models. And airports have had the right to opt out from the very beginning and go to private screening under Federal supervision. Now, we've been there. We've seen how it works. We have entire States that have said that they want the opportunity to have the second model, which has proven to be most cost effective, not just from dollars and cents, but also from efficiency and effectiveness in operation.

This is all about the performance of TSA, and the models that have been independently tested will show you that private screeners, under Federal supervision, again, proper oversight, setting the rules, they perform better.

So the purpose of this is to set aside some of that money. TSA came in, and I think that the administrator, while well intended, was kept in the dark and fed a lot of mushrooms on what happens with these programs.

And in order to justify 3,700 positions, administrative positions in Washington, D.C., just in Washington, D.C., 3,700 positions making on average \$105,000 a person—imagine that, what we've created—and another 8,000-plus administrators out in the field, but to justify those positions, what they did was they fudged—and GAO has also confirmed this—the facts on the cost of the private operation, again, under Federal supervision of passenger screening.

So all this does—it doesn't take any money out of TSA—is it gives the administrator the discretion to have that money, and he can use it for screening. And we believe that with the pending applications, which this bill and your

bill helps open up, we want to make certain that there are adequate funds available to do it in the most cost-effective manner. And that's what my amendment provides for.

So, again, the whole point of this is doing the best possible job for security. And stop and think about this: this bill provides \$3 billion-plus just for screening, 3 billion. I think the total of this bill is, what, \$8 billion, staff? The entire bill is 46.

But just for TSA is how much? 7.8, close to \$8 billion for TSA's operation. And I wouldn't begrudge them a penny if it, in fact, were used properly for the security of our Nation to make certain that people are safe in the skies.

But I'm saying that this amendment does make certain that for a very cost-effective means of providing passenger screening, we can do a better job. We'll have the money available, and we won't rely on just the all-Federal model.

So I urge support for this amendment and your consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chair, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIR. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I've been listening carefully to the gentleman as he described his intentions in offering this amendment, and all I can do, I think all any of us can do, is react to the amendment before us, not to hypothetical future amendments or future administrative actions. And on the face of it, I oppose this amendment.

The bill provides \$3.03 billion for screeners. This amendment would cut funding by \$270 million.

□ 1510

If this amendment is accepted, TSA would need to lay off 5,000 screeners. That's 10 percent of the current screener workforce. It would also eliminate nearly all of the new screeners hired over the past 12 months. These are screeners that are needed to support, to operate new security equipment.

Mr. Chairman, there's no way around it: this would decrease security. It would lead to longer wait lines just at a time when passenger growth is rebounding at our country's airports. We continue to hear from the intelligence community about aviation threats. These threats are becoming more and more ominous, more diversified. Why on earth would we want to cut back our screener force at this point?

Now, the gentleman has talked about giving the Secretary discretion to somehow make up for this cut in the private screener force. But there is really nothing in this amendment that grants such discretion. There is not any augmenting in this amendment of

the private screener account, nor is there any assurance that even if that account were to be augmented, that the people that could be hired would replace, one for one, the 5,000 we are talking about laying off.

So just taking this amendment on the face of it, I think it is an amendment that would lessen aviation security and, particularly, undo a lot of the additional protections that have been put in place in the last year or so. So I think it is a most unwise amendment, and I urge rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Again, this amendment comes to us late. The gentleman from Florida happens to be the chairman of the Transportation Committee. He could write a bill to change this. All of these things that he has bemoaned here on the floor, he could fix. He could bring the bill to the floor, and we could have a debate and a discussion. But instead, he comes here with a meat ax approach, 10 percent reduction in screeners.

Also, I think the gentleman's figure of 3,700 people, I think, are not screeners here in the Nation's capital.

So again, I just wish the gentleman would use his jurisdiction and his committee, hold the hearings, bring TSA up here and do the job that the chairman of the Transportation Committee should do and get this thing fixed. If it's so good, why don't you fix it?

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. MICA. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Let me just try to clarify the record. The information I have on the number of screeners from our investigative staff director is 49,553 screeners. That is the figure given to us by TSA. The number of screeners is 49,553.

The other point, too, when I said 3,700 administrative personnel, I'm talking about TSA bureaucrats here. I'm not talking about screening force. Not one screener am I including in that. I'm just talking about TSA headquarters or TSA administrative personnel making, on average, \$105,000 a year. Now I'm not talking about the screeners. These poor screeners, some of the screeners are starting at the lowest wage. The money isn't going for professional screeners, although this bill, I understand the average pay is about, if you calculate \$3 billion divided by 49,000, you come close to \$60,000, and there are costs for benefits and all that, I grant you. But let me just try to make the record clear, again: We have 3,700 administrative TSA people in the headquarters or associated here in the Washington area, not screeners.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I understand that the gentleman from Florida's amendment wouldn't do anything about those managers because it is aimed at the screeners themselves. And, also, the bill already reduces screeners to 46,000.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Well, again, the justification of most of the 3,700 who fed the administrator mushrooms and kept him in the dark was in fact you had someone to supervise all of these people. We have another 8,000 supervisors out in the field.

When you go through the airport line sometime, I challenge you to ask some of these people what they are doing standing around, the thousands standing around. The whole point of this is there is another model, and we created that in 2001. We have 16 airports, five initially. The biggest one is in the minority leader's district, Ms. PELOSI. It set the standards, the example for the rest of us. And tomorrow, we will show a report, and we have examined position by position with San Francisco airport against LAX because we want to compare apples to apples. You will see the incredible savings. You'll see the efficiency, which is like twice as much with private screeners.

So I am taking the money and the positions out of the all Federal and making them available to the discretion of the administrator to use them hopefully for this SBP program, which is private screeners under Federal supervision, which worked so well.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. Again, the gentleman is the chairman of the Transportation Committee. You are the one who helped create this bureaucracy. Why don't you fix it and bring a bill to the floor so we can have a chance to vote on it? If it is so good, why do you come here at the last moment and cut screeners?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Again, I would love nothing more than to have the jurisdiction. I do not have the jurisdiction. I do have jurisdiction for some oversight, which we have assumed.

Mr. DICKS. Oh, Homeland Security does. I get that.

Mr. MICA. Yes, they do. So I will be here when Homeland Security cows come marching through the pasture here and try to make the changes that are necessary. We have discussed with your staff the changes that we believe are necessary. But I don't have that jurisdiction; I wish I did. But I am doing all I can to work with the Appropriations Committee. Your professionals

are doing all they can within the limitations of your jurisdiction. I am doing my little oversight bit, and then we have the Homeland Security Committee that will march forward with their authorization. And I will be here for that parade.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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. MICA) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, 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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1611

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2017.

□ 1612

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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 92, line 7.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, as we had talked earlier about this legislation, this bill is about putting priority on limited dollars and robustly supporting the most essential functions of the Department of Homeland Security and to make sure that our homeland is safe.

The Department of Homeland Security, with all of its critical missions, is not immune from fiscal discipline. That has been the theme that we have been talking about since we started the bill yesterday afternoon. That means that the Department has to find the most cost-effective way to meet its mission requirements.

The American people, quite honestly, are demanding no less in this regard.

Again, we started yesterday afternoon at around 3:30, we went until about 12:30 this morning, we started again about 12:30 today, this afternoon, and we are continuing with this legislation. It will probably take us a couple of more hours this evening before we finish. A lot of people have done a lot of work to make this bill happen and for it to take place.

I just again would want to thank each of them for their hard work.

Again, the ranking member, Mr. PRICE, has been a true partner in this as we have worked together, and I want to thank him for his contribution that he has made.

Also, I would like to thank the full committee chairman and the ranking member, Mr. HAL ROGERS and Mr. DICKS, for their support. They have both been very helpful as we have gone through this process, and they have had to make some very difficult choices as they have to work with all 12 subcommittees. I want to congratulate them, as we have kicked off the start of a new appropriations season, and we have nearly the first appropriation bill to come to the floor.

But I do want to take a moment and thank the committee staff for their hard work, namely, I want to thank Stephanie Gupta and Paul Cox on the minority side; and, of course, the majority staff has worked very, very closely with the minority, and we do appreciate their hard work.

But on the majority staff, Jeff Ashford, Kris Mallard, Kathy Kraninger, Miles Taylor, and Rebecca Ore have all done a tremendous job in their work and, of course, last but not least, Ben Nicholson. Ben Nicholson serves as the clerk of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations and Ben has done a tremendous

job as he has helped me up here as I have managed the time on this particular piece of legislation.

□ 1620

Also, on the appropriations staff, Jennifer Miller and Mike Robinson have done a great job, and also Jim Kulikowski. They have been very helpful in making sure this process moves forward. As you can imagine, there's a lot of moving parts. And so I do want to thank Mike, Jennifer, and Jim for their hard work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chance as we enter the homestretch of this debate to also express my appreciation to the many colleagues and staff members who have brought us to this point.

I want to commend Chairman ADERHOLT for this first voyage that he has taken as the subcommittee chairman and for the professional approach that he has brought to this, the careful process, the inclusive process. We are very grateful to him.

We had a good, full season of hearings and an open process in the Appropriations Committee, at markup, and we've had an open process here on the floor. That's the way Appropriations is supposed to work. And so I do commend the chairman and the leadership for that.

We have had a good, robust debate here. I certainly wish that we were in closer agreement on this bill. I have always believed that on Appropriations we should look out for the institutional role of this House in holding the executive accountable, on a bipartisan basis, no matter which party is in charge either here or in the White House.

And so when the partisan divisions that inevitably characterize our work here, when those partisan divisions are evident on Appropriations, we try our best to overcome them. Historically, we have tried our best to overcome them. That has been very difficult this year, and we have a bill that we are divided on—but not on the entire bill by any means. As I said in my opening statement yesterday, the chairman and the majority have done a good job in keeping the frontline operations of the Homeland Security Department intact, keeping those operations strong.

Where they've fallen down is, I believe, to pass a budget resolution that contains a Homeland Security allocation that is simply inadequate. That has been compounded by the treatment of disaster funds beyond the President's request, a refusal to designate those as emergency funds. And so we are left with a bill that's severely squeezed. I won't elaborate except to say that this is the bigger picture we are dealing with, the radical shortfall in the State and local grants, a challenge we will have to continue to work on.

We will move on from this point today and be working with our colleagues in the other body and with the White House to come up with a final product that hopefully keeps faith with the States and local communities who depend on us for a reliable partnership.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. One of the things that worries me about this bill is the role that the Department of Homeland Security plays in cybersecurity, and the fact that we have cut the S&T budget worries me because there were a number of projects, science and technology projects, underway to help us deal with this great threat to our country.

I serve on the Defense Subcommittee. I have served on the Intelligence Committee. Cybersecurity gives an asymmetrical advantage to others—China, Russia, and Iran—penetrating the networks of our major defense companies. We've had stories just this week about Lockheed. They say this has been going on since the nineties, and this issue worries me. And I am concerned. You have bioterrorism, you have the threat of nuclear weapons, and you have the threat of cyber attacks. And this last one is where we're most vulnerable.

And we have critical infrastructure in this country where homeland security is supposed to be taking care of it. The Defense Department has a Cyber Command. NSA has signed an agreement between the Defense Department and Homeland Security about sharing people so we get some of the expertise from the NSA over in Homeland Security.

My concern is that we still don't have a real plan for our utilities and our critical infrastructure in this country. This is something that Homeland Security has to be involved in. And, as I said, they support the rest of the government.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(On the request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Regarding this cybersecurity vulnerability, I think our financial institutions make a major effort at trying to protect themselves. But I have been told that our corporate intellectual property, over the last few years, \$1 trillion has been stolen through these cyber attacks from the free world to others. Some of these people are simply criminals. Some of them are acting under state authority. This is one of those issues that we are still vulnerable to. I just hope that these dramatic cuts in science and technology won't undermine our ability to come up with solutions on this cyber issue.

I also believe the administration, the President, his people and the Department of Homeland Security have a responsibility to make certain that we have a plan and we have an approach and we work with the private sector in a way that will make sure that we are protecting our critical infrastructure.

So I just urge you, Mr. PRICE, as the ranking member, and the chairman, Mr. ADERHOLT, to see if we can't make certain that, in conference, we keep some of this money in there for the cybersecurity programs that I know Dr. O'Toole is concerned about.

And I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I certainly share the commitment to developing a more comprehensive approach to cybersecurity, in particular, and to the research and development budget, in general.

With that, let me reiterate my thanks for all who have brought us to this point on both sides of the aisle, for our fine staff whom we always depend on, and the way the staff has scrambled with this amendment process—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. At a time like this floor debate when we've had such a flurry of amendments from all sorts of sources, we realize anew how dependent we are on our staff for staying on top of all this and helping guide us, and we are very grateful to our staff on both sides of the aisle.

With that, we are ready to proceed, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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 section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

□ 1630

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee for allowing an open rule, including the offering of my commonsense amendment which would save millions of dollars by cutting funding to 287(g), something that is called an immigration enforcement program which actually increases crime by expanding the mandate of our local crime-fighting officials.

This program effectively adds responsibilities, which should be Federal responsibilities, to local law enforcement so that they effectively engage in Federal immigration enforcement. So in-

stead of keeping serious criminals from threatening our communities, the 287(g) program forces police to waste their time trying to figure out the immigration status of noncriminals, as well as opening them up to charges of racial profiling which can be expensive to defend.

Instead of using our precious national security dollars on these kinds of programs, this bill has estimated savings of \$6.4 million for the next year alone. The inspector general found this program cost \$68 million.

These programs force local law enforcement officers to follow and enforce Federal laws even though they are not trained to do so. That is why law enforcement officers from across the country have spoken out against it. The IG found 33 problems the first time they investigated 287(g) last year. The biggest problem was that they found the program did not focus on noncitizens who actually pose a threat to public safety. Instead, it focused on noncitizens who pose no threat to public safety.

Mr. Chairman, 287(g) forces police officers to enforce laws that they are not trained to do, which is why law enforcement leaders across the board tend to oppose this law. Chief Acevedo from Austin said: "It's a matter of resources and priority. My priority is dealing with criminals and terrorism issues, not dealing with civil matters."

I would point out that the failure to enforce our Federal immigration laws is a Federal failure. It is a national disgrace. But the answer is not to add an additional burden to our hardworking men and women who are working at local law enforcement to keep our communities safe at a time when their budgets are being constrained, both the money they receive from Washington as well as their local and State revenue.

Why are we not listening to our local law enforcement officials? Instead of cutting funding for firefighters and police, we should stop wasting taxpayer funds on failed programs like 287(g).

I would like to show the detrimental effect of the 287(g) program. You can see across Arizona, Statewide, incidents of violent crime went down 12 percent in the last 10 years. But they have one particular sheriff who does a particularly bad job of protecting his community. His name is Sheriff Arpaio. He is one of the notorious abusers of the 287(g) program. In his community, Maricopa County, crime went up 58 percent. So you have a 12 percent decrease, and then you have this incompetent sheriff who has a 58 percent increase. Now he might be incompetent in other areas as well, but one of the main reasons crime has gone up in Maricopa County is because he has diverted law enforcement resources to try to enforce Federal laws that we in this body are irresponsibly ignoring day in and day out and that this bill does nothing to fix.

In recent years, local law enforcement has increased community policing efforts, working with our residents, both documented and undocumented, to finally defeat violent crime and keep our communities safe. This is the reason why law enforcement officers across my community, including sheriffs and police chiefs, are strongly opposed to 287(g), which stretches local police forces beyond the breaking point, hinders law enforcement, and causes real harm and danger to American citizens living in our communities.

I call on Congress to fix our broken immigration system. We need to enforce our Federal laws. We need better border security. Nobody from either side of the aisle disagrees with that. But it is time to stop playing politics with this issue and stop trying to foist a Federal responsibility into our already overtaxed local community law enforcement efforts, increasing crime and putting innocent Americans in harm's way at the risk of violent crime. I strongly urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse robust enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws. I happen to be from the State that has more of the Mexican border than any other State in the union. We are very familiar with that border. We have been living with it for our entire lives, and for the life of our State, from before the time when it was a State when it was a republic.

Our law enforcement officers see an epidemic of lawlessness flowing across the southern border of the United States, and our law enforcement officers in our area want to be involved in protecting the life, liberty, and property of Texans, and they are perfectly willing to be involved in protecting the life, liberty, and property of every American citizen. They are deeply concerned with what is going on at the border, and they want to be involved. They have volunteered to go into the 287(g) program, which gives them the kind of training which this Congress believes, and has made it a point to believe, that they should have, to know how to deal with immigrants who are looked upon as having special law enforcement needs.

The best I've been able to figure, I don't know who's imposing this on the people of Boulder, Colorado, but it is not being imposed on anybody else that I know of. It's a volunteer program. Law enforcement officers go and seek 287(g) training so that they can meet the standards that those who deal in immigration issues want them to know and understand. That's why we created 287(g), to make knowledgeable law enforcement officers at the local level

who could be effective in assisting those who have the Federal requirement and the Federal duty to protect our borders.

I only agree with one thing that I have heard from my colleague: I agree we are failing at protecting our borders. And I would argue that this committee has done everything and continues to do everything that we can do to protect our borders, and this bill does everything it can do and does not short the people who protect our borders any because of the dangerousness that we are aware of on our southern border.

I don't understand why enlisting volunteers to assist in law enforcement would be offensive to anyone. Now if the folks in Colorado don't want to be part of the 287(g) program, don't volunteer. This is not hard stuff. But, you know, if you are one or two lone border patrolmen out in the middle of Brewster County in Texas, you've got a lonely, dangerous job. You've got some people coming through for economic reasons, and other people coming through who are clearly violators of the laws of the State of Texas and the laws of the United States, and our law enforcement officers who believe in their oath of office to protect people that they are there to protect. They volunteer for this program so that they can assist the border patrolmen in the effort both of the economic immigrants and the criminal immigrants that come across our border.

And don't tell a law enforcement officer that he's not happy to see a sheriff when he sees a body of armed men packing packs across open country in Texas.

This is a good program. It is a program that has effectively trained law enforcement to understand the rules that Federal agents have to play by, and still gives them the authority to assist people who need their assistance.

I would argue that the safest part of the Texas border is the part of the border where local law enforcement and local sheriffs and Operation Stonegarden in other areas—the safest part is where local law enforcement has joined with Federal law enforcement to enforce the laws of this land. I think anything short of that is leaving resources on the table that will protect the United States of America.

So I very much oppose this gentleman's amendment, and I very much hope that our colleagues will realize that we need every resource available, and in my opinion even troops, to protect the American border and make sure Americans citizens and their property and their lives are safe. So I urge my colleagues to not support this gentleman's amendment, to oppose this gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1640

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend our colleague from Colorado for offering this amendment and for calling attention to some of the deficiencies in the 287(g) program and some of the ways that we need to do things better. I would have wished for an amendment, though, that would have given the Department of Homeland Security more direction.

If not 287(g), then what should immigration enforcement look like, and what should the interface between the Federal Government and local authorities look like?

I'm afraid the amendment doesn't really address that very conclusively, but I want to offer just a few reflections on the 287(g) program and the ways in which I think we might transition to something more positive in the area of immigration enforcement.

The gentleman from Colorado has already described the 287(g) program. It delegates Federal immigration authority to local law enforcement in many respects, supposedly to identify criminals in their communities. At the end of the fourth quarter of fiscal year '10, the 287(g) program had established partnerships with 72 local jurisdictions; but both the DHS Inspector General and the GAO have raised serious concerns about the 287(g) program, particularly related to the lack of oversight by Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the fact that it was not really living up, in many cases, to its stated goal of focusing on serious criminals who pose a threat to the community. The Inspector General found 33 major deficiencies in the program last year, and found 16 more when he recently reassessed the program. Based on these concerns, I believe we do need to take a hard look at 287(g) and make sure that that authority is being exercised properly before we simply appropriate more money for the program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, we pushed ICE to place a much greater emphasis on the identification and removal of criminal aliens. Part of ICE's response has been the Secure Communities Program, which we fully supported and continue to do so in this bill. Since 2008, resources have consistently grown for ICE to make progress in finding aliens in local and State custody and in removing them at the completion of their criminal sentences.

This bill supports the continued expansion of Secure Communities, which already covers many more prisons than 287(g). Now, Secure Communities isn't perfect either, by any means, but at least it does draw that bright line between the Federal role and the local role in immigration enforcement. It sorts that role out much more effectively than the 287(g) program. I think we should concentrate on making the Secure Communities Program work

well. It accomplishes the objectives of 287(g) but much more efficiently, much less problematically, and without deputizing local police to enforce immigration law. That is a proposition that is rife with complications and potential abuses.

So I believe—and our subcommittee determined last year—that it is desirable to transition from 287(g) into the Secure Communities format. As it stands now, it's a duplicative program. It is a program that is highly problematic. If we work on Secure Communities—make sure it works responsibly and monitor it carefully—I believe it can accomplish the task more efficiently to identify and remove dangerous criminals from our communities, which I think we very widely agree should be the main priority of immigration enforcement.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, for those who want to be sure that we send away from our borders illegal aliens who are criminals, they surely would understand that the 287(g) program gives us a hugely better opportunity to do that.

We've got a few thousand ICE agents, Border Patrol agents, doing a wonderful job, and they are dedicated public servants; but there are so few of them, relatively speaking, to deal with the millions of illegals crossing our borders, many of whom are here in a criminal nature. A few thousand Federal agents. By working with local law enforcement, we can multiply that by hundreds of thousands of enforcers of America's laws, and we can get rid of the criminal aliens in this country. That's what 287(g) empowers localities to do.

Now, it is entirely up to the local communities. If they don't want to participate in the 287(g) program and receive funds from the Federal Government to train their local officials on how to enforce the Federal law, it's their choice. They don't have to do it. We don't make them do it. It's purely a local option. Many communities have. However, if they want to and if they decide to seek Federal assistance, it is there for them through this program to help train their local officials. We need to better empower States and localities, and through this program, that's exactly what we do.

Everyone admits we are failing to protect our borders. There is a consensus around that. We have not protected America's borders yesterday, today or probably tomorrow. The reason we can't do it is that we are outnumbered, and there is just not the Federal manpower to stop it. If you're going to want to try to stop it, particularly keep criminal aliens out, I don't understand why you would not want to gain some extra help from the local law

enforcement officers, properly trained under this program and financed. I don't understand that.

In 1996, this section was added as an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act for the express purpose to provide necessary immigration enforcement assistance to State and local law enforcement entities. It authorizes the department to enter into agreements with State and local law enforcement, equipping them through thorough training to perform important immigration enforcement functions. Local law enforcement agencies that are closest to the problem are more threatened by the criminality involved, and have more motivation to try to stop the criminal activity flowing across the border.

To date, the ICE agency has trained more than 1,240 State and local officers nationwide pursuant to this program. Since 2006, the 287(g) program has, according to ICE, resulted in the identification of more than 200,300 potentially removable aliens, mostly at local jails. Law enforcement agencies participate in the program in 24 different States: Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia. Those States say to keep this program in place because it's helping us keep criminal aliens out of our local communities—no longer selling drugs to our kids, no longer engaging in any criminal activity in their communities.

So I urge the defeat of this amendment. This program works. It is the only program that has allowed us to engage tens of thousands of local law enforcement officers to help with this consuming problem we have with criminal aliens.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

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

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

□ 1650

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to shed some light on an amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) last night which the House will vote on later today.

The gentleman from Iowa came to the floor at approximately 11:30 p.m. last night and under the open rule offered an amendment prohibiting any funds from the Homeland Security bill

to be used for ACORN and ACORN-affiliated community organizations. Besides the fact is that it is clear that ACORN or ACORN-affiliated community organizations are not eligible for funds from the Homeland Security appropriations bill, because as far as I know, ACORN is not in the business of homeland security.

In addition to going after ACORN, the gentleman from Iowa in his amendment goes after 300 organizations. Let me quote from Ranking Member NORM DICKS' eloquent words during debate last night:

You're asking this House to vote on something that you haven't verified, and you don't know what these groups are all about.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), ranking member of Homeland Security appropriations, also asked a good question when he asked for specific information on what was the wrongdoing of these organizations. The gentleman from Iowa's response was that he didn't know.

