

Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Filner
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Henger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Visclosky
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—11

Amash
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Campbell

Duncan (TN)
Flake
Graves (GA)
Kingston

Mulvaney
Paul
Rokita

NOT VOTING—13

Fattah
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Lucas

Manzullo
Myrick
Rogers (MI)
Ryan (WI)
Schwartz

Tierney
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1533

Ms. BASS of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a VetStar Award Program.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2017, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 2017.

□ 1535

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

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my honor to present the fiscal year 2012 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill before us today, perhaps more than any other bill, exemplifies the difficult choices that need to be made in order to address our Nation's fiscal crisis.

This bill demonstrates how we can fully fund vital security programs while also reducing spending overall. Furthermore, this bill does not represent a false choice between fiscal responsibility and security. Both are national security priorities, and both are vigorously addressed in this bill.

I am under no illusion that everyone here in this Chamber will agree with the spending reductions included in this legislation; but now, more than ever, our government needs fiscal discipline, and this bill takes the necessary steps toward that goal.

The bottom line: more money and more government do not equal more security. So in this time of skyrocketing debt and persistent threats, we must get our homeland security priorities right.

The bill before us today provides \$40.6 billion in discretionary funding, or almost \$3 billion, which is 7 percent below the request, and \$1.1 billion, or almost 3 percent below the fiscal year 2011 level. In addition, the bill also includes \$1 billion in offset, emergency supplemental funding for FEMA's disaster relief fund immediately upon enactment. There are no earmarks that are set out in this bill or the accompanying report.

The bill places priority on funding our Nation's greatest security needs—fully funding all frontline personnel such as Border Patrol, CBP officers, ICE officers, Coast Guard military personnel, and Secret Service agents, and fully funding all intelligence, watchlisting, and threat targeting functions.

In addition, the bill provides funding where the administration and the Department of Homeland Security have failed. This bill makes up for the nearly \$650 million shortfall handed to us by the Department through phony, unauthorized fee collections. It is irresponsible for the administration to submit a budget based on the illusion that Congress is going to raise taxes or fees in this current economy.

This bill also addresses the wholly inadequate request for disaster relief funding and provides the resources to help our communities recover from natural disasters, like the unprecedented flooding across the Mississippi

River Valley; the tornadoes that devastated my home State of Alabama a few weeks ago; and the horrific tornado that destroyed much of Joplin, Missouri, just a little over a week ago.

However, programs that have been underperforming and failing to execute their budgets or which have repeatedly ignored congressional directives to measure their results are significantly reduced.

In short, this bill places a priority on the taxpayers' limited dollars towards the security programs that will have an immediate impact upon our national security and responsibly reduces spending wherever possible.

The bill is constructed around three core priorities: number one, fiscal discipline; number two, targeted investments in security operations and disaster relief; and, number three, meaningful, hard-hitting oversight.

First on fiscal discipline. The bill goes further than simply cutting spending. This bill insists upon real reform—reform in how the Department justifies its budget; reform on how FEMA manages its first responder grants; and reform on how FEMA, the Department, and the administration budget for the costs of disaster relief.

□ 1540

Number two, on security, the bill includes nearly \$150 million worth of targeted investments above the budget request for security operations—the frontline programs that are among the most critical at keeping our Nation secure and these activities that directly countered recent terrorist attacks and address known threats.

On disaster relief, I have seen firsthand what natural disasters can do over the past few weeks, and I can tell you that my constituents in Alabama are expecting FEMA to get it right. So this bill picks up from where we left off in FY 2011 and provides an increase of \$850 million above the request and within the budget for FEMA's disaster relief fund to address the known and expected cost of disasters in FY 2012. And as we added unanimously in our full committee markup of the bill last week, \$1 billion in offset, emergency supplemental funding is provided to FEMA to ensure that disaster relief efforts stay on track this year and well into 2012.

And, three, finally, is oversight. Our subcommittee has a long tradition of insisting upon results for each and every taxpayer dollar that is appropriated. This is a testament to the previous leadership on this subcommittee that was exhibited by our founding chairman of this subcommittee, Chairman ROGERS, and also my predecessor and now the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PRICE.

This bill continues the dedication to frontline security programs and robust oversight by including numerous spend plan requirements, reporting requirements, and operational requirements, such as border patrol staffing levels

and an increase to ICE's detention capacity.

Now, I know there has been some criticism on the funding level this bill is recommending for FEMA's first responder grants. Let me emphasize that there is more than \$13 billion in the pipeline that has not been spent, but FEMA has yet to establish a credible method for measuring the impact of these grants.

So this bill takes bold steps to get FEMA's fiscal house in order—requiring accountability for every dollar spent, requiring a plan for drawing down the enormous unexpended balances, consolidating duplicative grant programs, putting priority on high-risk needs, and rewarding programs like the Emergency Management Performance Grants that actually spend their funds wisely and are willing to measure their results.

I know how important first responders are to this Nation. We see it every day. But we simply cannot keep on throwing money into a clogged pipeline when our debt is soaring out of control. I believe it's our duty to reform these grant programs.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is about putting a priority on limited dollars and robustly supporting the most essential functions. The Department of Homeland Security, with all its critical missions, is not immune from fiscal discipline. That means the Department has to find the most cost-effective way to meet its mission requirements. The American people are demanding no less.

In closing, let me thank Ranking Member PRICE. Although we have certainly had a turbulent year, he has been a statesman and a true partner as we worked on this vital bill. I sincerely thank him for his input and his contributions that he has made on this bill.

In addition, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full committee, Chairman HAL ROGERS and Ranking Member NORM DICKS. As much as we have had to make difficult choices and tradeoffs at subcommittee level, I know that both of these gentlemen have had to make much more difficult decisions dealing with all 12 subcommittee budgets.

Finally, I would like to take a moment to thank the committee staff for their hard work on this bill, namely: Stephanie Gupta and Paul Cox on the minority