So, Mr. Chair, to highlight the ridiculous nature of this amendment, the gentleman from Iowa is asking this body to vote on an amendment to beat up on ACORN and ACORN-affiliated organizations and cannot produce a single item of evidence for the record of wrongdoing by these organizations in his amendment.

Mr. Chair, one of the organizations listed, and the reason I take certain umbrage to this amendment is that it's an organization in my own district, is known as Minnesota Neighborhoods Organizing for Change. Minnesota Neighborhoods Organizing for Change are people who are known to me. They work hard every day. They work on foreclosure. They work on trying to get people to vote. They work with poor people in particular.

Let me read from their Web site to describe to you what they actually do:

Minnesota Neighborhoods Organizing for Change is a new nonprofit committed to building power in low-income and moderate-income neighborhoods through community organizing, civic engagement, political mobilization, and education. NOC is a member-funded and member-run organization that takes on the social and economic justice issues that impact our community the most. Whether it's huge issues like health care and bank reform or a small neighborhood concern like getting a stop sign installed at a dangerous intersection, NOC members work together to apply their collective strength and get things done.

This is a good, decent civic service organization, Mr. Chair, and I resent them being slandered in the way they were last night.

So how did Minnesota Neighborhoods Organizing for Change get on the gentleman from Iowa's hit list? Well, they used to be an affiliate of ACORN. Now they're an independent organization. So I guess there is guilt by association.

Also, Mr. Chair, since the gentleman from Iowa wants this body to talk

about ACORN, a community organizing group, on the Homeland Security bill, I think it's fair to talk about ACORN.

The House, in 2009, voted to defund ACORN. I voted against that defunding amendment because it was unconstitutional and based on politics of fear and guilt by association. It was a good vote, and I'm proud I voted that way, because a Federal court, Mr. Chair, in December 2009, found the House ban on ACORN grants unconstitutional, and I'm proud I was not on the side of that unconstitutional vote.

Finally, the GAO, in a study released in June 2010, found, quote, no evidence of ACORN mismanaging Federal funds. Again, we held this organization up for ridicule and destruction, and we, the Congress, were wrong.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman. I hope other Members who are watching this tonight will look at this amendment that the gentleman from Iowa offered last evening. There are over 300 organizations. And what the gentleman has said here is why the gentleman from North Carolina and I so vehemently opposed this amendment.

This is guilt by association; there is no question about it. These various groups, some of which were just mentioned in the media, the author of this amendment said repeatedly when asked about some of these groups by Mr. PRICE:

I have no facts; I have no information. The Government Oversight Committee put together this list and we added some more names that we found in the media.

And he couldn't describe one of these groups that had had a problem.

So I hope that the Members will carefully look at this list.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ELLISON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Again, this is a very serious amendment. I hope it will be defeated. I appreciate the gentleman rising to tell us about this group in Minnesota, and I am sure that there are other groups here that are doing good work, helping people, and that would hurt them, I think, in other areas. I think people would say, You're banned from being able to get a contract at Homeland Security even if you're doing good work helping people. That, I think, is a serious mistake.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me say quickly, I pulled some articles about this whole thing:

"House Ban on ACORN Grants is Ruled Unconstitutional."

"ACORN Workers Cleared of Illegality by Outside Probe."

"ACORN Did Nothing Wrong," is another headline.

"All You Need to Know About the ACORN Scandal and Who is Behind It."

Who was behind it? A young man named James O'Keefe, who was found guilty of a Federal crime.

[From NY Times.Com., Dec. 11, 2009]

HOUSE BAN ON ACORN GRANTS IS RULED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(By Janie Lorber)

WASHINGTON.—The federal government must continue to provide grant money to the national community organizing group Acorn, a federal court ruled Friday, saying that the House violated the Constitution when it passed a resolution barring the group from receiving federal dollars.

A judge at the United States District Court in Brooklyn issued a preliminary injunction that nullifies the resolution and requires the government to honor existing contracts with the group and review its applications for new grants unless the Obama administration appeals the decision.

The court ruled that the resolution amounted to a "bill of attainder," a legislative determination of guilt without trial, because it specifically punishes one group.

That provision plays a crucial, but rarely necessary, role in maintaining the balance of powers, said Eric M. Freedman, a professor of constitutional law at Hofstra Law School. "It says that the Congress may not act as judge, jury and executioner. That is precisely what the Congress sought to do in this case, and the district court was entirely right to enjoin it."

In the opinion, Judge Nina Gershon wrote of Acorn, "They have been singled out by Congress for punishment that directly and immediately affects their ability to continue to obtain federal funding, in the absence of any judicial, or even administrative, process adjudicating guilt."

The Justice Department said it was still reviewing the ruling Friday night.

Judge Gershon's opinion made a point of separating the court's ruling from the controversy surrounding Acorn, which is short for Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now.

The House acted after the organization came under fire for a series of embarrassing scandals, most notably the disclosure by conservative activists of videotape showing Acorn counselors giving mortgage advice to people posing as a pimp and a prostitute interested in setting up a brothel. Even before that, Republicans attacked the group, accusing it of voter registration fraud in 2008.

Jules Lobel, a lawyer at the Center for Constitutional Rights, which brought the suit on behalf of Acorn, said the resolution was the first time Congress had ever singled out one group for punishment. "Whenever you challenge a statute of Congress, it's always a significant political battle," Mr. Lobel said.

The chief executive of Acorn, Bertha Lewis, issued a statement calling the ruling a victory for the group and "the citizens who work through Acorn to improve their communities and promote responsible lending and homeownership."

In a lawsuit filed last month, Acorn that it was penalized by Congress "without an investigation" and had been forced to cut programs that counsel struggling homeowners and to lay off workers.

[From The Two-Way—NPR's News Blog, Dec. 7, 2009]

(ACORN WORKERS CLEARED OF ILLEGALITY BY OUTSIDE PROBE)

(By Frank James)

ACORN, the community organizing group which found itself embroiled in the latest of several controversies after some of its workers were recorded providing advice to a couple posing as a pimp and prostitute, was cleared of illegality in the matter by the former Massachusetts attorney general.

But Scott Harshbarger, the lawyer ACORN hired to conduct a review, criticized the organization for bad management which it said contributed to the ACORN's problems. A major problem, he said, was that the organization grew too quickly, neglecting training of its workers and other essentials.

An excerpt of Harshbarger's report:

The serious management challenges detailed in our report are the fault of ACORN's founder and a cadre of leaders who, in their drive for growth, failed to commit the organization to the basic, appropriate standards of governance and accountability. As a result, ACORN not only fell short of living its principles but also left itself vulnerable to public embarrassment. This hidden camera controversy is an apt example.

While some of the advice and counsel given by ACORN employees and volunteers was clearly inappropriate and unprofessional, we did not find a pattern of intentional, illegal conduct by ACORN staff; in fact, there is no evidence that action, illegal or otherwise, was taken by any ACORN employee on behalf of the videographers. Instead, the videos represent the byproduct of ACORN's long-standing management weaknesses, including a lack of training, a lack of procedures, and a lack of on-site supervision.

Harshbarger provided ACORN with nine recommendations:

1. ACORN should return its organizational focus to its core competency—community organizing and citizen engagement empowerment, with related services—and transition away from the provision of services that may be provided more effectively and efficiently by others.

2. ACORN should consolidate, simplify and centralize its local and national organizational staffing, monitoring and supervision.

3. ACORN should develop a simplified national organization and board structure consisting of just two entities—a 501(c)(3) for charitable, non-profit fundraising, advocacy and education with a majority of independent members, and a 501(c)(4) for support of ACORN community organization and political activity, with at least one-third independent members.

4. ACORN should continue to implement the comprehensive internal governance program and strategy, including internal controls, compliance and codes of ethics, designed to educate and guide staff, volunteers and board members, that was recommended and has been adopted within the past year.

5. ACORN should recruit an independent ethics officer and/or independent inspector general to oversee and implement the governance and compliance program at the national level, and an independent member of the national board should chair a board-level ethics and governance committee.

6. ACORN should hire an appropriately qualified and experienced chief operating and financial officer, comptroller and in-house auditing staff.

7. ACORN should continue to strengthen its legal capacity to guide its governance reforms, coordinate the dissolution of all extraneous ACORN organizations and represent the organization's interests in litigation and investigations.

8. ACORN should require all of its state and local affiliates to agree to oversight by the national staff and board, and to adhere to appropriate national standards, including financial audits, training and supervision.

9. ACORN should formalize a strong, independent national advisory group and charge it with the responsibility to report within six months, and thereafter annually for two years, to the national board on the progress of the reform action plan.

After the videos by a conservative videographer went viral on the Internet, Congress passed legislation to prevent ACORN from receiving federal funding. ACORN is suing the federal government on the grounds that the legislation is an unconstitutional "bill of attainder" since it targets for punishment an individual group. ACORN fired some of the workers caught on video.

ACORN welcomed the report as an important step in its redemption. In a statement, ACORN CEO Bertha Lewis is quoted as saying:

"The report is part vindication, part constructive criticism and 100% roadmap to the future," ACORN CEO Bertha Lewis said.

"ACORN's leadership is pleased that this evaluation shows even the low-level employees portrayed in the videos did not engage in any illegal activity or seek to encourage it," Lewis continued. "Mr. Harshbarger was tough but fair in examining where ACORN has been and what we still need to accomplish in having the most effective possible organization to represent the interests of the communities we represent—low and moderate income, African American and Latino families across America."

It's unlikely the Harshbarger report will silence the group's conservative critics, however.

[From the NJ.com, June 15, 2010]

ACORN DID NOTHING WRONG. SO SAYS THE CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG OFFICE

(By John D. Atlas/NJ Voices)

On Monday, June 14, a preliminary probe by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) of ACORN has found no evidence the association or related organizations mishandled the \$40 million in federal money they received in recent years.

A review of grants by nine federal agencies found no problems with ACORN's grants. In my book *Seeds of Change* I document how ACORN, the largest most successful national anti-poverty organization in America, was forced to close its door.

The GAO interviewed and obtained documentation from grant program managers and staff from nine agencies; NeighborWorks, the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of the Treasury (Treasury), and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Department of Homeland Security and (DHS), the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Most of the grants were for housing-related purposes during fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

The GAO, an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress, is often called the "congressional watchdog." It investigates how the federal government spends taxpayer dollars. Nearly two dozen members of Congress requested an investigation after a series of complaints against ACORN and its affiliates. The complaints included an embezzlement matter, several cases of voter registration fraud, and the release of edited and misleading videotapes, secretly made by conservative activists that

appeared to implicate ACORN workers in several offices facilitating prostitution. In fact the staff in most of ACORN's offices turned the pair away, reported the couple to the police, refused to provide them any aid, and in one case tried to convince the phony prostitute to get counseling. In no ACORN office did employees file any paperwork or do anything illegal on the duo's behalf.

But Fox News broadcasted the deceptive tapes nearly around the clock for several days defaming ACORN.

While Republicans in Congress, who for years had accused ACORN of corruption, used the phony tapes to lead an effort to successfully strip the group of federal funding in 2009. Months later the group was exonerated from any wrongdoing by every official and independent investigation.

After the broadcast of the videotapes on Fox and CNN, the New York Times and Washington Post inaccurately reported that the ACORN workers in several offices facilitated prostitution. The papers also reported that O'Keefe was dressed up in a cartoonish pimp garb when he entered the ACORN offices, when he actually wore a dress shirt and slacks and identified himself as a student or friend of the young woman who posed as a prostitute. As a result of the conservative's smear campaign and the media's erroneous reporting of the smears as true, the U. S. Congress defunded ACORN, which led to many of its funders and allies to withdraw their support.

An independent investigation by the Brooklyn District Attorney's office and the Attorney General of California vindicated ACORN of any wrongdoing. A federal judge ruled that the law barring the group's receipt of federal funds was unconstitutional. Although Acorn had internal problems, it has never been convicted of wrongdoing. I capture the story of this incident as well as the history of ACORN, in my new book, *Seeds of Change, The Story of ACORN, America's most controversial anti-poverty community organizing group*. What happened to Acorn is one of the most bizarre incidents in recent history.

One of the activists, James O'Keefe recently pleaded guilty to charges of entering federal property under false pretenses when he attempted to embarrass Senator Mary Landrieu because of her support for national health care legislation. Acorn has never been convicted of a crime. But the right wing activist trying to entrap Acorn into committing an unlawful act, becomes a criminal.

[From the Huffingtonpost.com, Oct. 22, 2009]

ALL YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE ACORN SCANDAL AND WHO IS BEHIND IT

(By Mike Stark)

Andrew Breitbart says he cares a lot about the truth, but it appears that's only true when he isn't the one being questioned.

You remember Breitbart as Matt Drudge's junior partner, the proprietor of BigGovernment.com, and, apparently, babysitter for juvenile delinquents James O'Keefe and Hannah Giles, the conservative, hidden-camera-wielding duo that went undercover to obtain footage of low-level ACORN staffers.

They continued their media assault yesterday at the National Press Club. With assists from Republican Congressmen Steve King and Thad McCotter, Fox News and the aforementioned Andrew Breitbart, O'Keefe and Giles unleashed their most recent attack.

Let's review their story:

O'Keefe, dressed as a pimp, and Giles, disguised as a prostitute, visited ACORN offices where they asked for assistance purchasing a home. They claimed to have difficulty documenting income derived from the streets.

But they had so much money! In fact, it wasn't just the two of them—they had a whole crew of underage girls from El Salvador turning tricks for them. Hell, they had so much money, they needed help laundering it for the pimp's run for Congress.

Now let's tell the truth.

The truth is that O'Keefe never wore the pimp outfit into an ACORN office. Instead, he posed as a candidate for Congress that wanted to help a young woman caught in the trappings of prostitution. Supposedly, he wanted to help her, and her fellow prostitutes, escape the clutches of a brutal pimp by finding a place for them to live.

Look, the ACORN personnel aren't blameless. Some did and said some pretty stupid things and deserved to be fired. But the world in which they work is vastly different from the world most readers of this blog post recognize. CNN, *Desperate Housewives*, even *The Wire* aren't going to begin to convey the social chaos that defines the neighborhoods ACORN often serves.

Breitbart and his crew would have you believe that the ACORN staffers should have called the police when confronted with a prostitute.

I hope the staffers, at first, were celebrating. It's not often you see a prostitute assert control over her life and try to break free from a pimp. The idea that this one was trying to take a whole crew of vulnerable underage women with her must have been amazing!

In the first video below, Breitbart asks me if I'm disturbed by what I saw in the videos.

If he had let me answer, I would have told him that I perceive ACORN's mission to be helping the underserved. That I don't understand how helping women out of sexual slavery is something that deserves to be condemned. That what I'm disturbed by is the behavior being demonstrated by those up on the stage that would demonize people trying to make a real difference in people's lives.

In the end, I think I ruined their little press conference.

Evidently, it hadn't occurred to them that they might face serious scrutiny. Why, for example, does O'Keefe dress up in the ridiculous pimp garb for the bumpers of the video when he didn't wear that costume into the ACORN offices? Why is Breitbart attaching his name and credibility to someone that was kicked out of his Rutgers dorm for refusing to cease his use of racial slurs? Exactly why would Breitbart expect an ACORN staffer to call the police on a Congressional candidate trying to rescue a young prostitute from her vicious pimp?

Finally, in the second video, we learn all we need to know

After hiding behind the lawsuit and using it as a shield to deflect questions they did not want to answer, they refuse to commit to releasing every full and unedited tape they have in exchange for ACORN dropping all of its lawsuits.

If they really wanted the truth out there, why do they need to edit these tapes in the first place? Why aren't the unedited videos already in the public domain?

UPDATE: I've been questioned regarding my sourcing for the claim that O'Keefe was kicked out of his Rutgers dorm for frequently using racial slurs.

After checking with my sources, neither of which were James O'Keefe or any of his public comments, writings or other communication regarding the matter, I do not feel compelled to change anything about my post.

You may believe I should have informed my readers that Mr. O'Keefe denies the allegations, but frankly, as a matter of my own personal judgment, Mr. O'Keefe is not credible. As such, it would be irresponsible for me to report what I consider to be O'Keefe's prevarications. in the business of reporting

the truth as best as I know it. "Balancing" the truth with lies is not a practice I subscribe to.

[From Nola.com, May 25, 2011]

JAMES O'KEEFE DENIED PERMISSION TO TRAVEL OUTSIDE NEW JERSEY
(By The Associated Press)

A federal magistrate in New Orleans has refused to let conservative activist James O'Keefe make several trips outside New Jersey while he's on probation for a case in which he was accused of trying to tamper with the phones in Sen. Mary Landrieu's office.

Last week, O'Keefe asked for permission from Magistrate Daniel Knowles III to attend a conference in Washington, travel to Charleston, S.C., and Baltimore for paid speeches and make several personal trips to Maryland.

Knowles, who denied that request Monday without explanation, had approved several previous requests by O'Keefe to travel outside New Jersey. O'Keefe's attorney, Michael Madigan, said in court papers that prosecutors and his client's probation officer didn't object to his latest request.

On Tuesday, Madigan said he hadn't seen Monday's order.

"All his prior travel had been approved," Madigan said. "Obviously, the young man needs to travel to make a living."

O'Keefe and three others pleaded guilty last year to misdemeanor charges of entering federal property under false pretenses.

The FBI has said O'Keefe used his cell phone to try to capture video of two others who posed as telephone repairmen and asked to see the phones at Landrieu's office. O'Keefe has said the group was trying to investigate complaints that constituents calling Landrieu's office couldn't get through to criticize the Democrat's support of a health care reform bill.

O'Keefe is famous for wearing a pimp costume in a video that embarrassed the community organizing group ACORN. Knowles sentenced him last May to three years of probation, 100 hours of community service and a \$1,500 fine.

[From Scoop.co.nz, June 2, 2011]

FEDERAL JUDGE DENIES FIRST AMENDMENT IN ACORN WORKER LAWSUIT
(By Brad Friedman)

Rightwing activists and propagandists James O'Keefe and Hannah Giles, employees of con-artist and propagandist Andrew Breitbart, may not use the First Amendment as an excuse for breaking the law in California, according to a federal judge's ruling this week.

Judge M. James Lorenz rejected the defendants' argument and motion for summary judgment in federal court, as part of the civil lawsuit filed against them by former San Diego ACORN worker Juan Carlos Vera.

Giles had previously thrown O'Keefe under a bus by arguing that she should not be held accountable at all for violating California's Invasion of Privacy Act [CA Penal Code §632], since he, not she, was actually wearing the hidden video camera used to secretly tape their conversations with Vera, even after they had asked if their meeting would be kept confidential.

For his part, O'Keefe, a convicted federal criminal, argued that he was allowed to violate the law because the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment protected him as a "journalist". The judge ruled against the defendants on all points. . . .

According to Maria Dinzeo of Courthouse News Service:

Juan Carlos Vera claimed James O'Keefe III and Hannah Giles visited his office in Au-

gust 2009, and conspired to create video and audio tapes of him, even after asking him if their conversation would be confidential.

[Lorenz ruled] that the law "is directed to the surreptitious recording of confidential communications and not the manner or method of recording the conversation." Given the meaning of the word "record," Lorenz found Giles equally responsible.

Lorenz also rejected O'Keefe's motion for judgment on the pleadings, in which he argued that First Amendment protections for journalists supersede the California Privacy Act. Since there was a mutual understanding that the conversation was confidential, Lorenz found that the privacy law "is not an overbroad intrusion on expose newsgathering in which O'Keefe participates."

"Exposé newsgathering" is not what O'Keefe traffics in, as demonstrated again most recently by, ironically enough, the "news" website of Fox "News" host Glenn Beck after a similarly deceptive and secretly video taped smear of an NPR employee by O'Keefe last March.

But O'Keefe's long track record of deceptive video hit-jobs was not at issue in this particular legal argument.

In his ruling [PDF], Judge Lorenz highlighted specific portions of the CA law which is violated by "Every person who, intentionally and without the consent of all parties to a confidential communication, by means of any electronic amplifying or recording device, eavesdrops upon or records the confidential communication."

The ruling goes on to further cite the statute which reads "The term 'confidential communication' includes any communication carried on in circumstances as may reasonably indicate that any party to the communication desires it to be confined to the parties thereto."

"California's law is quite clear," Lorenz wrote in response to the First Amendment arguments by O'Keefe and Giles, "that persons who engage in news gathering are not permitted to violate criminal laws in the process."

O'Keefe and Giles were sued by Vera last summer, after an investigation by California's Attorney General found that the pair had likely violated the CA Privacy Act by secretly taping workers at ACORN. The duo were spared criminal charges for violation of the same law after bargaining for immunity in exchange for finally providing law enforcement with the unedited videos of their secretly taped meetings with ACORN employees.

After examining the unedited video tapes, the CA AG echoed all other independent investigations of the tapes published by Breitbart, to determine that they had been "severely edited" to present a false portrait of ACORN and of the meetings with workers there.

The AG found the CA ACORN workers "committed no violation of criminal law." Previously, a New York District Attorney investigation also found "no criminality" in the "highly edited" video tapes of ACORN workers there.

Similarly findings were also offered by a former Massachusetts attorney general and an investigation by the Congressional Research Service.

Vera, however, and other ACORN employees across the country, were fired by the organization shortly after Breitbart's publication of the falsely edited video tapes on his Rightwing political websites.

No employees of ACORN have been charged with any crimes in relation to the O'Keefe/Giles/Breitbart hit-jobs carried out during the summer of 2009 in which Breitbart and O'Keefe had purported to the media that he had played a pimp during meetings with

ACORN to Giles, who was dressed as a prostitute during those encounters. In fact, ACORN workers had been told that O'Keefe, playing her conservatively dressed boyfriend, was hoping to rescue Giles from an abusive pimp who had been threatening her life and stealing her money. (One of the videos was deceptively edited to make it appear that ACORN workers had told Giles to bury her money in the backyard, so the government couldn't get at it for tax purposes. In fact, as the actual transcripts revealed, the worker was advising her on how to keep the abusive pimp from stealing it from her. Giles blatantly lied about that point on Fox "News.")

Their hoax was successful, however, resulting in the loss of federal funding for ACORN which led to a loss of private donations, eventually forcing the four-decade-old community organization to close its doors.

ACORN had long been targeted by Rightwingers due largely to their years-long success in legally registering millions of legal low- and middle-income citizens to vote. Most such voters tend to vote for Democrats.

Despite persistent, yet evidence-free, claims by the Right over many years that ACORN participated in "voter fraud," there is no known evidence of even a single fraudulent vote ever having been cast in any election due to an improper registration by any ACORN worker.

The BRAD BLOG spent a fair portion of 2010 demonstrating to the New York Times and other media outlets that they had repeatedly misrepresented the story of the hoax carried out by O'Keefe, Giles and Breitbart. In fact, O'Keefe neither dressed as a "pimp" nor represented himself as one in the secretly-taped meetings with ACORN workers, even as he famously lied to the public and media about having done so.

Following our numerous exposés, the NY Times was eventually forced to issue corrections for some of their reporting after their Public Editor admitted both he and the paper had been "wrong" about O'Keefe's version of the story which they had reported uncritically.

In addition to the civil lawsuit O'Keefe and Giles are facing in San Diego, O'Keefe's high-powered Republican attorneys were able to obtain a plea deal for him in another case, in which felony counts were lowered to misdemeanor charges in exchange for his guilty plea.

That case involved a scam similar to the one carried out against ACORN. O'Keefe and his fellow conspirators were caught secretly taping federal employees at the New Orleans office of Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-LA) after entering the property under false pretenses and attempting to access her phone system.

For his part, admitted liar Breitbart is busy defending himself against a lawsuit brought by former USDA official Shirley Sherrod. She was fired after Breitbart published yet another deceptively edited video, purporting to serve as evidence that the African-American Sherrod was discriminating against white farmers in her role as a federal worker.

The unedited version of the tape demonstrated that Sherrod had been doing the complete opposite of what Breitbart attempted to illustrate her as doing.

Though an apology was quickly issued to Sherrod by the White House, they have never apologized for having defunded ACORN under the fraudulent pretenses knowingly presented to the public by O'Keefe, Giles and Breitbart.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak about what I think is a very, very important undertaking. It deals with our democratic system and what works against it.

My amendment would require that anyone that receives an appropriation, a contract, doing business with the Federal Government produce full disclosure relative to political expenditures.

I raised this because I think there is a dark corner of our system that is not being addressed, and it is an issue that is as much about deficit reduction as it is about our democracy. We know that there are political expenditures that are made. Some are disclosed; some aren't. I think it's important to state that I think, I really believe, that this could have been a bipartisan agreement. It's important to remember that our Republican colleagues were for disclosure before they were against it.

In 2000, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL asked, "Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?"

In 2007, on Meet the Press, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said, we need "full disclosure of all the money that we raise and how it's spent. And I think sunlight is the best disinfectant."

I agree with what the Speaker said in 2007, but since then our colleagues have changed their minds. Not a single Republican voted for the DISCLOSE Act. And when I offered an amendment similar to this one in February, it wasn't even allowed to be brought up for a vote. Since then, Republicans have gone on high alert at the news that the President is considering an Executive order to create the same kind of disclosure they used to favor.

□ 1700

I know that the National Chamber of Commerce has weighed in, and they've raised First Amendment. I'm really interested in this new effort and interest of the National Chamber of Commerce, and I hope they'll come to my office and talk to me about forming a coalition on First Amendment rights. This is not about that. This is not about that, and no one can say that with a straight face.

My constituents are very smart; they can think for themselves. But even the

smartest people can't make a decision without critical information, and today's broken system leaves millions of Americans in the dark. They don't know who's paying for what; they don't know who is being paid to say what because there is not disclosure at the Federal level.

So this levels this out. It very simply says that we're on the side of taxpayers, that we are going to make sure that whether it's procurement or contracts or appropriations, that we want to be on the side of the taxpayer, on the side of the taxpayer having full disclosure so that they not only know who's doing business with the Federal Government, but where these tax dollars are going.

There's a requirement at the SEC, Mr. Chairman, where boards of directors, who essentially are the congress of a corporation, must disclose their financial interests. Why? So that shareholders know. Well, guess who the shareholders are in the country? The taxpayers, the citizens. This is in many ways a backdoor earmark, and we need to get rid of it.

So I hope that this will be made in order. And I also think that this is a very important effort for full disclosure at the Federal level, whoever does business with the Federal Government, that they disclose. It's a fair requirement, it's a simple requirement, and I think it's something we should all agree on: disclosure, disclosure, disclosure.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

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

The rule states, in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law and it requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of whether a corporation discloses certain contributions. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill would be improved by an

amendment similar to that which Ms. ESHOO just offered, and here's why. Justice Brandeis said sunlight is the great antiseptic of democracy, and we have followed his teaching to a great extent in conducting our democracy.

Mr. Chairman, you and I and every other Member on this floor must disclose every dollar we raise and every dollar we spend in the pursuit of our politics, so must the National Republican Campaign Committee, so must the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, so must people running for the United States Senate and for the Office of Presidency. And I think our democracy is strengthened by this.

Now, we have a disagreement over whether there should be limitations on what people may spend. I, frankly, believe that limitations are appropriate, but I know that some of our colleagues who follow the libertarian principle believe that limitations on what someone may spend is a violation of someone's right of free speech. I respectfully disagree, but I understand it. There should be no disagreement, though, over a universal requirement to disclose who has spent what.

If you're proud of what you say, then you ought to let people know who it was that said it. But instead we have, as my friend from California said, a dark corner of American politics where people who wish to manipulate the outcome of elections and influence legislation have a special privilege that Republicans and Democrats in this House do not have, that Members of the Senate do not have, that the Presidential candidates do not have. They can say what they want to say but not say who they are. They can hide behind corporate veils and within corporate shadows to fail to disclose who they are. Now, I find this to be puzzling.

I think the Members of this House are proud of what we say. I think the Members of this House want the public to know whom we support and whom we oppose because we believe in what we say. Who are these people who want to spend hundreds of millions, maybe billions, of dollars to influence elections but are afraid the public will find out who they are? And why should they enjoy this special privilege?

So I think we do need an amendment like that that Ms. ESHOO put forward that says that if you want the privilege of doing business with the United States Government, then one of the conditions is to participate in a healthy democracy that runs that United States Government. And that healthy democracy would include a requirement that people winning business with our government meet the same level of disclosure that every single one of us does.

I'm proud of the things that my party and my friends say on the floor; and I'm, frankly, proud of what our adversaries say on the floor because they believe in good faith that what they say is right for the country. And they

don't hide a thing—maybe the public thinks we should hide sometimes when we say the things we do, but we don't hide a thing. Why should there be a special class of Americans who have the prerogative of free speech, but not the obligation to identify themselves when they speak?

This is an insipid, insidious threat to the free exchange of ideas. We should use every tool within our constitutional purview to stop this threat. I think Ms. ESHOO has a great idea, and I hope that under a truly open rule the day will come when we can consider her idea.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. SCALISE of Louisiana.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.
An amendment by Mr. CRAVAACK of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ROKITA of Indiana.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ROKITA of Indiana.

Amendment No. 42 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

An amendment by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. MICA of Florida.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 213, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—207

Adams	Bachmann	Benishek
Aderholt	Bachus	Berg
Akin	Barletta	Billbray
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Amash	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Austria	Bass (NH)	Black

Blackburn	Griffin (AR)
Bonner	Griffith (VA)
Bono Mack	Guinta
Boren	Guthrie
Boustany	Hall
Brady (TX)	Hanna
Brooks	Harper
Broun (GA)	Harris
Buchanan	Hartzler
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)
Buerkle	Hayworth
Burgess	Heck
Burton (IN)	Hensarling
Calvert	Herger
Camp	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Huelskamp
Canseco	Huizenga (MI)
Cantor	Hultgren
Capito	Hunter
Carter	Hurt
Cassidy	Issa
Chabot	Jenkins
Coble	Johnson (OH)
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Jordan
Conaway	Kelly
Cravaack	King (IA)
Crawford	Kingston
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)
Culberson	Kline
Davis (KY)	Labrador
Denham	Lamborn
Dent	Landry
DesJarlais	Latham
Dreier	Latta
Duffy	Lewis (CA)
Duncan (SC)	Long
Duncan (TN)	Lucas
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer
Farenthold	Lummis
Fincher	Lungren, Daniel
Fitzpatrick	E.
Flake	Mack
Fleischmann	Marchant
Fleming	Marino
Flores	McCarthy (CA)
Forbes	McCaul
Fortenberry	McClintock
Fox	McHenry
Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Gallegly	McMorris
Gardner	Rodgers
Garrett	Meehan
Gerlach	Mica
Gibbs	Miller (FL)
Gibson	Miller (MI)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
Gohmert	Mulvaney
Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Gosar	Noem
Gowdy	Nugent
Granger	Nunes
Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
Graves (MO)	Olson

NOES—213

Ackerman	Cohen
Altmire	Connolly (VA)
Andrews	Conyers
Baca	Cooper
Baldwin	Costa
Barrow	Costello
Bass (CA)	Courtney
Becerra	Critz
Berkley	Crowley
Berman	Cuellar
Biggert	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)
Blumenauer	DeFazio
Boswell	DeGette
Brady (PA)	DeLauro
Braley (IA)	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Butterfield	Dicks
Capps	Dingell
Capuano	Doggett
Cardoza	Dold
Carnahan	Donnelly (IN)
Carney	Doyle
Carson (IN)	Edwards
Chandler	Ellison
Chu	Emerson
Cicilline	Engel
Clarke (MI)	Eshoo
Clarke (NY)	Farr
Clay	Fattah
Cleaver	Filner
Clyburn	Frank (MA)

Palazzo	King (NY)
Paul	Kissell
Paulsen	Kucinich
Pearce	Lance
Pence	Langevin
Pitts	Larsen (WA)
Platts	Larson (CT)
Poe (TX)	LaTourette
Pompeo	Lee (CA)
Posey	Levin
Price (GA)	Lewis (GA)
Quayle	Lipinski
Reed	LoBiondo
Rehberg	Loeback
Renacci	Lowey
Ribble	Lujan
Rigell	Lynch
Rivera	Maloney
Roby	Markey
Roe (TN)	Matheson
Rogers (AL)	Matsui
Rogers (KY)	McCarthy (NY)
Rogers (MI)	McCollum
Rohrabacher	McCotter
Rokita	McDermott
Rooney	McGovern
Ross (FL)	McIntyre
Royce	McKinley
Ryan (WI)	McNerney
Scalise	Meeks
Schilling	Michaud
Schweikert	Miller (NC)
Scott (SC)	Miller, George
Scott, Austin	Moore
Sensenbrenner	Moran
Sessions	Murphy (CT)
Shuster	Murphy (PA)
Simpson	Nadler
Smith (NE)	Napolitano
Smith (TX)	
Southerland	
Stearns	
Stivers	
Stutzman	
Sullivan	
Terry	
Thompson (PA)	
Thornberry	
Tiberi	
Tipton	
Walberg	
Walden	
Webster	
West	
Westmoreland	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

Olver	Scott, David
Owens	Serrano
Pallone	Sewell
Pascrell	Sherman
Pastor (AZ)	Shimkus
Payne	Shuler
Pelosi	Sires
Perlmutter	Slaughter
Peters	Smith (NJ)
Peterson	Smith (WA)
Petri	Speier
Pingree (ME)	Stark
Polis	Sutton
Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Rahall	Tierney
Rangel	Tonko
Reichert	Towns
Reyes	Tsongas
Richardson	Turner
Richmond	Upton
Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Roskam	Velazquez
Ross (AR)	Visclosky
Rothman (NJ)	Walsh (IL)
Roybal-Allard	Walz (MN)
Runyan	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Schultz
Ryan (OH)	Waters
Sánchez, Linda	Watt
T.	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Weiner
Sarbanes	Welch
Schakowsky	Whitfield
Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Schmidt	Woolsey
Schock	Wu
Schrader	Yarmuth
Scott (VA)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Myrick
Chaffetz	Lankford	Neal
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Giffords	Manzullo	Schwartz

□ 1735

Messrs. SIREs, CARNEY, ROSKAM, HOLT, FATTAH, TURNER and PETRI changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BISHOP of Utah was allowed to speak out of order.)

FAREWELL TO THE PAGES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Fellow Members of the House, if you would turn your attention to the back rail there, you will see the pages who have served us for this past semester.

Thank you. You are supposed to applaud after I speak.

These are the kids who still get up in the middle of the night—at times which I thought was only a rumor—so they can go to an accredited high school in the Library of Congress and complete a full day of studies before they are here at 10 o'clock to serve us.

They have learned the process of government by watching us, which is a scary thought, but in the process of doing that, they have gained a healthy respect for our system, and they have learned lessons that they will take with them and made friendships they will take with them through the rest of their lives, and they have served this body well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages for

what they have done to serve this House of Representatives.

These groups of young people who come from all across the Nation represent what is good about our country. To become a page, Mr. Chairman, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience, they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends and learned the details of how our government operates.

As we all know the job of congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and their energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. At the same time they face a challenging academic schedule of classes in the House page school.

The pages have witnessed the House debate issues of war and peace, hunger and poverty, justice and civil rights. You have lived through history. You have seen Congress at moments of greatness, and you have seen Congress with its frailties. You have witnessed the workings of an institution that has endured well over 200 years.

No one has seen Congress and Members of Congress as close up as have you, and I am sure that you will consider your time spent in Washington, D.C., to be one of the most valuable and exciting experiences of your lives. With this experience, you will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

I would like to thank the members of the House Page Board, who provide such a service to this body: Congressman ROB BISHOP, not only a member of the board but a dear friend; DIANA DEGETTE, also a very good friend; and my good friend on the other side of the aisle, VIRGINIA FOXX.

I don't think we have ever had a disagreement in the page board. We reach unanimity there.

□ 1740

I also thank the Clerk of the House, Karen Haas; the Sergeant at Arms, Bill Livingood; and Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein. I want to thank them for their service on the House Page Board. And I thank all our departing pages.

SPRING 2011 PAGE CLASS

Daniel Ryan	Erin Brewer, TX
Ackerman, MI	Michael S. Brinkley, GA
Aram	
Ambartsumyan, WA	Emily M. Bull, PA
Dina Asfaha, CA	Ashley Burke, VA
Thomas B. Ashe, MA	Edgar Byrum Davis
Jihad Barnes, PA	Camacho, II, TX
Ryan Andrew Beeson, NC	Olivia Campbell, CA
Eliana Marie	Wesley Lanier
Bencosme, MA	Colston, GA
Annabelle Boyd, IL	D'ymond Shanty'1
	Dantzler, MD

Stephen Delahunt, WI	Alexander Murphy, NY
Timothy Desmarais, RI	Nicholas Jacob
Anna Dietderich, WA	Ensign Murphy, NY
William Powell	Frances Diane
Eddins, NC	Murray, WY
Jeremy-Clay	Imani Nicole
Fauchier, CA	Phillips, CT
Brad Fingerroot, MI	Dante Michael
Maria G. Garcia, CA	Procopio, RI
Christopher W.	Brendan Coltrane
Gardner, CA	Browner
Kari Ellen Gibson, IL	Pulsford, KY
Therese Gildea, CT	Natalie Queally, CA
Julian Alexander	Kiwanda Robinson, MD
Gilyard, NC	Molly Rose, IL
Micah C. Goodman, NC	Shayna Saliman, CA
Neshaun Grady, IN	Jack Sanders, IA
Lauren Harper, OH	Sarah Suchower, WA
Branden Haynes, VA	Shayna Talbott, FL
Sophia Hoog, SC	Adriana Threlkeld, CA
P.K. Isacs, CT	Daisy Torres, CA
Aminata Jamina, MA	Julie Towbin, FL
Stella Joh, CA	Amanda Trosen, MO
Alia Khan, IL	Allie Vreeman, MN
Anna Mather, WA	Ervis Vukaj, CT
Giovana Meza, CA	Kel Walters, TX
Thomas McKee, NC	Scott Weber, OH
Andrew Robert	Avery Weisel, NC
Mumford, MI	Conor Winters, NC
	Allison Zwierlein, CA

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who is also a member of the Page Board.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to add my congratulations to the pages and my great thanks to them for their service to us. They really do a tremendous amount to help this House work effectively. And I also want to say a thank you to the page coordinators, Ms. Keating and Ms. Sampson who are with them, who help facilitate their activities here. They also do a tremendous job and work long hours. And I'm very grateful to them.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, once again, we thank the pages who will be having their graduation ceremony tomorrow and then leaving us. We wish you very well on your further endeavors. Thank you very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 168, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—251

Adams	Gohmert	Nunes
Akin	Goodlatte	Nuneelee
Alexander	Gowdy	Olson
Altmire	Granger	Palazzo
Austria	Graves (GA)	Paul
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Barrow	Grimm	Peters
Bartlett	Guinta	Peterson
Bass (NH)	Guthrie	Petri
Benishek	Hall	Pitts
Berg	Hanna	Platts
Biggert	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bilbray	Harris	Pompeo
Billirakis	Hartzler	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Black	Hayworth	Quayle
Blackburn	Heck	Reed
Bonner	Hensarling	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Herger	Reichert
Boren	Herrera Beutler	Riacci
Boustany	Hochul	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Holden	Rigell
Brooks	Huelskamp	Rivera
Brown (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Buerkle	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Canseco	Jones	Roskam
Cantor	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Capito	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Cardoza	King (IA)	Royce
Carnahan	King (NY)	Ryunan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chabot	Kissell	Schilling
Chandler	Kline	Schmidt
Coble	Labrador	Schock
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott (SC)
Conaway	Landry	Scott, Austin
Cooper	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Costa	Latham	Sessions
Costello	LaTourette	Shimkus
Cravaack	Latta	Shuler
Crawford	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Long	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lucas	Southerland
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
DesJarlais	Lummis	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Lungren, Daniel	Stutzman
Dold	E.	Sullivan
Donnelly (IN)	Mack	Terry
Dreier	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Marino	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Ellmers	McCaul	Turner
Emerson	McClintock	Upton
Farenthold	McCotter	Walberg
Fincher	McHenry	Walden
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Walsh (IL)
Flake	McKeon	Webster
Fleischmann	McKinley	West
Fleming	McMorris	Westmoreland
Flores	Rodgers	Whitfield
Forbes	McNerney	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Meehan	Wittman
Foxx	Mica	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Womack
Gallely	Miller (MI)	Woodall
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Yoder
Garrett	Mulvaney	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Young (FL)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Gibson	Noem	
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	

NOES—168

Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Capuano
Aderholt	Bishop (NY)	Carney
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carson (IN)
Baca	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Chu
Bass (CA)	Braleigh (IA)	Cicilline
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Clarke (MI)
Berkley	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Berman	Capps	Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—12

Barton (TX)
Chaffetz
Ellison
Eshoo

□ 1747

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 397, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 397 I put my card in the slot, but didn't check whether my vote registered. It so happens that the vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair wishes to remind Members this is a series of 2-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 131, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—289

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebstack
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)

Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

NOES—131

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Ciocilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
McGovern
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lujan
Maloney
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

NOT VOTING—12

Canseco
Chaffetz
Frelinghuysen
Giffords
Lofgren, Zoe
Manzullo
Miller, George
Myrick

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1750

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 295, not voting 10, as follows:

Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—127

Adams Guthrie Paul
 Amash Gutierrez Payne
 Baldwin Hall Pearce
 Bartlett Harper Petri
 Barton (TX) Harris Pingree (ME)
 Benishkek Hartzler Poe (TX)
 Bishop (UT) Heck Polis
 Black Herrera Beutler Pompeo
 Broun (GA) Holt Posey
 Buerkle Huelskamp Price (GA)
 Burgess Huizenga (MI) Quayle
 Calvert Hultgren Reichert
 Camp Hunter Ribble
 Campbell Hurt Rigell
 Cardoza Issa Roe (TN)
 Cassidy Johnson (IL) Rooney
 Chabot Jones Roskam
 Chu Jordan Roybal-Allard
 Coble Kingston Ryan (WI)
 Coffman (CO) Kinzinger (IL) Scalise
 DesJarlais Kucinich Schmidt
 Labrador Duffy Schmeckert
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn Scott (SC)
 Duncan (TN) Landry Scott, Austin
 Farenthold Lankford Sensenbrenner
 Finer Lee (CA) Smith (NE)
 Fincher Mack Smith (NJ)
 Flake Marchant Speier
 Fleming McCaul Stearns
 Forbes McGintock Stutzman
 Fortenberry McGovern Sullivan
 Gardner McKeon Terry
 Garrett McMorris Tipton
 Gibbs Rodgers Tonko
 Gibson Mica Turner
 Gohmert Michaud Upton
 Goodlatte Miller (FL) Walberg
 Gosar Miller, Gary Walsh (IL)
 Gowdy Mulvaney Webster
 Graves (GA) Nunnallee Wilson (SC)
 Griffith (VA) Pallone Wu
 Grijalva Pastor (AZ) Young (AK)
 Guinta

NOES—295

Ackerman Clarke (MI) Frank (MA)
 Aderholt Clarke (NY) Franks (AZ)
 Akin Clay Fudge
 Alexander Cleaver Gallegly
 Altmire Clyburn Garamendi
 Andrews Cohen Gerlach
 Austria Cole Gingrey (GA)
 Baca Conaway Gonzalez
 Bachmann Connolly (VA) Granger
 Bachus Conyers Graves (MO)
 Barletta Cooper Green, Al
 Barrow Costa Green, Gene
 Bass (CA) Costello Griffin (AR)
 Bass (NH) Courtney Grimm
 Becerra Cravaack Hanabusa
 Berg Crawford Hanna
 Berkley Crenshaw Hastings (FL)
 Berman Berlan Critz Hastings (WA)
 Biggert Crowley Hayworth
 Bilbray Cuellar Heinrich
 Bilirakis Culberson Hensarling
 Bishop (GA) Cummings Herger
 Bishop (NY) Davis (CA) Higgins
 Blackburn Davis (IL) Himes
 Blumenaier Davis (KY) Hinchey
 Bonner DeFazio Hinojosa
 Bono Mack DeGette Hochul
 Boren DeLauro Holden
 Boswell Denham Honda
 Boustany Dent Hoyer
 Brady (PA) Deutch Inslee
 Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart Israel
 Braley (IA) Dicks Jackson (IL)
 Brooks Dingell Jackson Lee
 Brown (FL) Doggett (TX)
 Buchanan Dold Jenkins
 Bucshon Donnelly (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Burton (IN) Doyle Johnson (OH)
 Butterfield Dreier Johnson, E. B.
 Canseco Edwards Johnson, Sam
 Cantor Ellison Kaptur
 Capito Ellmers Keating
 Capps Emerson Kelly
 Capuano Engel Kildee
 Carnahan Eshoo Kind
 Carney Farr King (IA)
 Carson (IN) Fattah King (NY)
 Carter Fitzpatrick Kissell
 Castor (FL) Fleischmann Kline
 Chandler Flores Lance
 Cicilline Foxx Langevin

Larsen (WA) Oliver Sessions
 Larson (CT) Owens Sewell
 Latham Palazzo Sherman
 LaTourette Pascrell Shimkus
 Latta Paulsen Shuler
 Levin Pelosi Shuster
 Lewis (CA) Pence Simpson
 Lewis (GA) Perlmutter Sires
 Lipinski Peters Slaughter
 LoBiondo Peterson Smith (TX)
 Loeb sack Pitts Smith (WA)
 Long Platts Southerland
 Lowey Price (NC) Stark
 Lucas Quigley Stivers
 Luetkemeyer Rahall Sutton
 Lujan Rangel Thompson (CA)
 Lummis Reed Thompson (MS)
 Lungren, Daniel Rehberg Thompson (PA)
 E. Renacci Thornberry
 Lynch Reyes Tiberi
 Maloney Richardson Tierney
 Marino Richmond Towns
 Markey Rivera Tsongas
 Matheson Roby Van Hollen
 Matsui Rogers (AL) Velazquez
 McCarthy (CA) Rogers (KY) Visclosky
 McCarthy (NY) Rogers (MI) Walden
 McCollum Rohrabacher Walz (MN)
 McCotter Rokita Wasserman
 McDermott Ros-Lehtinen Heck
 McHenry Ross (AR) Heinrich
 McIntyre Ross (FL) Herrera Beutler
 McKinley Rothman (NJ) Holt
 McNeeroy Royce Poe (TX)
 Meehan Runyan Poliss
 Meeks Ruppberger Welch
 Miller (MI) Ryan (OH) West
 Miller (NC) Sanchez, Linda Westmoreland
 Moore T. T. Whitfield
 Moran Sanchez, Loretta Wilson (FL)
 Murphy (CT) Sarbanes Wittman
 Murphy (PA) Schakowsky Wolf
 Nadler Schiff Womack
 Napolitano Schilling Woodall
 Neugebauer Schock Wooley
 Noem Schrader Yarmuth
 Nugent Scott (VA) Yoder
 Nunes Scott, David Young (FL)
 Olson Serrano Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Chaffetz Lofgren, Zoe Rush
 Frelinghuysen Manullo Schwartz
 Giffords Myrick
 Hirono Neal

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1753

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—123

Amash Benishkek Buchanan
 Baldwin Bishop (UT) Buerkle
 Bartlett Black Burgess
 Barton (TX) Broun (GA) Calvert

Camp Campbell Hurt
 Cardoza Campbell Issa
 Cassidy Cardoza Johnson (IL)
 Chabot Cassidy Johnson, Sam
 Clarke (MI) Jones
 Crenshaw Jordan
 DesJarlais Kingston
 Duffy Kinzinger (IL)
 Duncan (SC) Kucinich
 Duncan (TN) Labrador
 Farenthold Lamborn
 Finer Landry
 Flake Filner
 Fleming Flake
 Forbes Fleming
 Fortenberry Forbes
 Garrett Fortenberry
 Gibson Garrett
 Gingrey (GA) McKeon
 Gohmert McMorris
 Goodlatte Rodgers
 Gowdy Mica
 Graves (GA) Michaud
 Griffith (VA) Miller (FL)
 Guinta Mulvaney
 Guthrie Murphy (CT)
 Gutierrez Paul
 Harris Pearce
 Heck Petri
 Heinrich Pingree (ME)
 Herrera Beutler Platts
 Holt Poe (TX)
 Huelskamp Poliss
 Huizenga (MI) Pompeo
 Hultgren Posey
 Hunter Price (GA)

NOES—300

Ackerman Cole
 Adams Conaway
 Aderholt Connolly (VA)
 Akin Conyers
 Alexander Cooper
 Altmire Costa
 Andrews Costello
 Austria Courtney
 Baca Cravaack
 Bachmann Crawford
 Bachus Critz
 Barletta Crowley
 Barrow Cuellar
 Bass (CA) Culberson
 Bass (NH) Cummings
 Becerra Davis (CA)
 Berg Davis (IL)
 Berkley Davis (KY)
 Berman DeFazio
 Biggert DeGette
 Bilbray DeLauro
 Bilirakis Denham
 Bishop (GA) Dent
 Bishop (NY) Deutch
 Blackburn Diaz-Balart
 Blumenaier Dicks
 Bonner Dingell
 Bono Mack Doggett
 Boren Dold
 Boswell Donnelly (IN)
 Boustany Doyle
 Brady (PA) Dreier
 Brady (TX) Edwards
 Braley (IA) Ellison
 Brooks Ellmers
 Brown (FL) Emerson
 Bucshon Engel
 Burton (IN) Eshoo
 Butterfield Farr
 Canseco Fattah
 Cantor Fincher
 Capito Fitzpatrick
 Capps Fleischmann
 Capuano Flores
 Carnahan Foxx
 Carney Frank (MA)
 Carson (IN) Franks (AZ)
 Carter Fudge
 Castor (FL) Gallegly
 Chandler Garamendi
 Chu Gardner
 Cicilline Gerlach
 Clarke (NY) Gibbs
 Clay Cleaver
 Cleaver Clyburn
 Coble Graves (MO)
 Coffman (CO) Green, Al
 Cohen Green, Gene

Griffin (AR)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holden
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 Dicks (TX)
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kissell
 Kline
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan
 Lummis
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch

Mack Peters Shuler
 Maloney Peterson Shuster
 Marino Pitts Simpson
 Markey Price (NC) Sires
 Matheson Quigley Smith (TX)
 Matsui Rahall Smith (WA)
 McCarthy (CA) Rangel Speier
 McCarthy (NY) Reed Stivers
 McCaul Rehberg Stutzman
 McCollum Renacci Sullivan
 McCotter Reyes Sullivan
 McDermott Richardson
 McGovern Richmond Thompson (CA)
 McHenry Rivera Thompson (MS)
 McIntyre Roby Thompson (PA)
 McKinley Rogers (KY) Thornberry
 McNerney Rogers (MI) Tierney
 Meehan Rohrabacher Towns
 Meeks Rokita Van Hollen
 Miller (MI) Ros-Lehtinen Velázquez
 Miller (NC) Ross (AR) Visclosky
 Miller, George Ross (FL) Walberg
 Moore Rothman (NJ) Walden
 Moran Royce Walz (MN)
 Murphy (PA) Runyan Wasserman
 Nadler Ruppertsberger Schultz
 Napolitano Ryan (OH) Waters
 Neugebauer Sanchez, Linda
 Noem T. Watt
 Nugent Sarbanes Waxman
 Nunes Schakowsky Weiner
 Nunnelee Schiff Welch
 Olson Schilling West
 Olver Schock Westmoreland
 Owens Schrader Whitfield
 Palazzo Scott (VA) Wilson (FL)
 Pascrell Scott, Austin Wittman
 Pastor (AZ) Scott, David Wolf
 Paulsen Serrano Womack
 Payne Sessions Woodall
 Pelosi Sewell Woolsey
 Pence Sherman Yoder
 Perlmutter Shimkus Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Chaffetz Lofgren, Zoe Neal
 Frelinghuysen Manzullo Rush
 Giffords Myrick Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1757

Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. HOCHUL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 257, noes 164, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—257

Adams Bachus Biggert
 Aderholt Barletta Bilbray
 Akin Barrow Bilirakis
 Alexander Bartlett Black
 Altmire Barton (TX) Blackburn
 Amash Bass (NH) Bonner
 Austria Benishek Bono Mack
 Bachmann Berg Boren

Boustany Hastings (WA) Petri
 Brady (TX) Hayworth Pitts
 Brooks Heck Platts
 Broun (GA) Hensarling Poe (TX)
 Buchanan Herger Pompeo
 Bucshon Herrera Beutler Posey
 Buerkle Himes Price (GA)
 Burgess Holden Quayle
 Burton (IN) Huelskamp Reed
 Camp Huizenga (MI) Rehberg
 Campbell Hultgren Reichert
 Canseco Hunter Renacci
 Cantor Hurt Ribble
 Capito Issa Rigell
 Cardoza Jenkins Rivera
 Carter Johnson (IL) Roby
 Cassidy Johnson (OH) Roe (TN)
 Chabot Johnson, Sam Rogers (AL)
 Jones Jones Rogers (KY)
 Coble Jordan Rogers (MI)
 Coffman (CO) Kelly Rohrabacher
 Cole King (IA) Rokita
 Conaway King (NY) Rooney
 Costello Kingston Ros-Lehtinen
 Cravaack Kinzinger (IL) Roskam
 Crawford Kissell Ross (AR)
 Crenshaw Kline Ross (FL)
 Culberson Kucinich Royce
 Labrador Davis (KY) Runyan
 Lamborn Lance Ryan (WI)
 Dent Lance Scalise
 DesJarlais Landry Schmidt
 Diaz-Balart Lankford Schock
 Doggett Latham Schweikert
 Dold LaTourette Scott (SC)
 Donnelly (IN) Latta Scott, Austin
 Dreier Lewis (CA) Sensenbrenner
 Duffy Lipinski Sessions
 Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Shimkus
 Duncan (TN) Long Shuler
 Ellmers Lucas Shuster
 Emerson Luetkemeyer Simpson
 Farenthold Lummis Smith (NE)
 Fincher Lungren, Daniel
 Fitzpatrick E. Smith (NJ)
 Flake Lynch Smith (TX)
 Fleischmann Mack Smith (WA)
 Fleming Marchant Southerland
 Flores Marino Speier
 Forbes Matheson Stearns
 Fortenberry McCarthy (CA) Stivers
 Foxx McCaul Stutzman
 Franks (AZ) McClintock Sullivan
 Gallegly McCotter Terry
 Gardner McHenry Thompson (PA)
 Garrett McKinley Thornberry
 Gerlach McMorris Tiberi
 Gibbs Rodgers Tipton
 Gibson Meehan Turner
 Gingrey (GA) Mica Upton
 Gohmert Miller (FL) Walberg
 Goodlatte Miller (MI) Walden
 Gosar Miller, Gary Walsh (IL)
 Gowdy Mulvaney Walz (MN)
 Granger Murphy (PA) Waters
 Graves (GA) Neugebauer Webster
 Graves (MO) Noem West
 Green, Gene Nugent Westmoreland
 Griffin (AR) Nunes Whitfield
 Griffith (VA) Nunnelee Wilson (SC)
 Grimm Olson Wittman
 Guinta Palazzo Wolf
 Guthrie Paul Womack
 Gutierrez Paulsen Woodall
 Hall Pearce Yoder
 Hanna Pence Young (AK)
 Harper Perlmutter Young (FL)
 Harris Peters Young (IN)
 Hartzler Peterson

NOES—164

Ackerman Capuano Critz
 Andrews Carnahan Crowley
 Baca Carney Cuellar
 Baldwin Carson (IN) Cummings
 Bass (CA) Castor (FL) Davis (CA)
 Becerra Chu Davis (IL)
 Berkley Cielline DeFazio
 Berman Clarke (MI) DeGette
 Bishop (GA) Clarke (NY) DeLauro
 Bishop (NY) Clay Deutch
 Blumenauer Cleaver Dicks
 Boswell Clyburn Dingell
 Brady (PA) Cohen Doyle
 Braley (IA) Connolly (VA) Edwards
 Brown (FL) Conyers Ellison
 Butterfield Cooper Engel
 Calvert Costa Eshoo
 Capps Courtney Farr

Fattah Lujan Ruppertsberger
 Filner Maloney Ryan (OH)
 Frank (MA) Markey Sanchez, Linda
 Fudge Matsui T.
 Garamendi McCarthy (NY) Sanchez, Loretta
 Gonzalez McCollum Sarbanes
 Green, Al McDermott Schakowsky
 Grijalva McGovern Schiff
 Hanabusa McIntyre Schrader
 Hastings (FL) McKeon Scott (VA)
 Heinrich McNeerney Scott, David
 Higgins Meeks Serrano
 Hinchey Michaud Sewell
 Hinojosa Miller (NC) Sherman
 Hirono Miller, George Sires
 Hochul Moore Slaughter
 Holt Moran Stark
 Honda Murphy (CT) Sutton
 Hoyer Nadler Thompson (CA)
 Inslee Napolitano Thompson (MS)
 Israel Olver Tierney
 Jackson (IL) Owens Tonko
 Jackson Lee Pallone Towns
 (TX) Pascrell Tsongas
 Johnson (GA) Pastor (AZ) Van Hollen
 Johnson, E. B. Payne Velázquez
 Kaptur Pelosi
 Keating Pingree (ME) Visclosky
 Kildee Polis Wasserman
 Kind Price (NC) Schultz
 Langevin Quigley Watt
 Larsen (WA) Rahall Waxman
 Larson (GT) Rangel Weiner
 Lee (CA) Reyes Welch
 Levin Richardson Wilson (FL)
 Lewis (GA) Richmond Woolsey
 Loeb sack Rothman (NJ) Wu
 Lowey Roybal-Allard Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (UT) Lofgren, Zoe Rush
 Chaffetz Manzullo Schilling
 Frelinghuysen Myrick Schwartz
 Giffords Neal

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1800

Mr. LYNCH changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 312, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—110

Amash Butterfield Flores
 Bartlett Campbell Foxx
 Barton (TX) Canseco Gardner
 Benishek Chabot Garrett
 Bishop (UT) Coble Gohmert
 Bono Mack Coffman (CO) Goodlatte
 Brady (TX) Conaway Gosar
 Brooks Duffy Gowdy
 Broun (GA) Duncan (SC) Graves (GA)
 Buchanan Duncan (TN) Griffin (AR)
 Burgess Farenthold Griffith (VA)
 Burton (IN) Flake Hall

McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel

Reed
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Chaffetz
Frelinghuysen
Giffords

Lofgren, Zoe
Manzullo
Myrick

Neal
Rush
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1806

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 170, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—252

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany

Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Bonner
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz

Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)

Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)

LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—170

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Jones
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Langevin
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler

Napolitano
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Burgess
Chaffetz
Frelinghuysen
Giffords

Lofgren, Zoe
Manzullo
Myrick
Neal

Rush
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1810

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 404 I inadvertently voted “no” when I intended to vote “yes.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 224, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—199

Adams
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito

Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly

Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Herger

Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Richardson	Serrano	Velázquez	Kelly	Nunnelee	Scott, Austin
Huelskamp	Miller, Gary	Schilling	Richmond	Sewell	Visclosky	King (IA)	Olson	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Schmidt	Rigell	Sherman	Walz (MN)	Kingston	Palazzo	Sessions
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Schock	Ross (AR)	Shuler	Wasserman	Kinzinger (IL)	Paul	Shuster
Hunter	Noem	Schweikert	Rothman (NJ)	Simpson	Schultz	Kline	Pearce	Simpson
Hurt	Nunes	Scott (SC)	Royal-Allard	Sires	Waters	Labrador	Pence	Smith (NE)
Issa	Nunnelee	Scott, Austin	Runyan	Slaughter	Watt	Lamborn	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Waxman	Lance	Pitts	Smith (TX)
Johnson (IL)	Palazzo	Sessions	Ryan (OH)	Speier	Weiner	Landry	Platts	Southerland
Johnson (OH)	Paul	Shimkus	Sánchez, Linda T.	Stark	Welch	Lankford	Poe (TX)	Stark
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Shuster	Sanchez, Loretta	Sutton	Wilson (FL)	Latham	Pompeo	Stearns
Jones	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wittman	LaTourette	Posey	Stevens
Jordan	Pence	Smith (NJ)	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Wolf	Latta	Price (GA)	Stutzman
Kelly	Petri	Smith (TX)	Schiff	Tierney	Woodall	LoBiondo	Quayle	Sullivan
King (IA)	Pitts	Southerland	Schrader	Towns	Woolsey	Long	Reed	Terry
Kingston	Platts	Stearns	Scott (VA)	Tsongas	Wu	Luetkemeyer	Rehberg	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Poe (TX)	Stivers	Scott, David	Van Hollen	Yarmuth	Mack	Renacci	Thornberry
Labrador	Pompeo	Stutzman			Young (FL)	Marchant	Ribble	Tiberi
Lamborn	Posey	Sullivan				Marino	Rigell	Tipton
Landry	Price (GA)	Terry				McCarthy (CA)	Rivera	Tipton
Lankford	Quayle	Thompson (PA)				McCaul	Roby	Turner
Latta	Rehberg	Thornberry				Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)	Upton
LoBiondo	Reichert	Tiberi				McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Long	Renacci	Tipton				McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Walden
Lucas	Ribble	Turner				McHenry	Rohrabacher	Walsh (IL)
Luetkemeyer	Rivera	Upton				McKeon	Rokita	Webster
Lummis	Roby	Walberg				McKinley	Rooney	West
Mack	Roe (TN)	Walden				McMorris	Roskam	Westmoreland
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walsh (IL)				Rodgers	Ross (FL)	Whitfield
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Webster				Mica	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	West				Miller (FL)	Runyan	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland				Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
McClintock	Rokita	Whitfield				Miller, Gary	Scalise	Womack
McCotter	Rooney	Wilson (SC)				Mulvaney	Schilling	Woodall
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack				Neugebauer	Schmidt	Yoder
McMorris	Roskam	Yoder				Noem	Schock	Young (AK)
Rodgers	Ross (FL)	Young (AK)				Nugent	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Mica	Royce	Young (IN)				Nunes	Scott (SC)	
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)							

NOT VOTING—9

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

□ 1813

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—219

Ackerman	DeLauro	Langevin	Adams	Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Ackerman	Donnelly (IN)	Maloney
Aderholt	Denham	Larsen (WA)	Akin	Chabot	Gohmert	Aderholt	Doyle	Markey
Altmire	Dent	Larson (CT)	Alexander	Coble	Goodlatte	Edwards	Edwards	Matheson
Amash	Deutch	Latham	Amash	Coffman (CO)	Gosar	Andrews	Ellison	Matsui
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Austria	Conaway	Gowdy	Baca	Engel	McCarthy (NY)
Baca	Dicks	Lee (CA)	Bachmann	Cravaack	Granger	Baldwin	Eshoo	McCollum
Baldwin	Dingell	Levin	Bachus	Crawford	Graves (GA)	Barrow	Farr	McDermott
Barrow	Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Barletta	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)	Bass (CA)	Fattah	McGovern
Bass (CA)	Dold	Lewis (GA)	Bartlett	Culberson	Griffin (AR)	Becerra	Filner	McIntyre
Bass (NH)	Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Barton (TX)	Denham	Griffith (VA)	Berkley	Frank (MA)	McNerney
Becerra	Doyle	Loeb sack	Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Guinta	Berman	Fudge	Meehan
Berkley	Edwards	Lowey	Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie	Bilbray	Garamendi	Meeks
Berman	Ellison	Lujan	Berg	Dold	Hall	Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	Michaud
Biggart	Emerson	Lungren, Daniel E.	Biggart	Dreier	Hanna	Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Bilbray	Engel	Lynch	Bilirakis	Duffy	Harper	Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Maloney	Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Harris	Boren	Grijalva	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Maloney	Black	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler	Boswell	Gutierrez	Moran
Blumenauer	Fattah	Markley	Blackburn	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)	Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)
Boren	Filner	Matsui	Bonner	Emerson	Hastings (MO)	Brady (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (PA)
Boswell	Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Bono Mack	Farenthold	Heck	Brown (FL)	Heinrich	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	McCaul	Boustany	Fincher	Hensarling	Butterfield	Higgins	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Frank (MA)	McCollum	Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Hergert	Capps	Himes	Olver
Brooks	Fudge	McDermott	Brooks	Flake	Herrera Beutler	Capuano	Hinche y	Owens
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McGovern	Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Huelskamp	Cardoza	Hinojosa	Pallone
Bucshon	Gonzalez	McIntyre	Buchanan	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)	Cardoza	Hirono	Pascarell
Butterfield	Gowdy	McKeon	Bucshon	Flores	Hultgren	Carnahan	Hochul	Pastor (AZ)
Calvert	Green, Al	McKinley	Buerkle	Fortenberry	Hunter	Carson (IN)	Holden	Paulsen
Cantor	Gutierrez	McNerney	Burgess	Fox	Hurt	Castor (FL)	Holt	Payne
Capps	Hanabusa	Meehan	Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Issa	Chandler	Honda	Pelosi
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Calvert	Camp	Issa	Chu	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Cardoza	Heinrich	Michaud	Camp	Campbell	Jenkins	Cicilline	Insee	Peters
Carnahan	Hensarling	Miller (NC)	Canneco	Canseco	Johnson (IL)	Clarke (MI)	Israel	Peterson
Carney	Higgins	Miller, George	Cantor	Capito	Johnson (OH)	Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)
Carson (IN)	Himes	Moore	Canter	Carter	Jones	Clay	Jackson Lee	Polis
Castor (FL)	Hinche y	Moran	Capito		Jordan	Cleaver	(TX)	Price (NC)
Chandler	Hinojosa	Mulvaney	Carter			Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Chu	Hirono	Murphy (CT)				Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Cicilline	Hochul	Nadler				Cole	Kaptur	Rangel
Clarke (MI)	Holden	Napolitano				Connolly (VA)	Keating	Reichert
Clarke (NY)	Holt	Nugent				Conyers	Kildee	Reyes
Clay	Honda	Olver				Cooper	Kind	Richardson
Cleaver	Hoyer	Owens				Costa	King (NY)	Richmond
Clyburn	Insee	Pallone				Costello	Kissell	Rogers (AL)
Cohen	Israel	Pascarell				Courtney	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Connolly (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)				Critz	Langevin	Ross (AR)
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Payne				Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
Cooper	(TX)	Pelosi				Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Royal-Allard
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter				Cummings	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Peters				Davis (CA)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Kaptur	Peterson				Davis (IL)	Lewis (CA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Critz	Keating	Pingree (ME)				Davis (KY)	Lewis (GA)	
Crowley	Kildee	Polis				Hurt	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Kind	Price (NC)				Issa	Loeb sack	Sarbanes
Cummings	King (NY)	Quigley				Johnson (OH)	Lowey	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Kinzing er (IL)	Rahall				Johnson, Sam	Dent	Schiff
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Rangel				Jones	Deutch	Schrader
DeFazio	Kucinich	Reed				Jordan	Dicks	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lance	Reyes					Dingell	Scott, David
							Doggett	Serrano

NOES—204

Sewell Tierney
Sherman Tonko
Shimkus Towns
Shuler Tsongas
Sires Van Hollen
Slaughter Velázquez
Smith (WA) Visclosky
Speier Walz (MN)
Sutton Wasserman
Thompson (CA) Schultz
Thompson (MS) Waters

NOT VOTING—9

Chaffetz Lofgren, Zoe
Frelinghuysen Manzullo
Giffords Myrick

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1817

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The 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 noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 313, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—107

Ackerman Hastings (FL)
Baca Heinrich
Baldwin Himes
Bass (CA) Hinchey
Becerra Hinojosa
Blumenauer Hirono
Braley (IA) Holt
Brown (FL) Honda
Butterfield Hoyer
Capps Jackson (IL)
Carnahan Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN) Kucinich
Castor (FL) Langevin
Chu Larsen (WA)
Cicilline Larson (CT)
Clarke (NY) Lee (CA)
Clay Lewis (GA)
Cleaver Lowey
Cohen Luján
Courtney Maloney
Crowley Markey
Cummings Matsui
Davis (CA) McCollum
DeGette McDermott
DeLauro McGovern
Deutch Meeks
Edwards Miller, George
Ellison Moore
Engel Moran
Eshoo Murphy (CT)
Farr Nadler
Fattah Napolitano
Filner Oliver
Gonzalez Owens
Grijalva Pallone
Gutierrez Pastor (AZ)
Hanabusa Payne

NOES—313

Adams Altmire
Aderholt Amash
Akin Andrews
Alexander Austria

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Berkeley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke (MI)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Lance
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dodd
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

NOT VOTING—12

Camp Giffords
Canseco Lofgren, Zoe
Chaffetz Manzullo
Frelinghuysen Myrick

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1821

Ms. TSONGAS changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2012”.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, 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. 2017) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 287, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2017 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 64, lines 2 and 4, after each of the dollar amounts insert “(reduced by \$75,000,000)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this final amendment, the Bishop-Holt motion to recommit, in order to increase funding for grants for transportation security and counterterrorism.

Intelligence seized from Osama bin Laden's compound indicates that al Qaeda was targeting America's railroads on the 10th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. Earlier, in 2009, the FBI disrupted a plot to blow up trains in New York City and in Washington, D.C.

The 9/11 Commission placed some of the blame for the intelligence breakdown before the 9/11 attacks on a failure of imagination; but today, we don't have to imagine the damage a terrorist could do on a rush-hour commuter train. That is evident from the tragedies in Madrid, London, and Mumbai. An even more deadly attack could occur on a train carrying hazardous chemicals through a major city, including trains that pass regularly only a stone's throw from the U.S. Capitol.

While airline security upgrades over the past 10 years can help prevent another 9/11, we still face an evolving threat to multiple modes of transportation. In fact, trips by rail exceed air travel by 18 times. Yet air travel receives over 200 times more Federal security funding per passenger than rail.

Still, the bill before us today makes deep cuts to rail security. It provides no specific funding for transit, rail, or bus security grants in 2012. Instead, it rolls nine grant programs together to compete for funding that has already been cut 55 percent. That's not a failure of imagination; that's a dereliction of duty.

In response, the Bishop-Holt amendment would increase funding for grants for transportation security and counterterrorism by \$75 million, fully offset with a reduction in funding for the National Bio and Agro-defense facility, otherwise known as NBAF.

While DHS insists that a new billion-dollar animal disease research lab in the heart both of cattle country and tornado alley is completely safe, both the GAO and the National Academy of Sciences have found many faults in safety and in cost overruns. In fact, most of us agree with the National Academy of Sciences that the risk of a release of foot-and-mouth disease in America's heartland must be better addressed before DHS proceeds with construction. We have much higher homeland security priorities than beginning a new billion-dollar facility that will replicate many of the existing functions already conducted at our Federal labs.

Fourteen million Americans ride mass transit every day in our Nation's urban areas, with millions more riding

commuter or passenger rail each year. If we understand the clear threat to these passengers and accepted efforts to protect them are underfunded, we must do more to keep them safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make the right choice and support this final amendment to increase funding for grants for transportation security and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment has a simple purpose: to prevent the reckless cuts to passenger rail security.

Mr. Speaker, you probably read that at the time the al Qaeda leader bin Laden was killed he was planning attacks on U.S. passenger rail systems. Even as we debate this bill, our intelligence and law enforcement communities are running to ground leads about these and other potential terrorist plots. This discovery underscores the need to sustain, not to cut, transit security funding.

Following the terrible events of 2001, our Nation took unprecedented steps to secure our Nation's airlines—appropriately so. However, transit security grant programs remain badly underfunded. We need these funds to field canine teams, install surveillance cameras and security fencing, provide the resources for incident response training, and a host of other mission-critical activities that are required to help secure our trains and buses.

Transit provides 18 times as many passenger trips as aviation, but receives 12 times less security funding. In other words, aviation security receives 215 times as much Federal funding per passenger as land transit. We have to do much, much better because the threat is real. In 2004, terrorist cells conducted successful and deadly bombings in Spain; the next year in the U.K.; in India; in Belarus, hundreds of people killed, thousands of people wounded. Let's not put off the necessary rail security steps until after the tragedy here. Let's thwart bin Laden's plans.

I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is about priorities, fiscal discipline priorities as our Nation grapples with a genuine budget crisis, and security priorities in the aftermath of Osama bin Laden's death and as we approach the 10th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.

This bill includes robust spending reductions on bureaucracy and on programs that are not producing, cutting waste, reducing spending, and instilling genuine budget discipline.

□ 1830

Mr. ADERHOLT. In addition, this bill puts money where it matters:

frontline operations, intelligence, counterterrorism, and disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's motion is simply a political ploy at the end of an open process on a bill that delivers the Nation's spending restraints and robust security that our Nation needs.

And furthermore, under Speaker BOEHNER's leadership, as executed by Chairman DREIER and Chairman ROGERS, we have just completed 2 days of floor debate under a completely open rule. It is the most open possible debate before the people's House.

We have repeatedly addressed the issues that the gentleman is raising with this motion and thoroughly debated the merits of this shortcoming of his points.

In short, it is time to vote, Mr. Speaker. It's time to deliver fiscal discipline, and it's time to deliver robust security. The American people are demanding no less.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 234, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—187

Ackerman	Costa	Himes
Altmire	Costello	Hinchee
Andrews	Courtney	Hinojosa
Baca	Critz	Hirono
Baldwin	Crowley	Hochul
Barrow	Cuellar	Holden
Bass (CA)	Cummings	Holt
Berkley	Davis (GA)	Honda
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Insole
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Israel
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Boren	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Boswell	Dicks	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Donnelly (IN)	Kaptur
Butterfield	Doyle	Keating
Capps	Edwards	Kildee
Capuano	Ellison	Kind
Cardoza	Engel	King (NY)
Carnahan	Eshoo	Kissell
Carney	Farr	Kucinich
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Chu	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Ciilline	Garamendi	Levin
Clarke (MI)	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lipinski
Clay	Green, Gene	Loeb sack
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lowey
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lujan
Cohen	Hanabusa	Lynch
Connolly (VA)	Hastings (FL)	Maloney
Conyers	Heinrich	Markey
Cooper	Higgins	Matheson

Matsui Price (NC)
 McCarthy (NY) Quigley
 McCollum Rahall
 McDermott Rangel
 McGovern Reyes
 McIntyre Richardson
 McNerney Richmond
 Meeks Ross (AR)
 Michaud Rothman (NJ)
 Miller (NC) Roybal-Allard
 Miller, George Ruppertsberger
 Moore Ryan (OH)
 Moran Sánchez, Linda
 Murphy (CT) T.
 Nadler Sanchez, Loretta
 Napolitano Sarbanes
 Olver Schakowsky
 Pallone Schiff
 Pascrell Schrader
 Pastor (AZ) Scott (VA)
 Payne Scott, David
 Pelosi Serrano
 Perlmutter Sewell
 Peters Sherman
 Peterson Shuler
 Pingree (ME) Sires
 Polis Slaughter

NOES—234

Adams Franks (AZ)
 Aderholt Gallegly
 Akin Gardner
 Alexander Garrett
 Amash Gerlach
 Austria Gibbs
 Bachmann Gibson
 Bachus Gingrey (GA)
 Barletta Gohmert
 Bartlett Goodlatte
 Barton (TX) Gosar
 Bass (NH) Gowdy
 Benishek Granger
 Berg Graves (GA)
 Biggert Graves (MO)
 Bilbray Griffin (AR)
 Bilirakis Griffith (VA)
 Bishop (UT) Grimm
 Black Guinta
 Blackburn Guthrie
 Bonner Hall
 Bono Mack Hanna
 Boustany Harper
 Brady (TX) Harris
 Brooks Hartzler
 Broun (GA) Hastings (WA)
 Buchanan Hayworth
 Bucshon Heck
 Buerkle Hensarling
 Burgess Herger
 Burton (IN) Herrera Beutler
 Calvert Huelskamp
 Camp Huizenga (MI)
 Campbell Hultgren
 Canseco Hunter
 Cantor Hurt
 Capito Issa
 Carter Jenkins
 Cassidy Johnson (IL)
 Chabot Johnson (OH)
 Coble Johnson, Sam
 Coffman (CO) Jones
 Cole Jordan
 Conaway Kelly
 Cravaack King (IA)
 Crawford Kingston
 Crenshaw Kinzinger (IL)
 Culberson Kline
 Davis (KY) Labrador
 Denham Lamborn
 Dent Lance
 DesJarlais Landry
 Diaz-Balart Lankford
 Dold Latham
 Dreier LaTourette
 Duffy Latta
 Duncan (SC) Lewis (CA)
 Duncan (TN) LoBiondo
 Ellmers Long
 Emerson Lucas
 Farenthold Luetkemeyer
 Fincher Lummis
 Fitzpatrick Lungren, Daniel
 Flake E.
 Fleischmann Mack
 Fleming Marchant
 Flores Marino
 Forbes McCarthy (CA)
 Fortenberry McCaul
 Foxx McClintock

Smith (WA) Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

Stivers Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra Lofgren, Zoe
 Chaffetz Manzullo
 Frelinghuysen Myrick
 Giffords Neal
 Pence
 Rush
 Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1853

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—231

Adams Duncan (SC)
 Aderholt Ellmers
 Akin Emerson
 Alexander Farenthold
 Altmirer Fincher
 Austria Fitzpatrick
 Bachmann Fleischmann
 Bachus Fleming
 Barletta Flores
 Barrow Forbes
 Bass (NH) Fortenberry
 Benishek Foxx
 Berg Franks (AZ)
 Berkley Gallegly
 Biggert Gardner
 Bilbray Garrett
 Bilirakis Gerlach
 Bishop (UT) Gibbs
 Black Gibson
 Blackburn Gingrey (GA)
 Bonner Gohmert
 Bono Mack Boreen
 Boren Gowdy
 Boustany Granger
 Brady (TX) Graves (GA)
 Brooks Graves (MO)
 Buchanan Griffin (AR)
 Bucshon Griffith (VA)
 Buerkle Meehan
 Guinta Burton (IN)
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Cassidy Heck
 Chabot Hensarling
 Chandler Herger
 Coble Herrera Beutler
 Coffman (CO) Holden
 Cole Huelskamp
 Conaway Huizenga (MI)
 Cravaack Hultgren
 Crawford Hunter
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donnelly (IN)
 Dreier
 Duffy

Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)

NAYS—188

Ackerman
 Amash
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Bartlett
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (CA)
 Berman
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Campbell
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Flake
 Frank (MA)
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gonzalez
 Goodlatte
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Harris
 Hastings (FL)
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kildee
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kissell
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (CT)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Olver
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Richmond
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Walsh (IL)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra Lofgren, Zoe
 Chaffetz Manzullo
 Conyers Markey
 Frelinghuysen Myrick
 Giffords Neal
 Pence
 Rush
 Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1859

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chair, I missed a series of votes today because of a family medical issue. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 389; "yea" on rollcall No. 390; "yea" on rollcall No. 391; "yea" on rollcall No. 392; "no" on rollcall No. 393; "no" on rollcall No. 394; "yea" on rollcall No. 395; "yea" on rollcall No. 396; "yea" on rollcall No. 397; "yea" on rollcall No. 398; "no" on rollcall No. 399; "no" on rollcall No. 400; "yea" on rollcall No. 401; "yea" on rollcall No. 402; "yea" on rollcall No. 403; "yea" on rollcall No. 404; "yea" on rollcall No. 405; "no" on rollcall No. 406; "no" on rollcall No. 407; "no" on rollcall No. 408; and "yea" on rollcall No. 409.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 293

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Ms. Hochul.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. ISSA. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 771

Mr. CUELLAR. I ask for unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to remove Representative PAUL RYAN as a cosponsor of H.R. 771.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2055 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 288 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. 2055.

□ 1903

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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY 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 Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, it's my privilege to lay out tonight for the House for consideration the appropriations bill for Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and my good friend, Mr. SANFORD BISHOP of Georgia, we have worked together arm in arm in this committee to make sure that our men and women in uniform have everything they need to do their job. We on this committee think of our job as sort of we are the peace of mind committee for the United States military and for our veterans.

We have an obligation—this Congress, this government—has an obligation, first and foremost, to provide for national security, to make sure that our men and women in uniform, not only here at home, but overseas have everything they need to do their job.

The scope of our appropriations bill today includes construction, of course, of all the military bases here and over-

seas. We have fully funded in this bill all the requests of the branches of the military for our men and women in uniform on active duty. We've made sure that all the retired men and women who have served this Nation have everything they need when it comes to the veterans hospitals, the Department of Veterans Affairs.

We are laying before the House tonight this funding bill as a part of our Nation's—I like to also think of it as part of our Nation's mortgage payment. This is one of those fundamental obligations that we have as a government to ensure that our military is fully funded, that they've got the equipment, the logistical support that they need, that their housing is the best it can be, that the facilities are the very best they can be, and this is one of those fundamental obligations we've absolutely got to take care of.

In this bill and in all the appropriations bills, Mr. Chairman, brought to the House for the first time, this new Republican majority, this conservative majority is for the first time—money that has been left in the Treasury unspent in previous years was just spent in other areas. For the first time under the leadership of Chairman HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, our committee, the other subcommittees of Appropriations, are returning that unspent money back to taxpayers to reduce the deficit.

Chairman ROGERS and the leadership of the House, Speaker BOEHNER, our Republican leadership, all of us are committed to bringing the Nation—doing everything in our power to get back to a balanced budget, to reduce Federal spending, to bring the size, scope, and cost of the Federal Government back under control.

While we recognize our responsibility to fully fund and take care of our troops in military construction, of our veterans in the Veterans Affairs, the hospitals, through the VA, we also have an obligation to manage the money in a way that's fiscally sound. So we've identified rescissions, or returned money, unspent money, to taxpayers in the amount of \$388 million, again, the first time that's ever been done.

Again, these savings don't impact in any way the level of services provided to our veterans. This in no way impacts or diminishes the quality of housing or the level of service necessary on bases here in the United States or overseas.

But we have found savings. For example, \$100 million in planning and design money that was left over from previous years. We found \$100 million in unspent funds from the BRAC, the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in 1990, money that was unspent and left over. We found money in a variety of accounts, Mr. Chairman, that in previous years would have been spent elsewhere.

And under the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and Speaker BOEHNER, our

subcommittee, every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is committed to return that money to taxpayers and to find savings everywhere we can that will not diminish, again, the level of service provided to our military because we want to make sure they have absolutely no worries as they stand on the wall defending our freedom every night, every day, 24/7.

We have also incrementally funded, Mr. Chairman, five projects and found savings of \$304 million that we have been able to return to taxpayers. In three cases, we found there's three projects which we did not fund for the F-35 aircraft facility at the Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada because that aircraft is not ready to be fully deployed. There is a central distribution facility in Germany, a commissary building, a variety of savings that we've looked for, not just unspent money but looking for ways we can save money for taxpayers while maintaining that very high level of service for our men and women in uniform while being good stewards of the public's precious tax dollars.

In the areas of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Chairman, we were able to find savings of \$25 million in the general administration of the VA. We also found savings of \$136 million in information technology. And in a whole separate category of accounts for minor construction, we saved about \$75 million there. All of this money has been returned to taxpayers to reduce the deficit, to do everything we can within our power to reduce the level of obligation that our children and grandchildren are going to inherit.

Finally, I want to point out we also found savings—the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims had asked for a new courthouse. And in light of the unprecedented size of the debt and the deficit, we did not recommend to the House that that new courthouse be built. That resulted in a \$25 million savings. The Court of Appeals for Veteran Claims does a great job. They're working in a leased facility right now, and we recommend that that be continued.

Mr. Chairman, the situation the Nation faces today is truly unprecedented. We calculated that about \$2.2 trillion in revenue comes into the Treasury every year, yet the existing obligations of the Federal Government to pay the current liability of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt, and our veterans benefits are all programs that have to be funded upfront. That is sort of our national mortgage payment. And those programs alone consume \$2.3 trillion.

So if you just look at the math, right out of the gate, the Nation begins the year, at the stroke of midnight on the first day of the year, American taxpayers are already \$105 billion in debt.

□ 1910

So every dollar the Appropriations Committee spends all year is borrowed.

This is why you see fiscal conservatives, all of us, constitutional conservatives in this new majority are so passionate, so determined to get us back on path to a balanced budget, to do everything we can within each one of these subcommittees to find savings. I am so grateful to Chairman ROGERS and Speaker BOEHNER for the first time returning unspent money to reduce the deficit.

We have had to reduce the overall amount of money available to every sector of the government dramatically. And it is tough. We have a lot of tough savings. But in the area of supporting our military, when it comes to making sure that they have got the best equipment, that they have got the absolute best in their housing and their hospital care, whether you are active duty military or if you are retired and in the care of the Veterans Administration, you can be sure that the United States Congress stands behind you. We are immensely proud of you. We have made sure that we have fully funded every need that you have got, and we have made sure that you are given the absolute best medical care.

All of the family members out there who have sons or daughters or fathers or mothers serving in the U.S. military need to know that, despite this tough budget environment, this Congress stands behind your father, your mother, your brother, your sister who serves in the military, and we are absolutely committed to ensuring that they have the very best equipment possible on the face of the Earth, that they have got everything they need to do their job, to stand on the wall defending this great Nation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as they do so beautifully.

We are very fortunate on this subcommittee, Mr. Chairman. We have an extraordinary group of people working behind the scenes—we have had for years—to make sure that this subcommittee has produced a bill that this House can support in a bipartisan way with great pride.

I want to make sure to thank our extraordinary staff: Tim Peterson who is our chief clerk of the subcommittee and has served with the Appropriations Committee for 22 years and served on the staff of the Secretary of the Navy for 9 years. Tim has done an extraordinary job, and I am very grateful to him for the time and effort he has put into this bill. I want to thank Sue Quantius for her work on the committee and her expertise when it comes to veterans affairs. To Sarah Young who has done such an extraordinary job as well and has been such a great asset. They have all done a magnificent job, and we are lucky to have them.

On the minority side, Matt Washington has just done an extraordinary job, as has Danny Cromer. All of us have worked together, arm in arm. My good friend, Mr. BISHOP from Georgia.

This is one bill, Mr. Chairman, that I know that Members of the House will be able to support in a bipartisan way

with great pride because our subcommittee has produced this bill in a bipartisan way without regard to party label. Our entire focus has been: How can we make sure that our men and women in uniform, active duty and retired, have got everything they need? How can we be better stewards of the taxpayers' precious dollars?

We identified things, for example, we share a concern for money that was unspent. Veterans hospitals and the giant facilities like the new one in Denver that I understand had \$978 million unspent for years, and we put language in this bill telling them they are going to lose that money after 5 years unless they make sure that they get it obligated and get these hospitals built.

We had great support from Mr. BISHOP on ensuring that our veterans who have valid claims for disabilities get those disability claims handled in an expeditious way.

We worked together arm in arm not just to find savings, but to make sure we identify efficiencies. How can we make sure that our men and women in uniform not only have the best housing, but veterans who are retired are given the best possible service?

We have, on every occasion throughout the year working on this bill, found that we have areas of agreement in this bill, and we produce it in a way that is really unanimous. It is a real privilege for me to work with Mr. BISHOP and with our ranking member from Washington State, Mr. DICKS. It has been a real privilege to work with him.

But above all, I am extraordinarily proud to serve as the subcommittee chairman under my chairman, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, who I count as a role model and as a mentor to me. Mr. ROGERS has been a very good friend and a great leader for this committee and is a stalwart fiscal conservative, committed to making sure that our men and women in uniform continue to be the very best military in the world.

It is my privilege to be here tonight to present this bipartisan bill to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join Chairman CULBERSON as the House takes up the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill for Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and related agencies. The MilCon-VA bill is critically important to the strength and the well-being of our military, our veterans, and the families who sacrificed so much to defend our country.

Working with Chairman CULBERSON and the members of the subcommittee, we have crafted a bill that will address the funding needs for military construction and family housing for our troops and for their families, as well as other quality of life construction projects.

In addition, it will provide funding for many important VA programs as

well as agencies like the Veterans Court of Appeals and the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The bill before us today touches every soldier, every sailor, every marine, and every airman. In addition, this bill will also impact military spouses, their children, and every veteran that participates in veterans programs.

I want to commend Chairman CULBERSON for his hard work. He has done his best to hold hearings that he believes are important to the work of the subcommittee. Together we sat through 12 hearings, gaining valuable insight into the working of all of the agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

I would like to thank all of the subcommittee members and recognize them for their hard work on the bill.

I believe that the minority was treated fairly during this process, and I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for that. We worked very well in a very collegial fashion, and I think that is the way that this institution should work.

Chairman CULBERSON has already provided the funding highlights in the bill, and I won't repeat them all, but I want to point out a few items that I think are extremely important.

The Department of Defense schools. The bill before us today includes \$483 million for the renovation and replacement of 15 Department of Defense schools. Six schools here in the United States and nine schools at overseas installations will be refurbished with this funding. Mr. Chairman, I believe that providing the funds for DOD schools will not only help our servicemembers' children get a quality education in a safe facility, but it will also give our servicemembers some peace of mind.

Medical center replacement. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased that the bill includes \$1.1 billion for the medical center replacement in Germany. As you know, a large proportion of the serious casualties from the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters are treated there in Landstuhl, and I am pleased to see we are making this very, very important investment.

Regarding veteran affairs, the bill contains \$52.5 billion for advance appropriations for medical services, for medical support and compliance, and medical facilities at the VA, which is \$1.8 billion above the amount that was included in the FY 2011 continuing resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that advance funding provides timely and predictable funding for the veterans health care system. For example, during the delay in the FY 2011 funding, veterans health care funding was already in place and the veterans health care programs were not subject to the continuing resolution process and our veterans did not have to go without their health care.

Mr. Chairman, overall the bill provides adequate funding for programs

included in this bill. However, I am troubled by one item. Unfortunately, during the full committee markup, an amendment was adopted to eliminate funding to implement Executive Order 13502, which was issued in February 2009, which addresses project labor agreements, PLAs. Now, if you are opposed to that Executive Order, that's fine; but using the MilCon-VA bill to address this issue, I believe, is the wrong place.

□ 1920

This language is purely an ideological and political provision that really is beyond the scope of this bill.

If we want to deal with this issue, we should deal with it on a labor bill and not on the Military Construction-VA bill. The MilCon-VA bill has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and has avoided divisive issues like this no matter which party has held the gavel. I believe including this language only causes unnecessary complications and does nothing to help our servicemembers or our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, please know that as we continue through the process, I will work to address this issue because an item like this really has no place in a bill that has always placed our troops, their families and our veterans above ideology.

Before I close, I would like to recognize the staff for all of the work and the time that they have put into this bill. From the minority committee staff, I would like to thank Matt Washington and Danny Cromer as well as Michael Reed and Greg Browder from my personal office. From the majority committee staff, I would like to thank Tim Peterson, Sue Quantius, Sarah Young, and Tracey Russell as well as Alec Fritchie and Evan Ewachiw from the chairman's personal office.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), our ranking member; and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), who set the standard for the committee and for the subcommittees with their collegial relationship in their ability to work together and in their efforts to make sure that we move these appropriations bills through regular order. I appreciate that very much.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman HAL ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I want to, at the outset, congratulate him on a great job on this bill. He and his terrific staff have worked long and hard, along with the subcommittee members, to produce, I think, a star of a bill.

So, on your maiden voyage, Mr. Chairman, congratulations on a good job.

To Mr. BISHOP and the minority members of the subcommittee, including my distinguished cohort, Mr. DICKS, the ranking on the full committee, we've all worked together on this, and we appreciate the collegial atmosphere, as Mr. BISHOP has said, that has governed this proceeding.

I rise in support of this act. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that our Nation's servicemembers, their families and our veterans deserve the greatest quality of care and support for their service and their sacrifices. This bill funds their most pressing needs in a timely manner while also acknowledging the urgent need to rein in Federal spending at a time of historically high and dangerous deficits.

This legislation provides \$72.5 billion in discretionary funding for military construction projects, veterans' programs and other agencies that support the quality of life of our warfighters, veterans and families. This funding level represents a \$615 million cut from last year's level and a \$1.2 billion reduction from the budgetary request.

The bill fully funds the construction of Department of Defense hospitals and clinics, schools and family housing, providing our military personnel with the resources to effectively advance U.S. missions abroad and the support they need here at home. The bill also protects the health and well-being of our veterans, funding medical care, disability benefits and education benefits.

But in addition to adequately funding these programs, the subcommittee also made difficult but responsible choices that eliminate excess spending wherever appropriate. Much of the reduction in this bill comes from savings related to the BRAC process and from rescissions of previous year funding left over from lower-than-estimated construction costs. The bill also includes provisions for strong oversight overspending.

Mr. Chairman, cleaning up the way we spend taxpayer dollars will help balance our Nation's budgets, and will show the American taxpayers that we can be trusted with their hard-earned money. We can't restrict cuts to only some areas of government. All agencies and programs must be held accountable to tighter budgets with more stringent supervision.

Chairman CULBERSON and members of this subcommittee have shown great fiscal restraint and a commitment to real savings in reducing the discretionary spending in this bill below the 2011 levels while providing the resources our troops and our vets deserve.

So, again, I want to congratulate Chairman CULBERSON, Ranking Member BISHOP, all the members of the subcommittee, and my ranking partner, Mr. DICKS, for their great work on this bill. Of course, I want to again say how much we appreciate the work of this fine staff, both on the minority and majority levels. Great work.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is an excellent representation of the good work that we can do in Congress when we work together, both as we support our troops and our veterans and as we work in regular order to fund our government responsibly. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BISHOP, I want to congratulate you on being the new ranking member on MilCon-VA. I also congratulate Chairman CULBERSON, who has, I think, done an outstanding job, and of course my good friend and colleague, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of our committee. I want to also congratulate the staff. The staff has done an amazing job considering we had to go through the 2011 episode and then come right back and get the 2012 bill out.

The MilCon-VA Subcommittee has always had a strong reputation for common ground and bipartisanship as members traditionally work together to fund the construction of military facilities and strive to improve the quality of life and care afforded to our veterans and military families.

Many years ago, during the Reagan administration, we got David Stockman to allow us and Cap Weinberger to do incremental funding on military hospitals, and I'm glad the committee has gone back to an incremental funding approach. I think it's the only way we can do these major projects.

We all acknowledge the challenges facing the Nation today with respect to the debt and deficit, and I believe this bill has done a commendable job in addressing these fiscal challenges while ensuring that we are not impacting the level of care and benefits that our servicemembers have so rightfully earned.

Military construction is funded at \$14 billion, which is \$2.6 billion below the FY11 enacted amount and \$752 million below the President's request. The subcommittee achieved these cuts through the incremental funding of projects and by eliminating funding for several projects that were ahead of need. As Ranking Member BISHOP noted, this bill makes a strong investment into Defense Department schools by investing \$483 million for the construction and replacement of substandard facilities. I have been a strong advocate for the modernization of schools serving the children of our Nation's servicemembers, and I commend the chairman and ranking member on their commitment to this effort.

The Department of Veterans Affairs would be funded at \$58.3 billion in discretionary spending, which is \$1.85 billion above the fiscal year 2011 enacted level and \$476 million below the President's request. Most of this funding is

for veterans' medical services. The recommendation provides the full funding of \$69.5 billion for the mandatory VA programs providing compensation and pensions, educational benefits, vocational rehabilitation, life insurance, and housing loan programs.

I would like to commend the chairman and ranking member for their efforts to ensure that our Nation's veterans are well taken care of by maintaining adequate funding for veterans' health care and other benefits on which so many have come to count on.

Again, I am pleased overall with the funding levels proposed in this bill today, and I am pleased that during the full committee markup we were able to remove a contentious and divisive restriction on the implementation of Davis-Bacon wage requirements; but unfortunately, there is one item that I believe will complicate the passage of this bill.

□ 1930

I am troubled by the inclusion of a provision that prohibits the use of project labor agreements for any project in this bill. This divisive policy rider should not be included in an appropriations bill, and the decision to implement PLAs should remain at the discretion of the agency as to whether it is appropriate for an individual project. The inclusion of this provision unnecessarily complicates the support for a bill that would otherwise pass with wide bipartisan support. I expect an amendment to be offered that would remove this restriction on PLAs and would further improve the bill. I would like to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DICKS. Regardless, I remain committed to working with my colleagues to respectfully work out any differences on the floor so that we may pass a bipartisan bill that adequately provides for our troops, veterans, and military families.

Again, I intend to support this bill. I wish we could finish tonight, but I understand we can't. I look forward to seeing this bill done. I commend, again, the chairman and ranking member for their good work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say very briefly, again, truly how much I appreciate working with all the members of this committee, including the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP). All of us have worked with one goal in mind, and that is to ensure the peace of mind of our men and women in uniform and our retired military members, to ensure that no matter where they go, no matter what they're doing, they don't have a worry in the world. We want to make sure

they are taken care of. And we've done so in a way that is fiscally responsible. We've done so in a way ever mindful of the record debt, the record deficit, of the inability of many of the projects the VA has worked on before getting done on time or, frankly, even getting started, making sure that disability claims are paid on time.

We are also presenting the bill tonight, Mr. Chairman, giving any Member of the House an opportunity to come down and file an amendment and be heard in an open and transparent way, something that we in the new majority committed to do, that every American would have an opportunity to read the bill online at least 72 hours in advance. It is vitally important that we, doing the Nation's business, do so in a way that's absolutely transparent and open and straightforward, especially when it comes to supporting our men and women in uniform. When it comes to making sure they are taken care of and have no worries, there are no party labels. It's really been a privilege to work with each and every one of you on this committee.

I see my good friend Mr. FARR of California is here. He's been a particularly valuable member of the subcommittee. He has brought great expertise to the committee. I look forward to hearing from him tonight as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations but who is a longtime member of this MilCon-VA subcommittee.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

It is a pleasure to serve on this committee. I might be the longest serving member on the committee, but I'm a ranking member on another committee. It's a pleasure to serve. I welcome the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) to his new role as chair of the committee. And it's always a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the ranking and chair of the major committee.

This committee is unique in Congress. It's the only committee where both active duty military and veterans are dealt with from the same policy. There's no other committee in this House or in the Senate that has the one-stop that this committee has. It's a pleasure to be focused on the continuum of care for active duty and reservists and veterans.

This past weekend, we remembered the patriotic sacrifice of those who have lost their lives in service to our country, and today we renew our commitment to keep our promise to our Nation's more than 2 million troops and reservists, their families, and 23 million veterans.

This committee has a strong history of working in a bipartisan way to

produce a bill that supports our active duty servicemembers and our veterans. I am proud to support some much needed increases for the Veterans Affairs Department, and I would note that while this bill is \$1.4 billion above last year's level, it is also \$1.2 billion less than what the President requested.

Additionally, I am pleased to see that this bill emphasizes the needs of our veterans in rural areas. The National Cemetery Administration anticipates that 10 percent of all veterans will not receive access to a burial option in a national, State, or tribal cemetery within 75 miles of their home. I am pleased that this bill directs the National Cemetery Administration to develop a strategy to serve our rural veterans.

This language is important because it recognizes that veterans who live in rural communities should be treated on par with veterans who live in urban areas in all services provided by the VA. In my rural district, the central coast of California, veterans are moving a step closer to achieving a dream of a veterans cemetery at the former Fort Ord military base.

I commend the chairman and ranking member for their hard work in ensuring that this bill is another significant step in fulfilling the promise our country has made to leave no veteran behind.

I urge support for this bill on one condition. The condition is that the language against project labor agreements needs to be taken out.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say very briefly that one of the reasons we're trying to move expeditiously on this is we want to make sure our men and women in uniform have everything they need as soon as possible. We're trying to get this bill through to ensure that we not only get it, but that we get it done in an expeditious fashion.

We are waiting for an amendment to be completed drafting, but it's important, I think, to reemphasize, if I could, in the time I have remaining, the scale of the problem the Nation faces. This is not just a record deficit and record debt we face. It's actually a whole lot bigger than that.

As we make sure that our men and women in uniform are taken care of with their housing, we've made sure that, for example, all the BEQs, the bachelor enlisted quarters, are fully funded; that the Army, the Navy, the Air Force is fully funded; our veterans are fully funded. We've had to do this in a way that is fiscally responsible because we are ever mindful of the scale of the problem the Nation faces financially.

It is difficult to even begin to comprehend how huge the problem is that has been created by so many years of

previous Congresses, of previous administrations, too many promises to too many people on too many occasions on money that was borrowed from future generations. The result has been that today, the unfunded liabilities facing the taxpayers of the Nation are about \$49.6 trillion. Those are liabilities at present value.

For example, the publicly held debt, military and civilian pensions, retiree health benefits and other explicit, direct liabilities of about \$16.9 trillion. The entire U.S. economy is about \$13 trillion. Our gross domestic product is, I think, right at about \$13 trillion. So just the explicit liabilities that we have to pay already exceed the size of the entire U.S. economy.

We've got long-term contingencies and implicit liabilities. For example, the future cost of Social Security benefits is \$31 trillion.

□ 1940

Future Medicare benefits under part A, part B, and part D all added together create—and this is unfunded liability for which there is no source or revenue lined up to pay for this—about \$50 trillion, \$49.6 trillion. And to give you an idea of how big that number is, in order to pay that liability off, every living American would have to write a check tonight for \$159,000 to pay off that future unfunded liability. I've had constituents ask me if they just write that check, can they be done? Is that it? They're done? I wish it were that simple. But we, on the Appropriations Committee, this vast amount of money that we spend every year, this extraordinary responsibility with which we have been entrusted by our constituents, the amount of money we spend every year pales in significance to the size of the unfunded liabilities in the future.

The amount of money that we spend every year on the Appropriations Committee—a little over \$1 trillion, an extraordinary amount of money, \$1,000 billion—is dwarfed by the size of the unfunded liability that we face in the future.

And it's important for everyone, Mr. Speaker, listening to this debate tonight to remember that the money we spend here tonight in support of our troops, the money we spend on Homeland Security, to build highways, to pay for all the things the Federal Government does, it's all borrowed. The hole is so deep that's been dug by our predecessors, and again, too many promises to too many people on too many occasions, too many Big Government promises—I'm still wondering about Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty, that is, how many trillions of dollars later and that still hasn't worked out.

We, in the new constitutional conservative majority, are absolutely committed to getting us back on track to a balanced budget because we recognize the scale of the problem, the urgency of these impending unfunded li-

abilities, this massive bill that's going to come due to our children and grandchildren. In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff do an analysis about every 5 years on the strategic threats facing the United States. And analyzing all the threats facing our Nation, the Joint Chiefs concluded that one of the greatest strategic threats America faces is our national debt, this unfunded liability, these crushing obligations that our kids are going to inherit if we as a Congress don't work—as we have on this subcommittee in a way without regard to party for the benefit of the Nation—to find ways to make sure that Social Security and Medicare are solvent, that we get the entitlement programs under control because they're going right off a cliff unless we make sure we rescue them and make sure they're solvent and there for our kids. But we've got to make sure that we are doing everything within our power in the annual appropriations process to save every single dollar that we can.

There has been some debate, Mr. Chairman, some Members of Congress in the past have said, well, we just need to raise taxes. My predecessor, Bill Archer, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, had an analysis done that showed that even if you were to confiscate all of the corporate income—100 percent of the corporate income in America—that would generate about \$1.3 trillion. If the government were to confiscate 100 percent of all individual income, over \$200,000, that would generate about \$2.1 trillion. So you can see that it isn't possible to solve this problem by raising taxes. And that is something that we also understand instinctively as conservatives; if you just simply get the government out of our lives, out of our pocket, out of our way, and leave us alone to raise our kids, to run our businesses, to run our lives—let Texans run Texas, let Georgians run Georgia. If you unleash the entrepreneurial creativity of the American people, the economy will grow, people will invest and save their own money far wiser than the government will, and we will begin to dig out of this hole that we're in.

We're committed not just to saving money year to year through the appropriations process, we're committed to ensuring that Medicare, Social Security, that these social safety net programs that are so essential to our Nation are there for the future, for our children and our grandchildren. We're going to do everything in our power to make sure that we have done our job in a fiscally responsible way this year. When it comes to Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, or Homeland Security, or Transportation, or Labor, Health and Human Services, all the various subcommittees of appropriations, that's year-to-year dollars that we have direct control over right now, but we're also thinking long term.

We also want to eliminate that threat that the Joint Chiefs of Staff

identified, the greatest threat to our long-term national security they identified as the national debt—much of which is held by nations hostile to the United States. Deeply, deeply disturbing, Mr. Chairman, that the Communist Chinese Government buys so much of our debt. They're the largest purchaser today of gold. The Chinese economy is thundering. They have a very aggressive campaign underway to acquire as much intellectual property as they can through espionage and acquisition. We have, as a Nation, in allowing this debt to be created and allowing so many nations that are hostile to the United States to buy our debt, have placed too much power in the hands of the Chinese, of sovereign wealth funds.

And we here tonight, when it comes to supporting our military, through this construction bill, through the Veterans Affairs, we've made sure our men and women in uniform have everything they need in a fiscally responsible way. And this is just a first step of many that we will take on this committee to get America back on track to a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the minority and our staff have been working to put together an en bloc amendment so we can attempt to continue to expedite this process and ensure that this bill is done as quickly as possible in order that, again, our men and women in uniform can have the peace of mind of knowing they're taken care of—there is no bubble in the logistical supply chain. And they are not going to have to worry about disability claims if they go to a veterans hospital, or make sure their housing needs are taken care of on bases.

We have an en bloc amendment, Mr. Chairman, that should be on the brink of being ready for consideration so that we can move very rapidly to passage of this bill and get it over to the Senate—because we know how long it sometimes takes the Senate to get things done.

I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have, I think, presented a good bill, with the caveats that have been expressed by Ranking Member DICKS and myself, along with Mr. FARR. At this time, we are prepared to entertain the amendments. I think the chairman has some en bloc amendments that he would like to offer. We are happy to entertain those and move forward at this time.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to

be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2055

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 military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$3,141,491,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$255,241,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Army determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available for "Military Construction, Army" from prior appropriations Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$100,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$2,461,547,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$84,362,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available for "Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps" from prior appropriations Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$25,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as

currently authorized by law, \$1,279,358,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$81,913,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available for "Military Construction, Air Force" from prior appropriations Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$32,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$3,665,157,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, 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 further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$454,602,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$24,118,000 shall be available for payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the planning, design, and construction of a new North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available for "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" in prior appropriations Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$131,400,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefore, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$773,592,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$20,671,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities

for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$116,246,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$9,000,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$280,549,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$28,924,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$26,299,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,591,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$33,620,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,200,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$272,611,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$186,897,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$494,858,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$100,972,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$367,863,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$84,804,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$404,761,000.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$50,723,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,184,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND

For the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, (42 U.S.C. 3374), as amended, \$1,284,000, to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of construction, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with 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, as currently authorized by law, \$75,312,000, to remain avail-

able until September 30, 2016, which shall be only for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$373,543,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$258,776,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 14 days prior to obligating an amount for a construction project that exceeds or reduces the amount identified for that project in the most recently submitted budget request for this account by 20 percent or \$2,000,000, whichever is less: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply to projects costing less than \$5,000,000, except for those projects not previously identified in any budget submission for this account and exceeding the minor construction threshold under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances available under this heading from prior appropriation Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$50,000,000 are hereby rescinded, which represent savings resulting from favorable bids.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds made available in this title for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to begin construction of new bases in the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General; (3) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available

in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country, or in countries within the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries within the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense shall inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be

obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were made available, if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. Subject to 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to: (1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or (2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in "Military Construction" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided*, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by subsection (d) of section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program incurred under subsection (a)(1)(A) of such section 1013. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: *Provided*, That not more

than \$35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress all operation and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 122. Amounts contained in the Ford Island Improvement Account established by subsection (h) of section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (i)(1) of such section or until transferred pursuant to subsection (i)(3) of such section.

SEC. 123. None of the funds made available in this title, or in any Act making appropriations for military construction which remain available for obligation, may be obligated or expended to carry out a military construction, land acquisition, or family housing project at or for a military installation approved for closure, or at a military installation for the purposes of supporting a function that has been approved for realignment to another installation, in 2005 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510: 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), unless such a project at a military installation approved for realignment will support a continuing mission or function at that installation or a new mission or function that is planned for that installation, or unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the cost to the United States of carrying out such project would be less than the cost to the United States of canceling such project, or if the project is at an active component base that shall be established as an enclave or in the case of projects having multi-agency use, that another Government agency has indicated it will assume ownership of the completed project. The Secretary of Defense may not transfer funds made available as a result of this limitation from any military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project to another account or use such funds for another purpose or project without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress. This section shall not apply to military construction projects, land acquisition, or family housing projects for which the project is vital to the national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees within seven days of a decision to carry out such a military construction project.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 124. During the 5-year period after appropriations available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction,

Defense”, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 125. Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in an account funded under the headings in this title may be transferred among projects and activities within the account in accordance with the reprogramming guidelines for military construction and family housing construction contained in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill and in the guidance for military construction reprogrammings and notifications contained in Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation 7000.14 — R, Volume 3, Chapter 7, of February 2009, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 126. Of the unobligated balances available for “Base Realignment and Closure Account, 1990” from prior appropriations Acts (other than appropriations designated by law as being for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism or as an emergency requirement), \$100,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 127. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Defense to take beneficial occupancy of more than 1,000 parking spaces provided by the combination spaces provided by the BRAC 133 project and the lease of spaces in the immediate vicinity of the BRAC 133 project.

SEC. 128. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any action that relates to or promotes the expansion of the boundaries or size of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado.

SEC. 129. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Army to relocate a unit of the Army that would impact more than 200 personnel, calculated as the sum of impacted members of the regular or reserve components of the Army, civilian employees of the Department of the Army, and Army contractor personnel, unless the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary complied with Army Regulation 5–10 relating to the policy, procedures, and responsibilities for Army stationing actions.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by section 107 and chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; and burial benefits, the Reinstated Entitlement Program for Survivors, emergency and other officers’ retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of title IV of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 541 et seq.) and for other benefits as authorized by sections 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, and chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$58,067,319,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$32,187,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to “General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration”, “Medical support and compliance”, and “Information technology systems” for necessary ex-

penses in implementing the provisions of chapters 51, 53, and 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the “Compensation and pensions” appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to “Medical care collections fund” to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 21, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$11,011,086,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under subsection (a) of section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, other than under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of that subsection, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen’s indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by chapters 19 and 21, title 38, United States Code, \$100,252,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by subchapters I through III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2012, within the resources available, not to exceed \$500,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$154,698,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, \$19,000, as authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$3,019,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$343,000, which may be paid to the appropriation for “General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration”.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by subchapter V of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, \$1,116,000.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SERVICES

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department, and including medical supplies and equipment, food services, and salaries and expenses of health care employees hired

under title 38, United States Code, aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code, assistance and support services for caregivers as authorized by section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, and loan repayments authorized by section 604 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–163; 124 Stat. 1174; 38 U.S.C. 7681 note) \$41,354,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading \$1,000,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a priority for the provision of medical treatment for veterans who have service-connected disabilities, lower income, or have special needs: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority funding for the provision of basic medical benefits to veterans in enrollment priority groups 1 through 6: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize the dispensing of prescription drugs from Veterans Health Administration facilities to enrolled veterans with privately written prescriptions based on requirements established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the implementation of the program described in the previous proviso shall incur no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided in Public Law 112–10 for “Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services” for fiscal year 2012, \$664,000,000 shall be available only in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year upon approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of a request from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to release such funding due to unanticipated needs related to economic conditions.

MEDICAL SUPPORT AND COMPLIANCE

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; and administrative and legal expenses of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); \$5,746,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading \$100,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliary facilities, and other necessary facilities of the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction, and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department; for oversight, engineering, and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving, or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry services, \$5,441,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available until September

30, 2013: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading, \$100,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, \$508,774,000, plus reimbursements, shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and repair, alteration or improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Cemetery Administration, \$250,934,000, of which not to exceed \$25,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available to any project associated with the National Cemetery Administration's Urban Initiative program until a strategy to serve rural veterans is finalized and operational.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-Wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms, or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, \$422,500,000, of which not to exceed \$22,144,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That \$20,000,000 shall be used to increase the Department's acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities and may be transferred by the Secretary to any other account in the Department to carry out the purposes provided therein: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading may be transferred to "General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration".

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES, VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Benefits Administration, not otherwise provided for, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and reimbursement of the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$2,020,128,000: *Provided*, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$105,856,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase (on a one-for-one replacement basis only) up to two passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses for information technology systems and telecommunications support, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; for pay and associated costs; and for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including contractual costs associated with operations authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$3,025,000,000, plus reimbursements, shall remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated until the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget; (2) complies with the Department of Veterans Affairs enterprise architecture; (3) conforms with an established enterprise life cycle methodology; and (4) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a reprogramming base letter which sets forth, by project, the operations and maintenance costs, with salary expenses separately designated, and development costs to be carried out utilizing amounts made available under this heading.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, to include information technology, in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$109,391,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, construction management services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$589,604,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which \$5,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contract disputes: *Provided*, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, including portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and salaries and associated costs of the resident engineers who

oversee those capital investments funded through this account, and funds provided for the purchase of land for the National Cemetery Administration through the land acquisition line item, none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for fiscal year 2012, for each approved project shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2012; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a written report on any approved major construction project for which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, \$475,091,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is equal to or less than the amount set forth in such section: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall be for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE

EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital, nursing home, and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by sections 8131 through 8137 of title 38, United States Code, \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to assist States and tribal governments in establishing, expanding, or improving veterans cemeteries as authorized by section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, \$46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2012 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred as necessary to any other of the mentioned appropriations: *Provided*, That before such transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of

Congress the authority to make the transfer and such Committees issue an approval, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 202. Amounts made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012, in this Act or any other Act, under the “Medical services”, “Medical support and compliance”, and “Medical facilities” accounts may be transferred among the accounts: *Provided*, That any transfers between the “Medical services” and “Medical support and compliance” accounts of 1 percent or less of the total amount appropriated to the account in this or any other Act may take place subject to notification from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the amount and purpose of the transfer: *Provided further*, That any transfers between the “Medical services” and “Medical support and compliance” accounts in excess of 1 percent, or exceeding the cumulative 1 percent for the fiscal year, may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: *Provided further*, That any transfers to or from the “Medical facilities” account may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 203. Appropriations made available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by sections 5901 through 5902 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. No appropriations in this title (except the appropriations for “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects”) shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new Department of Veterans Affairs hospital or home.

SEC. 205. No appropriations in this title shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled to such hospitalization or examination under the laws providing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under sections 7901 through 7904 of title 5, United States Code, or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)), unless reimbursement of the cost of such hospitalization or examination is made to the “Medical services” account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title for “Compensation and pensions”, “Readjustment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and indemnities” shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 207. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3328(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable only from “Compensation and pensions”.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2012, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund under

section 1920 of title 38, United States Code, the Veterans’ Special Life Insurance Fund under section 1923 of title 38, United States Code, and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund under section 1955 of title 38, United States Code, reimburse the “General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” and “Information technology systems” accounts for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in such an insurance program during fiscal year 2012 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided further*, That if the cost of administration of such an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2012 which is properly allocable to the provision of each such insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in that insurance program.

SEC. 209. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication under section 319 of title 38, United States Code, for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$42,904,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and \$3,360,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: *Provided*, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: *Provided further*, That amounts received shall be credited to the “General administration” and “Information technology systems” accounts for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. No appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental cost is more than \$1,000,000, unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 212. No funds of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospital care, nursing home care, or medical services provided to any person under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for a non-service-connected disability described in section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title: *Provided*, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges for such care or services from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: *Provided further*, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including disposal) may be deposited into the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts and be used for construction (including site acquisition and disposition), alterations, and improvements of any medical facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such sums as realized are in addition to the amount provided for in “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects”.

SEC. 214. Amounts made available under “Medical services” are available—

(1) for furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the Department.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 215. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to “Medical services”, to remain available until expended for the purposes of that account.

SEC. 216. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into agreements with Indian tribes and tribal organizations which are party to the Alaska Native Health Compact with the Indian Health Service, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations serving rural Alaska which have entered into contracts with the Indian Health Service under the Indian Self Determination and Educational Assistance Act, to provide healthcare, including behavioral health and dental care. The Secretary shall require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary. The term “rural Alaska” shall mean those lands sited within the external boundaries of the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(1)–(4) and (7)–(12) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), and those lands within the Alaska Native regions specified in sections 7(a)(5) and 7(a)(6) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1606), which are not within the boundaries of the Municipality of Anchorage, the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the Kenai Peninsula Borough or the Matanuska Susitna Borough.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 217. Such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the “Construction, major projects” and “Construction, minor projects” accounts, to remain available until September 30, 2016 for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 218. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 219. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 220. Amounts made available under the “Medical services”, “Medical support and compliance”, “Medical facilities”, “General operating expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration”, “General administration”, and “National Cemetery Administration”

accounts for fiscal year 2012, may be transferred to or from the "Information technology systems" account: *Provided*, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 221. Amounts made available for the "Information technology systems" account may be transferred between projects: *Provided*, That no project may be increased or decreased by more than \$1,000,000 of cost prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress to make the transfer and an approval is issued or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

SEC. 222. Of the amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012, in this Act or any other Act, under the "Medical facilities" account for non-recurring maintenance, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available shall be obligated during the last 2 months of that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the Secretary may waive this requirement after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 223. Of the amounts appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2012 for "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", "Medical facilities", "Construction, minor projects", and "Information technology systems", up to \$241,666,000, plus reimbursements, may be transferred to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 3571) and may be used for operation of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500): *Provided*, That additional funds may be transferred from accounts designated in this section to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund upon written notification by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 224. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, for health care provided at facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500) shall also be available: (1) for transfer to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund, established by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 3571); and (2) for operations of the facilities designated as combined Federal medical facilities as described by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 225. Of the amounts available in this title for "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", and "Medical facilities", a minimum of \$15,000,000, shall be transferred to the DOD-VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by

section 8111(d) of title 38, United States Code, to remain until expended, for any purpose authorized by section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

SEC. 226. (a) Of the funds appropriated in title X of division B of Public Law 112-10, the following amounts which become available on October 1, 2011, are hereby rescinded from the following accounts in the amounts specified:

(1) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services", \$1,000,000,000.

(2) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance", \$100,000,000.

(3) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities", \$100,000,000.

(b) In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, an additional amount is appropriated to the following accounts in the amounts specified, to remain available until September 30, 2013:

(1) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical services", \$1,000,000,000.

(2) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical support and compliance", \$100,000,000.

(3) "Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical facilities", \$100,000,000.

SEC. 227. The Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of all bid savings in major construction projects that total at least \$5,000,000, or 5 percent of the programmed amount of the project, whichever is less: *Provided*, That such notification shall occur within 14 days of entering into a contract: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall notify the committees 14 days prior to the obligation of such bid savings and shall describe the anticipated use of such savings.

SEC. 228. The scope of work for a project included in "Construction, major projects" may not be increased above the scope specified for that project in the original justification data provided to the Congress as part of the request for appropriations.

SEC. 229. (a) Section 5701 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1)(1) The Secretary shall disclose to a State controlled substance monitoring program, including a program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3), the name and address of a veteran or a dependent of a veteran to the extent necessary to prevent misuse and diversion of prescription medicines.

"(2) In this subsection, the terms 'State' and 'controlled substance' have the meaning given such terms in section 3990(m) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3(m))."

(b) Section 7332(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G)(i) To a State controlled substance monitoring program, including a program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3), to the extent necessary to prevent misuse and diversion of prescription medicines.

"(ii) In this subparagraph, the terms 'State' and 'controlled substance' have the meanings given such terms in section 3990(m) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3(m))."

SEC. 230. Not more than \$250,000 may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct any single national outreach and awareness marketing campaign, including motorsports sponsorship, prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress and an approval is issued or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one-for-one replacement basis only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$61,100,000, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2109 of title 36, United States Code.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by sections 7251 through 7298 of title 38, United States Code, \$30,770,000: *Provided*, That \$2,726,363 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase or lease of passenger motor vehicles for replacement on a one-for-one basis only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$45,800,000, to remain available until expended. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the "Lease of Department of Defense Real Property for Defense Agencies" account.

Funds appropriated under this Act may be provided to Arlington County, Virginia, for the relocation of the federally-owned water main at Arlington National Cemetery making additional land available for ground burials.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

TRUST FUND

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$67,700,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. 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. 402. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 403. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, or for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentation to Congress itself.

SEC. 404. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 405. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 406. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a project or program named for an individual serving as a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the United States House of Representatives.

SEC. 407. (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 confidential or 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. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries or successors.

SEC. 409. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 410. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used by an agency of the executive branch to pay for first-class travel by an employee of the agency in contravention of sections 301-10.122 through 301-10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 411. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be

used by an agency of the executive branch to exercise the power of eminent domain (to take private property for public use) without the payment of just compensation.

SEC. 412. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense in this Act may be used to renovate, expand, or construct any facility in the continental United States for the purpose of housing any individual who has been detained, at any time after September 11, 2001, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 413. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to execute a contract for goods or services, including construction services, where the contractor has not complied with Executive Order 12989.

Mr. CULBERSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 60, line 9, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 29, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000)"

Page 31, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)".

Page 32, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$22,000,000)".

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$22,000,000)".

Page 34, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)".

Page 35, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000) (increased by \$70,000,000)".

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking member.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1950

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. This is an amendment which we've worked hard again to come up with arm in arm in a cooperative, bipartisan way to increase, for example—we're making sure we've got \$20 million set aside for suicide prevention outreach. A terrible, terrible problem among veterans and a high priority for us to do everything we can to help prevent suicide, that amendment offered by Congressmen HOLT and RUNYAN.

Also, this is another amendment we are submitting to attempt to reduce wait times for mental health services, also to increase research funding by \$22 million offset by a reduction in general administration. And also, Mr. Chairman, to set aside \$100,000 for the pur-

pose of a study of Veterans Affairs, VA historic properties.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate that this bipartisan amendment offered by my colleague Representative RUNYAN of New Jersey has been accepted by the majority, and I thank Chair CULBERSON and Ranking Member BISHOP and their staffs for making this possible.

As you may know, Mr. Chairman, last month the Federal Ninth Circuit Court sided with two veterans groups that sued the Department of Veterans Affairs for failing to provide timely care to veterans at risk of suicide. The court noted that on average, 18 veterans per day take their own lives. I'll repeat. On average, 18 veterans per day take their own lives. We must end this suicide epidemic.

This amendment is one important step in that process. Our amendment is simple. It fences \$20 million of the billion dollars in advance funding for the VA for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and dedicates these funds to suicide prevention outreach. Specifically, our intention is to use television ads and social media. We know that when veterans are made aware of the national suicide prevention number, which is 1-800-273-TALK, they use it. And lives are saved. 1-800-273-TALK. Indeed, in the State of New Jersey, we have our own veteran counseling hotline, the Vet-to-Vet Program run by the University of Medicine and Dentistry in New Jersey.

Since it went live a half dozen years ago, no New Jersey Guard member who has used its services has taken his or her own life. It is a successful program. We want to see this expanded. When we get the word out about these counseling services, we save lives. It's past time that we push the VA to do the advertising and the outreach that's necessary to reach the people who need it.

This amendment is budget neutral, it's vitally needed, and I thank my colleagues for carrying it forward.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN).

Mr. RUNYAN. Thank you for the time.

I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for his work on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Holt-Runyan amendment, which takes further steps towards keeping veterans alive by dedicating \$20 million of suicide prevention outreach within the VA for fiscal year 2012.

Suicide is always tragic, but suicide by a veteran, especially young veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, is especially troubling. VA officials tell us that one in five suicides in America is a veteran, and that the suicide rate of male veterans is twice that of the general population. While most of these are older

veterans, young male veterans are still more likely to commit suicide than those who have never served in Iraq or Afghanistan.

When the suicide rate of veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan spiked in 2004, Congress responded by increasing VA's budget for mental health by nearly a third. This allowed VA to create a veterans crisis line and place suicide prevention coordinators in every medical center.

But if any veteran who needs help cannot get help or does not know it is available, the program is a failure. As I said before, every suicide is tragic. And more must be done.

This is why I strongly support this amendment which would give the VA the necessary additional resources to let veterans know, through TV and social media, to reach out to our veterans. I hope all of my colleagues will stand with me and my colleague, Mr. HOLT, in support of this amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much to the gentleman from Georgia.

I rise to support this omnibus amendment and for the purpose of directing the Department of Veterans Affairs to examine its practices on how it plans to rehabilitate and reuse national landmarks that are aging, outdated, or in obsolete condition within the VA infrastructure and issue a report to Congress no later than January 1, 2012, on any actions taken or planned to be taken to rehabilitate and use these national landmarks, to fulfill its responsibilities under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation and to our veterans.

An example of these landmarks is the Milwaukee Soldier's Home, built in 1867, one of the original soldier's homes established by congressional legislation and approved by President Abraham Lincoln on March 3, 1865. The soldier's home reflects how our forefathers chose to care for and honor the soldiers who fought to keep the country united as one Nation.

I say forefathers because it was the ladies of Milwaukee's West Side Soldiers Aid Society whose tenacity and dedication made it possible to raise the funds necessary to create the Milwaukee Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers which they generously gifted to the soldier's home system, a forerunner of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This summer, on the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, the soldier's home will hopefully be dedicated as a national historic landmark.

I urge the Department of Veterans Affairs to send a report to Congress.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would note we're pleased to support this amendment. As the gentlewoman has just pointed out, this Veterans Hospital was created, I think she said March 30 of 1865. That would have been one of the last acts on Earth of Presi-

dent Abraham Lincoln. So we're pleased to accept her amendment to ensure the preservation of this very historic and important piece of American history.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. We want to commend the gentlelady for her amendment and her compassion in offering it.

While I have the time, let me discuss the Altmire amendment which has been offered, and Mr. ALTMIRE, I believe, is on his way to the floor. This amendment will move \$22 million from the Veterans Administration's general administration account to the medical and prosthetic research account.

A recent Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs heard testimony from wounded soldiers about the disparity of prosthetics technologies between the Department of Defense and the veterans health care. This amendment will restore some of the funding that was cut from the medical and prosthetic research account by taking a small dollar amount from the VA general administration account.

Wounded warriors are deserving of no less than this Nation's full commitment. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do support Mr. ALTMIRE's amendment.

Obviously, we are all committed to supporting prosthetics research. Our military doctors have done an extraordinary job of saving the lives of these young men and women who are wounded in combat, and we want to make sure we are giving them all the support they need.

I am glad Mr. ALTMIRE has brought this amendment to us. I understand he is on the way to the floor because he would like to speak on his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to expedite consideration of this bill and ensure our men and women in uniform get all the help they need as soon as possible, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RUNYAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, 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. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SECURING OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take 1 minute to address, tonight, an important bill the House passed on Homeland Security, funding all the agencies of Homeland Security.

In addition to funding our military, the Military Construction bill which we have just done, for Veterans Affairs, we also have a fundamental obligation to secure our borders. And the Homeland Security bill that we just passed does that in a number of important ways, most importantly, for the people of Texas.

I want to reassure everyone listening tonight that the Texas delegation and this Congress, this majority, will not rest until the southern border is secure, until we, with the full support of the people that live along the border, secure the border with zero tolerance, using existing law, which means 6 months in jail for crossing the border illegally, as we are doing in Del Rio with the full support of the local community, arresting everybody that crosses the border and throwing them in jail for up to 6 months, with the obvious exception of women and children. But we are enforcing the law in Texas, in Del Rio and in Laredo.

With the help of my friend HENRY CUELLAR and the local community, we are working in this majority to expand that zero tolerance program from Brownsville to San Diego. And I want to thank the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. ADERHOLT, for allowing us, through language in the bill, to expand rapidly the use of available empty bed space for illegal aliens so there are no more police officers like we just lost, another police officer in Houston, Texas, to an illegal alien. And we are not going to rest until that border is secured, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 292, REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN LIBYA, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 51, LIBYA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-99) on the resolution (H. Res. 294) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 292) declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United

States Armed Forces from Libya, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2010

THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the next 20 minutes where we can discuss the future of Medicare. It is being addressed in this House during this 112th session of Congress. We have seen many statements made about Medicare in the last weeks.

I can tell you, a sign like this is greeting many colleagues as they return to their districts every weekend or during the recess that we have, the district work periods that we might have, signs such as this, "Hands off my Medicare," greeting us as we return to our districts, and rightfully so.

Medicare has been a program that has served our senior population for quite some time. Seniors and those living with disabilities have really found life to be far more doable with Medicare assistance.

It was in the sixties when the debate began, and it was President Lyndon Johnson who had been there to sign the measure into law. And at that point in time, our senior population, our senior community across these great United States, had a great concern. They were finding it unaffordable and inaccessible to search for health care insurance coverage.

There was cherry-picking going on. There were those with the preexisting conditions that were denied any opportunity, and I think it's fair to state that the economic stability of those who had retired at that point of retirement, they usually found that that stability had dwindled, had gone south simply because of the medical expenses that they required, and oftentimes with underinsurance or no insurance as a scenario, they were seeing their lifetime worth of savings dwindle because of that dynamic in their lives.

Now, in this four-and-a-half decade stretch forward, many have suggested that their economic consequences have stayed fairly stable, that they have enjoyed a better retirement because of the addition of Medicare to their outcome.

However, this Medicare program has been under attack. It's been under attack. There has been a Republican budget that has come forth and been produced in this House by the majority party, and they have voted on that measure to end Medicare, end the Medicare that would shift risk from government to the pockets of seniors in this country. It would take a given situation where they would be asked to shop, shop in the private sector. This

could be a 70-year-old; it could be an 80-85-year-old that might be asked to shop in that private sector market.

Well, the egregious notion is that the value of that coupon they are given to go shop for new insurance holds a value of about 32 cents for every \$1 of premium that would be paid on insurance costs. That means that they are tremendously drained economically. It means that 6,000 more dollars would come out of the pockets of our senior citizens individually for the cost of this insurance coverage.

Well, that is an unacceptable outcome. It's one that really makes it difficult for our senior community to be covered for health care purposes and to remain somewhat economically stable in their retirement years. And by the year 2030, it's suggested that the costs would triple for our seniors. By the year 2022, it would at least double.

These are frightening statistics. These are unacceptable notions for our senior community, all of whom need to be responded to with respect and sensitivity and with the utmost compassion.

This does not show compassion; this shows disinterest. It shows an insensitivity to the struggle that many would make and the correlation of the need for health care services.

With age as a factor, it is an understandable partnership. It's one that would mimic and trace each other's curves, because as you grow older, the propensity to require services of health care delivery would naturally grow. And so we do not want to put at risk our senior population.

Now, I think what is quite interesting is that, as we talk about the doubling and the tripling to seniors for this program, just recently a study came out that said that those who are age 55 today should have to save about 185, \$182,000 additional for their medical expenses without the efforts made by Medicare as it exists today. And then the numbers simply escalate. I believe it's in the \$400,000 realm if you are in your thirties. So this is going to put a huge hardship onto our American working families, onto our senior community of today and certainly of tomorrow.

Now, what I found most generous is the statements made by seniors who are eligible for Medicare today, speaking in a way that is not self-centered but really speaks to the future. They have said that they have enjoyed Medicare as a program. It has provided economic stability. It has provided health care quality of services, and they want that to be preserved for the next generation and the generation to follow. They want their children and grandchildren to enjoy the same order of benefits that they have enjoyed.

So while there might have been this idea that if we safety net somehow a certain given population currently enjoying Medicare and suggest that most of that could maybe be kept intact, well, there was a far broader sense of concern expressed by our senior com-

munity. It was not a selfish order of self-centered reflection that some might have anticipated but, rather, the seniors showed that they are truly concerned about generations to come, which I think is a magnanimous statement for our senior population in this country.

When it comes to messaging, it's important, I think, to know, to take lessons from the most recent congressional district election that was held just about a week ago. Last week the voters of the 26th Congressional District in the State of New York, in a rather Republican area, in fact, the ninth most difficult district in this Nation for a Democrat to win in—it was there that a Democrat by the name of KATHY HOCHUL was running. She was successful in that she was able to bring to the attention of the electorate in that district the facts as to the Republican plan, the Republican budget.

And it was more than just Medicare. She talked about the end of Medicare but then related it to the dollars, the savings accrued from that elimination going toward other spending. Just what was and what is that other spending proposed? It would be handouts, mindless handouts to the oil industry sitting on a profit rich situation, perhaps the most profitable situation that they have known in their history. To date, this calendar year, the industry is sitting on a \$36 billion profit margin, \$36 billion.

What they are asking here is that some \$44 billion worth of handouts, mindless handouts that have continued through the decades, nearly a century now, be continued. And how do we pay for that but by ending Medicare, ending Medicare to take care of the profit rich oil industry. The same is true of millionaire, billionaire tax cuts. You see the savings that can accrue by ending Medicare would then be slid over to provide for millionaire and billionaire tax cuts.

Well, middle-class America is not ready for that sort of assault. They are going to let their feelings be known. And it's why messages like this, "Hands off my Medicare" are greeting myself and colleagues across this country. They are concerned. They are concerned. They are letting their legislators know that this is not an acceptable thing to do.

Now, look at the track record where, with Medicare, we have avoided administrative costs to the nth degree; we have avoided marketing budgets; we have avoided all sorts of external costs that don't go to the health care delivery of patients but, rather, are the externals.

□ 2020

Avoiding those dollars has kept down the price tag on Medicare.

When we look at that same stretch from the beginning of Medicare to today, it's been an excess of a 5,000 percent increase in premiums that have risen from that point in 1965 to today.

So it tells us one thing. It tells us that there is this tremendous growth from the private sector in comparison to what the Medicare track record has been.

And we have spent time with the Affordable Care Act to strengthen Medicare. We have made certain that where there were overpayments to the insurance industry for certain services, those dollars were reduced. We made a major effort to go after fraud, abuse, and inefficiency. That strengthens the program. We provide for more dollars for primary care physicians who can be networked into the Medicare formula so that we can provide contact for administering the services. All of this has a growth factor so as to strengthen the Medicare concept as we know it.

But people are concerned. Their health care situation has been addressed in very magnanimous terms by the Medicare program. People fought for years to get this developed, and they have maintained and strengthened it over the decades. And for people to come in and assume that they are going to end the Medicare program simply to pay for oil handouts and millionaire and billionaire tax cuts is just not going to be well received by America's working families, by her middle class that has seen this assault where it's their turn now to get better treatment, not worsened treatment, from the halls of government here in Washington.

The Medicare situation is one that has really defined a stronger sense of quality of life for our senior community and has enabled them to have good coverage.

What we also did in the Affordable Care Act is begin to close, and will close completely by the year 2020, the doughnut hole that existed for pharmaceutical purposes for those on Medicare part D. Well, again, we saw what happened, that we needed to come forward with an improvement in a program that would assist people. And so we closed that doughnut hole eventually. I can tell you of so many seniors who have approached my office, who have seen me in the district, telling me of how difficult it is for them to absorb the doughnut hole concept. Within a few months within any given calendar year, they fall into the doughnut hole where they need to dig into their own pocket to pay for the cost of many pharmaceutical requirements that they have in their medical agenda to stay well or to be healed. So it is a very pricey situation for them, and we want to make certain that those improvements stay intact.

We have also removed copayments and deductibles for the annual checkups and for various medical screenings that are available to our senior population. These are the source of responses that are compassionate, that are speaking to the quality of services and certainly to the dignity factor for our senior population. These are improvements. These are ways to stretch

the budget and enable our senior community to be all the more intact and connected with community

While we had worked with the Medicare issue in the Affordable Care Act, we want to make certain we also strengthen the trust fund. So there are things that have been done along the way. And now to just come in and say, look, this is more business for the private sector, this is a way to drive all the accounts of individuals who are enjoying a Medicare program, a concept that has worked well for four-and-a-half decades is now deemed to be ended simply now because of the desire of those who are in the majority in this House to pay for benefits to the oil industry and to continue millionaire and billionaire tax cuts.

Just on the heels of this victory in a congressional district I mentioned earlier, in the 26th District of New York, we took yet another vote in this House to deem the Republican budget a budget from which we'll work. That includes the end to Medicare. So just this week, with another vote right in the shadows of that victorious Democratic win in the 26th Congressional District of New York, we are again at it, putting a close to the Medicare concept in this country. Unacceptable outcomes. People will not tolerate that outcome.

In a CNN poll of recent measurement, there was a huge response in the negative to the Republican plan. Seventy-four percent of Americans are saying, leave the Medicare situation alone or improve it. Build upon it, strengthen it, prepare it to have even stronger values and concepts, and also provide for the trust fund that will be all the more secure to give it the stability, the underpinnings of support, not to end it. People have seen what it meant to them. They have seen what it meant to be able to enjoy the economic relief that is so important, especially as we age as a population.

The life expectancy growing higher with time is an important factor that really underscores the need for Medicare as a model, as a concept in this Nation.

There are many who have been speaking out against this proposal. There are many who understand that it's provided a great deal of stability. It has provided families, working families, with the relief of knowing that the senior members of their family are in good hands with a Medicare program that enables them to have more independence, to have more preventative services, to have more acute care delivery with an affordable outcome for their given family situation. This is an important measurement that needs to be kept in mind. It's an important effort to keep our economic situation in this country all the more doable and all the more viable.

There's an opportunity for many seniors to be involved and invested in community. Medicare enables them to be that more vibrant citizen, to respond to the economy in positive con-

tributory terms. And I think that that is very important.

With the Medicare situation in this country, we have watched the quality of life of our senior population grow and grow exponentially. And for those forces to come here before this House to express this desire to end a concept for which people fought for many years, where there was a documented need for this sort of advice and this sort of concept, and now to watch it at risk where it could fold and not continue, where we could have a situation where the concept is ended, is unacceptable.

There are those in selling this package that suggest that the legislators here in Washington have the same sort of opportunity. It's akin to what we're offering the senior community. Nothing could be farther from the truth. On average, the benefit for a congressional Representative is about 72 cents on the dollar, meaning that every 28 cents worth of coverage would be absorbed by the individual legislator. For the senior population, we're looking at 32 cents, a 40-cent difference, meaning that the gross majority of that premium would be paid for by senior citizens.

That is where the economic consequences become very, very real. That is where the shifting of risk from government to the senior citizen would be a real dynamic. It would be an unbelievably painful outcome for those who perhaps would struggle to find insurance. We would be asking people to shop in a marketplace, asking them to deal with a profit-rich industry, to deal with situations that might return cherry-picking and that might return inaccessible, unaffordable notions when it comes to health care coverage.

We've seen it repeatedly. We know that there were populations that were underserved as we began the debate on affordable care that was completed in the 111th session of Congress, and we certainly don't want that to come back and be the issue for the most senior elements in our society again. This was a victory that was hard fought. It's been a concept that has only been strengthened through the years. And like any good program, it gets adjusted as we move with time.

Fix Medicare is the message. Strengthen Medicare is the appeal, not end it. And the advice for those who want to end it is very basic: Hands off my Medicare. It's the advice that's given, it's the chant that's repeated over and over again across this Nation. And it's been such for quite some time.

□ 2030

This is part of a plan that the Republican budget, introduced by the Budget Committee in this House, has dubbed itself as a Path to Prosperity.

My friends, it is so obvious that this is the road to ruin, not the path to prosperity. You are taking the vulnerable and making them pay more. This is about tough choices. We have seen

where people don't have insurance; they have to make tough choices.

There is nothing tough—people have said, Oh, this is a tough choice that people have made. They have gone forward and taken a situation that they think is not affordable and they are going to make a tough choice and remove it. There is nothing tough about asking the weak or the poor to pay more so that oil as an industry can get more benefits and millionaires and billionaires can draw down a larger tax cut. There is nothing tough about that.

What it is insensitive. It is un-American. It is immoral to have such an outcome after so much success with a program that has proven itself time and time again to be a great friend to the senior community.

There are those who have spent countless hours and effort to put together a plan that would respond to this Nation's seniors with respect and dignity. And we can simply not afford to walk away from this concept in the very calloused manner that we are asked to. I was proud when I saw so many people stand up and say "no" to this vote. Unfortunately, it passed in this House. If this budget had its way to the finish line, it would end Medicare at the expense of so many of our Nation's seniors.

They have enjoyed this benefit. They have prospered from this benefit. They have realized a great sense of dignity with this effort, and we must maintain it. We must continue the fight to preserve a program that has served this Nation very well.

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

THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me and presiding over these affairs tonight.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding his time as he prepares his remarks, which I look forward to hearing.

Earlier this afternoon and into the evening, this House considered an appropriations bill related to Veterans Affairs and Military Construction. At that point I asked my colleagues to support an amendment that I offered for the FY 2012 Military Construction-Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, and that amendment I am thankful to say was accepted. It was bipartisan acceptance. Both the majority and minority agreed it should be added to the bill, and I just wanted to tell the gentleman and my colleagues that amendment is very straightforward. It moves \$22 million from the VA general administration to solve a dramatic cut in medical and prosthetic research.

This bill that we are talking about, the VA-Military Construction account, as it was written, funds medical and prosthetic research at \$509 million in FY 2012, but that is a \$72 million cut over last year. But the amendment that I offered restores funding to an account that directly impacts treatment of amputees and other wounded veterans.

Like all of my colleagues, I want to do everything I possibly can to support our veterans and to promote these programs. And like many of us, I have visited the facilities for amputees at Walter Reed Army Medical Center right here in Washington, DC, and I have spoken with those disabled wounded warriors who have lost limbs in the line of duty.

Through technological and medical improvements at that facility, the DOD has demonstrated its ability to improve world-class health care to amputees and other wounded servicemembers. The VA must have the funding necessary to carry on that mission after veterans leave the service.

Just last week, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a hearing entitled: "Seamless Transition—Meeting the Needs of Servicemembers and Veterans." During the hearing, multiple wounded warriors testified about the difficulty of transferring between DOD and VA care.

In particular, one witness, Lance Corporal Tim Horton from Oklahoma, highlighted the disparity between health care he received as he sought out prosthetics that help him go about his everyday life.

Lance Corporal Horton said: "I know other veterans who live in close proximity to Walter Reed who are able to walk in and out with the services and equipment they need within the same day, all without ever needing to go through their local VA. While waiting weeks for an appointment might seem like a minor inconvenience, for a warrior like myself, spending weeks without necessary prosthetics equipment, or sometimes even worse, equipment that causes extreme discomfort and other medical issues, can be wholly disruptive to our daily lives. The timeliness and consistency of care should not be a function of where warriors happen to live."

I have spoken with amputees with similar stories from my district in western Pennsylvania who have expressed their dissatisfaction with the medical care they receive after retiring from the military. I am sure all of my colleagues would agree, we can never repay America's veterans for the sacrifice that they have made for our country. What amount of money could replace an arm or a leg lost in the line of duty?

I firmly believe, as I am sure we all believe, that we need to get our fiscal house in order, but in this extreme time of fiscal restraint and prioritization of appropriations, I believe that no one should stand ahead of

our Nation's veterans when making these difficult funding decisions. I believe that medical and prosthetic research is a higher priority than bureaucratic administration.

CBO has scored my amendment as having no impact on budget authority, and it would actually reduce FY 2012 outlays by \$5 million.

This amendment helps direct the priorities of the VA towards the veterans that deserve its funding and support, and I want to thank the American Legion for its support in helping craft this amendment because it is good for veterans, and I am so happy that my colleagues have agreed to accept this amendment as part of the bill. Hopefully, it will survive in the Senate and become law.

I greatly appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding me some time to allow me to discuss this.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much.

Several weeks ago I had the opportunity to come down to the floor of the House and start something that I think is very significant. Mr. Speaker, I can't directly can't talk to the American people. I have to address you. But if I could talk to the American people, I would remind them that a couple of weeks ago, when I came down here, I was inviting them to participate in what I am now calling "The People's House" so that ordinary people can have a say in what we do and make sure that their opinions are heard. So again, I would invite anyone and everyone to join me in this conversation to make sure that everyday people have a voice and have a way to contact me. So, again, you can reach me at myidea@mail.house.gov or you can find me on Facebook or you can find me on Twitter.

What I want to remind everyone of is the fact that it is very clear that many of us know a lot of things, but the most important thing we need to know is that we don't know it all. That is why I am soliciting, Mr. Speaker, the help of the American people, so they can give us their ideas.

When I started this the last time, I was asking them to send me their ideas on ways to cut spending and ways to save money. I also was asking for ideas on how to raise some revenue, how to make this country the great country that it used to be.

Well, the good thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we had people who took me up on this idea and to say that they thought that this was a good idea and they wanted to participate. They wanted to make sure that people heard their voice. They sent me a number of ideas, and we are going to talk about some of those ideas and those comments today.

So my goal here is to again have and initiate a conversation with the American people, because this is truly "The People's House." The United States House of Representatives, you cannot be appointed to it. You have to be

elected. And the history behind it is because we are the closest to the American people. So now, in this day of new technology and all of the outlets and social media that we have in order to strike up conversations in different ways, we should do that. This is not the day when the only thing we have is the United States Postal Service or slower means of communication.

□ 2040

Today, we can communicate in seconds if not nanoseconds. So I want to make sure that we use all of this new medium in order to expand this conversation to everyone who is concerned. These are some of the people who responded last week and some of the people whose ideas we will talk about. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to get such a large response, and these are some of the people I wanted to point out.

We had Sheila Baker who responded; Robert Becker from New Orleans, who also responded; Mary Anne Lawrence Cazaubon responded several times through several different media outlets, and had some very interesting things to say, as well as Micah Hill, Barbara Olinger from Folsom, and Freddy Vazquez, Jr. Then, through Facebook, we had Adam Haney, Anthony Sadler from Tennessee, Phil Schlittler, and Deloris Wilson, all of whom participated and gave me some of their thoughts about what they thought should be going on.

I want to make sure that at least the people back in the Second Congressional District of Louisiana understand that they are more than welcome to participate in this conversation but that this conversation is open to the American people. There is no monopoly on good ideas. Although I respect and value the opinions of the people from Louisiana in the Second Congressional District, we want to hear from everybody. So let's just start talking about some of the ideas. I will tell you before I start that I may or may not agree with all of the ideas, and some of my colleagues from the Republican side or the Democratic side may or may not agree.

The one thing I think both sides will agree on is that this is America and that this is what makes America the great place that it is. This is the place where we can provide kids with a free quality public education, which will prepare them for the future. This is the place where we strive to get the sick the health care that they need even if they can't afford it. This is the great country where we take care of our seniors and our disabled with Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. This is the country where we care for our fellow man and strive to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and shelter the homeless. Tonight, I am sharing recommendations on how we as Americans get back to that great place of humanity, of sacrifice and of prosperity.

Now, Micah Hill's comments were very, very interesting. Micah's frustra-

tion was the fact that Congress should address underachievement in our grade schools. He wanted us to address that underachievement by holding parents accountable for their children's performance. I'll give you an excerpt from his letter.

Micah's response was: Children who are not doing well in their studies are children who are constantly in trouble. Their parents should be investigated. The students' homes should be investigated to see if the parents are abusing substances or anything else. If young students, like those in grade school and freshmen in high school, are having problems, then the parents should be investigated. That will help educate our children who are not getting their educational needs met because of their home fronts. Find out the child's educational strengths, and find out what is lacking in the home.

Now, Micah, that is a very creative idea, and I think that that conversation has started numerous times back in my State legislature. It is a conversation that we should be having at the Federal level because, when we talk about our children's success, when we talk about their education, the one thing that everyone agrees on is the fact that parental responsibility and parental involvement is the single biggest indicator of that child's success. So, as government, if we can help to do anything to make sure that that home life is safe and secure and that that child can succeed, then we absolutely should do it, and I look forward to continuing that conversation with you.

I will now touch for a second on Mary Anne Lawrence Cazaubon, who, by the way, is 72, and is a retired teacher. Before her teaching career, she worked more than the required quarters in order to draw Social Security. Between the two lives that she lived and the two jobs that she worked, she now lives on less than \$1,150 per month. If there were a flat tax of only 10 percent, it would cost her, roughly, \$115 per month. She says, even though she would have to spend every dime of her check every month, she would just have to do that. She also mentions, some months, she has to go without food, but she always makes sure that she gets her medicine for her heart and her osteoporosis.

That's the type of sacrifice, that's the type of predicament a lot of our families are in.

Ms. Mary Anne went further as she talked about tax and fiscal issues, and she was very clear to write this, a statement that I absolutely agree with: Congressman, I hope you appreciate the fact that many of your constituents do support limited government and fiscal sanity. Our country is in real danger of economic collapse. Please don't just toe the party line and reject solutions to this crucial issue. Our Nation's fate depends on it.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think Ms. Mary Anne is absolutely right. I think that everyone in the

country is calling for limited government and fiscal sanity. Also, I think that we have to recognize at the same time that as we cut and make very prudent decisions to restore our fiscal sanity that we have to invest in this next generation, that we have to invest in the future, that we have to invest in those things that spur our entrepreneurial spirit and our innovation, and in those things that are going to continue to make sure that we are the leader in every industry and in every category that we used to be the leader in.

After Ms. Mary Anne talked about the limited government and fiscal sanity, she also volunteered that she would like to see an indexed income tax without any exceptions for individuals or families and no incentives or exemptions to any industry or company, large or small. Here is the recommendation that Ms. Mary Anne came up with:

She would recommend a 0 percent tax for anyone with an income of less than \$20,000, 5 percent for anyone with income from \$20,000 to \$40,000, 10 percent for any of those from \$40,000 to \$60,000, 15 percent for those from \$60,000 to \$80,000, 20 percent for those from \$80,000 to \$100,000, 25 percent for those from \$100,000 to \$150,000, 30 percent for those from \$150,000 to \$200,000, and 35 percent for all incomes over \$200,000.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is very interesting because we're talking about a 72-year-old lady who survives on \$1,150 per month, and she has taken the time not only to watch C-SPAN but to join in the conversation with me and the people's House to say that she understands that people who make more should pay a little bit more.

On that note, I'll go to Sheila Baker, whose quote, I think, is directly applicable to what Ms. Mary Anne was saying. Ms. Baker says: I pay my taxes responsibly with the understanding that I must pay more than those who earn an income less than mine.

Ms. Baker is clearly saying that she makes a little bit, and she understands that she pays more than the person who does not make what she makes and who is not as fortunate as she is; but her next sentence is the most important one. She says she also expects and demands that those who earn more than she should do the same and that those who make more than Ms. Baker should also pay their fair share, hence the concept of a fair shared burden of taxes.

So I want to thank Ms. Baker, one, for acknowledging that she is doing better than other people and that she has to pay a little bit more, and I want to thank her for participating in the people's House and in expressing her concerns and her opinions about where she thinks we should be as a country.

□ 2050

The next person I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is Freddy Vazquez, Jr. He has concerns about our spending; he

has concerns about foreign aid; and he has concerns about the war that we are fighting. And he writes, “We spend billions on helping others, and that’s fine when we have the means. Libya, Pakistan, Iraq and Afghanistan, they take our money, then they stab us in the back. America can and will go bankrupt. Our government is acting like a teenager who just received a credit card.” He then goes on to quote 2pac, where 2pac said, “They got the money for war, but they can’t feed the poor.” And he closes with, “That’s not right—that’s not America.”

And I would just say that the frustration that Mr. Vazquez is expressing here is a frustration that we’re hearing all across the country, the fact that we’re fighting so many wars on foreign soil, the fact that our humanity goes far out immediately. People are wondering, does humanity start at home? Do we have obligations to take care of on the home front before we go across the globe doing the same? Mr. Speaker, I would just chime in here and add my personal opinion that we’re America, we can do both; we can provide here at home, and we can continue to be the world leader, spreading democracy around this world to make sure that the world is just as great as the free country that we live in.

Now, what is it going to take to do that? It’s going to take a shared sacrifice. In the last People’s House we talked about, American people, give what you can give—if you’re a high school student, mentor an elementary kid; if you’re a college student, help out at a senior citizens home; if you’re a millionaire, then contribute to a charity. What makes America great is the fact that we are willing to give what we have to give. So I would just implore everyone, Mr. Speaker, to give what it is you have the ability to give because that’s what made this country what it is today and allowed us to achieve what we were able to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I would also add that Anthony Sadler wrote in to say that he believes we should buy more products from local businesses, especially minority businesses. Anthony, I just want you to know that down here today I don’t have our minority whip, Mr. STENY HOYER, but I will tell you that you and STENY HOYER are a match made in heaven. STENY and our Democratic Caucus are pushing what we call “Make It in America.” And if STENY was down here today, he would go on and on and really get excited about the fact that we will make it in America. That’s what we do—we make it in everything we do.

Another part of that Make It in America, we need to make more products in America. That’s what we do—we manufacture things, we build things, we have the best innovation, but we need to make sure that we have a focus, a commitment, and an investment in the American people so that they can make it here in America. So that goes right with what you’re say-

ing, Mr. Sadler. Because as Steny will push that we make it in America, you’re pushing that we buy American products, and those two things go hand in hand. So Mr. Sadler, I just want to thank you for chiming in. And I’m sure that my minority whip, STENY HOYER, is somewhere right now very appreciative of the fact that you also recognize the importance of making it in America.

Now we have Ms. Deloris Wilson and Phil Schlittler, who posted on my Facebook. And both of them didn’t post very long messages, they both posted the same thing at different times, and they simply said that they agree with the President’s rationale not to release the pictures of Osama bin Laden’s body. And I just want to say to Ms. Wilson and to Phil that I agree with both of you. I think the President made the right decision. But it’s very comforting to know that we have citizens like you all that are at home, paying attention, and simply are not voicing an opinion to get attention, but simply a heartfelt belief. And it just so happens that I agree with your opinion. But even when we don’t agree, I want to hear from you. I want to make sure that we keep this conversation going.

Now, the next person is Adam Haney, who I did not know before the first time I did the People’s House, but he was watching and this is what he wrote, “Saw you on C-SPAN, good job. Those maniacal Republicans want to kill my hopes for class mobility. Save the safety nets Republicans used to get into Congress for those of us who want to benefit from those same programs that they did.” And I would just add, Adam, that there are a bunch of programs out there, and those programs are what make this country great. And I don’t have to talk about the obvious—Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare—we can talk about Head Start, that gives our toddlers the ability to start school and give them a head start on their future.

As a country, we invest in things. We should look at what return do we get on our dollar. When we invest in early childhood education, we get a 9-1 return. For every dollar that we invest in that child, we get \$9 back. Those are the types of programs that Adam is referring to when he said that the majority would prefer to cut all of those programs now that they have received it and they’ve been the beneficiary of it.

Also, we can go back to free and reduced lunch in our public schools. We can talk about public school education, period, the fact that many of us that are lucky enough and honored enough to be Members of the United States Congress in this 112th Congress came from public schools with public school teachers funded by the American people. We should hold that very high, the privilege that we were able to do that, but at the same time we should recognize that that was a sacrifice by generations before us to make sure that it

was fully funded. We had the quality teachers that we needed so that we could be prepared, so that we could prosper and that we could be successful. It would be a sin and shameful for us not to invest that same energy, same money, same commitment into our next generation, and I’m afraid that that’s the route that we’re taking. So Adam, I just want to say I agree with you wholeheartedly.

The second to last one is Robert Becker from New Orleans who wrote me with an idea about Social Security and retirement security. He said, “We should increase the amount that is deducted from paychecks to pay into the trust fund and increase the amount employers contribute to the fund. It is in America’s best interest not to have a great portion of elderly Americans living on the edge of poverty.” Not only is it in America’s interest, Robert, I will tell you it’s the right thing to do. And at some point we have to remember that while we’re here on Earth, it’s for a purpose, and that’s to make the world a better place. And what you’re advocating for absolutely is the right thing to do. It makes this country the special country that it is.

And our last person is Barbara Olinger from Folsom. She is from Louisiana, not in my district, but she wrote, urging Congress to act on Social Security and related issues. Specifically, she was requesting that we as Congress reconsider the Social Security Fairness Act of 2009, which would repeal rules related to the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision. She says this reduces her income during tough times. She wrote, “Saddest of all is I am a retired social studies teacher, American history, civics. I am so distraught. We only ask for what is right and just. If I had not ever paid a dime, I would not be asking for a dime.” Well, Ms. Barbara, you’re absolutely right; you paid into it, you should get it, you shouldn’t be penalized. I’m not too big, too arrogant to say sometimes government gets it wrong, and government has it dead wrong on this issue, and it’s something that we should address. So I want to thank those people for writing in.

And now I just want to turn for a second to something that is absolutely the climax of foolishness. See, I have a shipyard in my district called Avondale Shipyard. It used to be Northrop Grumman, then Northrop Grumman spun it off, got a \$1.5 billion credit for the asset, and they spun it off to a new company that they made, Huntington Ingalls Shipyard. Well, Huntington Ingalls, in just the first quarter this year, made \$45 million, but they decided that they’re going to close that shipyard in my district. Now that’s almost 5,000 direct workers that work for Huntington Ingalls, 6,000 indirect jobs. Well, it’s every American company’s right to decide when they want to close a business. They can decide it’s just not profitable. They can decide that the heat in Louisiana and the humidity

and the mosquitos are too much for them, that they can quit, that they're going to shut their plant down. That is their right and that's what we fight for in this country, to give people the right to do what they want to do. It doesn't mean I have to like it. But government should not be a coconspirator in that company's quitting on the American people.

So what I have here today, I have all of these petitions—and they're not signed by the workers. It would have been far too easy to come in here with a big box of 5,000 signatures from people who depend on Huntington Ingalls for a paycheck. This is from businesses in the community that are saying that it's just not right for Huntington Ingalls to just abandon the community.

Here's the part that rises to the level of the climax of foolishness. Now that Huntington Ingalls has decided to close, they have applied for the Federal Government to reimburse them the cost of closing. So the Federal Government is contemplating giving Huntington Ingalls \$310 million to pay for their cost of ramping down and laying off almost 5,000 people. To me, that just doesn't make good sense. We can take that \$310 million, we can put it in an economic development fund for any other business that wants to come along and create thousands of jobs. We can put it in education for those 5,000 employees so that they can be competitive in another occupation. We can take that \$310 million and pay down the debt. We can take that \$310 million and do a number of things, but I would submit to you that we don't take that \$310 million and reward a company for closing.

I offered that amendment on a bill just a few days ago, and some of my Republican colleagues supported the idea that we should not reward a company for quitting on 5,000 employees, and my Democratic colleagues overwhelmingly supported the same amendment. I would just tell you that in these tough economic times it is unconscionable to reward a company for quitting.

For those people who voted against that amendment, I would hate to have to go back to Montana, Minnesota—somewhere—and say not only did I have an opportunity to take \$310 million and give it to paying down the debt or doing something productive with it, or even doing something in my district, I decided to give \$310 million to a company that is going to make \$180 million this year. And why are we giving them \$310 million? Because they're closing. They're still going to own the property; they're still going to have the asset; they won't have the employees.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just wanted to quickly touch on one thing, and that is, on the last district workweek, I had the opportunity to go to the Second Harvest Food Bank of Greater New Orleans. They are leading the fight in

eradicating hunger. Last year, they served 262,800 people, including 82,000 children and 40,000 seniors. I just want everyone to know that the problem of hunger, homelessness, and all of those things in our community is real. So as we cut, we need to remember to invest.

Again, I look forward to continuing this conversation on the next People's House. And you can email us at myidea@mail.house.gov.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after noon and tomorrow on account of a family funeral.

Mr. CICILLINE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 3 p.m. on account of attending a funeral in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 3, 2011, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1773. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account", for the period ending March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1774. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8177] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1775. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to United Arab Emirates pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1776. A letter from the Deputy Director for Operations, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1777. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Rate Increase Disclosure and Review (RIN: 0938-AQ68) received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animal Drugs, Feeds, and Related Products; Withdrawal of Approval of New Animal Drug Applications; Aklomide; Levamisole Hydrochloride; Nitromide and Sulfantran; Roxarsone; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0002] received May 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revised Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Lowell [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0445; A-1-FRL-9305-1] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0999; FRL-9304-8] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Permitting Authority and Tailoring Rule Revision [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-1028; FRL-9305-2] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1783. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Kahuku and Kualapuu, Hawaii) [MB Docket No.: 09-189] received May 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1784. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electric Reliability Organization Interpretations of Interconnection Reliability Operations and Coordination and Transmission Operations Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM10-8-000] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1785. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Version One Regional Reliability Standards for Facilities Design, Connections, and Maintenance; Protection and Control; and Voltage and Reactive [Docket No.: RM09-9-000] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1786. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Version One Regional Reliability Standard for Transmission Operations [Docket No.: RM09-14-000] received May 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared

with respect to Burma is to continue beyond May 20, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 112—32); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1788. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-032, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1789. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-015, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1790. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-038, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1791. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-011, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-025, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-009, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1794. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-017, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1795. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-008, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1796. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2010 on Voting Practices in the United Nations, pursuant to Public Law 101-246, section 406; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1797. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1798. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1799. A letter from the Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1800. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2011, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1801. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Seventieth Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010 pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1802. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska License Limitation Program [Docket No.: 0912021424-1182-03] (RIN: 0648-AY42) received May 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1803. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pueblo, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1246; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-17] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1804. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taylor, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1189; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-19] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1805. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kenton, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1054; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-23] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1806. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Terre Haute, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1034; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-22] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1807. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Raton, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1239; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASW-17] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1808. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Indianapolis Executive Airport, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1027; Airspace Docket No. 10-AGL-15] received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1809. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad Safety Appliance Standard, Miscellaneous Revisions [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0116; Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB97) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1810. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration,

transmitting the Administration's final rule — Intermediary Lending Pilot Program [Docket No.: SBA-2011-0002] (RIN: 3245-AG18) received May 9, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

1811. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft bill "Civilian Property Realignment Act"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

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. SCOTT of South Carolina: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 294. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 292) declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Libya (Rept. 112-99). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 672. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-100, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 672 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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 Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2084. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs.

LOWEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, regarding restrictions on the use of Department of Defense funds and facilities for abortions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHULER (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 2086. A bill to exclude from consumer credit reports medical debt that has been in collection and has been fully paid or settled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. RIGELL:

H.R. 2087. A bill to remove restrictions from a parcel of land situated in the Atlantic District, Accomack County, Virginia; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided health coverage for employees' spouses and dependent children to coverage provided to other eligible designated beneficiaries of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHULER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 2089. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to encourage the use of advanced technologies with respect to transportation projects that receive Federal funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2090. A bill to improve assessments of and research about energy critical elements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, 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. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to encourage investment in the expansion of freight rail infrastructure capacity and to enhance modal tax equity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HANNA, Mr. YODER, Mr. POMPEO, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 2092. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2093. A bill to establish the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Investigative Commission to investigate the policies and practices engaged in by officers and directors at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac responsible for making the decisions that led to the enterprises' financial instability and the subsequent Federal conservatorship of such enterprises; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington,

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2095. A bill to establish a grant program to assist retail power providers with the establishment and operation of energy conservation programs using targeted residential tree-planting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2096. A bill to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the military housing allowance exclusion for purposes of determining area gross income in determining whether a residential rental property is a qualified residential rental property for purposes of the exempt facility bond rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2098. A bill to support Promise Neighborhoods; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WEST, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 2099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for natural disaster mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. WEST):

H.R. 2100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create Catastrophe Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. WEST):

H.R. 2101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the creation of disaster protection funds by property and casualty insurance companies for the payment of policyholders' claims arising from future catastrophic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 2102. A bill to permit each commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission to appoint an electrical engineer or computer scientist to provide technical consultation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2103. A bill to modify certain requirements for countable resources and income under the Supplemental Security Income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARPER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2104. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; 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. TURNER (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. COLE, Mr. HECK, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WEST, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JONES, Ms. FOX, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. HUNTER):

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing disapproval of United States intervention in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 292. A resolution declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 293. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H. Res. 295. A resolution promoting increased awareness, diagnosis, and treatment of atrial fibrillation to address the high morbidity and mortality rates and to prevent avoidable hospitalizations associated with this disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

53. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 104 designating the month of May 2011 as

“Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month” in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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 Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18).

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 2086.

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. RIGELL:

H.R. 2087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 2089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 7 and Clause 18

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 2091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 2092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sixteenth Amendment

Congress shall have power to levy, or repeal, taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 8.

More specifically,

Article. 1. Section 8. Clause 3.

Article I. Section. 8. Clause 18.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2094.

At Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, “the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States.” As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.” I was elected in 2010 to serve in the 112th Congress as certified by the Secretary of State of Washington state.

Article III, Section 2 states that the Supreme Court has “the judicial power” that “shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States.” Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land when stating “The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court.”

The power of judicial review of the Supreme Court was upheld in Marbury v Madison in 1803, giving the Supreme Court the authority to strike down any law it deems unconstitutional. Members of Congress, having been elected and taken the oath of office, are given the authority to introduce legislation and only the Supreme Court, as established by the Constitution and precedent, can determine the Constitutionality of this authority.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, “Congress shall have the power To . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States” and “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers.”

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 2097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress held in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 2102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 12: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and within the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 85: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 91: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 218: Mr. OLVER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 321: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 343: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 370: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 421: Ms. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 452: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 459: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 466: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 478: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 481: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 575: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 623: Ms. MOORE and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 640: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 642: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 674: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 721: Mr. POSEY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.

H.R. 733: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 740: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 756: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 763: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 820: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 831: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 853: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 854: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 883: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 972: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 973: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 998: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1006: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1031: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1041: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1057: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1140: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 1154: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 1164: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1172: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1173: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1190: Ms. FOXX and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1219: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1222: Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 1224: Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 1259: Mr. HECK, Mr. REED, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 1262: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1281: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1283: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1297: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1317: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1338: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1390: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1394: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 1449: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1451: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1462: Mr. COHEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1465: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 1474: Mr. BROWN of Georgia.
 H.R. 1488: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1497: Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 1498: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 1506: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1514: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H.R. 1525: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 1529: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1533: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1551: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRÉN of California.
 H.R. 1606: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1614: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. POLLS.
 H.R. 1635: Mr. HIMES and Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 1672: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 1675: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 1712: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 1723: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 1734: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 1747: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. UPTON, Mr. YODER, and Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 1756: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 1802: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1803: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1815: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. DICKS, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1828: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1829: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 1834: Mr. CAMPBELL.
 H.R. 1839: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1848: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 1856: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1862: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1905: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1940: Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1970: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1974: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. BARROW and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 2001: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 2003: Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 2005: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2030: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2032: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 2040: Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 2046: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2064: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 2067: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 2068: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 2069: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 2070: Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEST, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 2072: Mr. DOLD, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2075: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 2077: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 2079: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. HOCHUL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. COBLE.
 H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. STARK.
 H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H. Res. 25: Mr. WALBERG.
 H. Res. 130: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 137: Mr. LANCE.
 H. Res. 177: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H. Res. 258: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 262: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 270: Ms. HAYWORTH.
 H. Res. 283: Ms. NORTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 771: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 77: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. GOHMERT

AMENDMENT No. 78: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the new construction, purchase, or lease of any building or space in the District of Columbia except where a contract for the construction, purchase, or lease was entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: Ms. ESHOO

AMENDMENT No. 79: 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 enter into a contract with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures.

H.R. 2017

OFFERED BY: MR. HONDA

AMENDMENT No. 80: Page 60, beginning on line 15, strike “; and of which none of the funds may be used for grants for immigrant integration”.

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. MEEKS

AMENDMENT No. 1: 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 declare as excess to the needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs or otherwise take any action to exchange, trade, auction, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, or reduce the acreage of, Federal land and improvements at the St. Albans campus, consisting of approximately 55 acres of land, with borders near Linden Boulevard on the northwest, 115th Avenue on the west, the Long Island Railroad on the northeast, and Baisley Boulevard on the southeast.

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

H.R. 2055

OFFERED BY: MR. ALTMIRE

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 32, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$22,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$22,000,000)”.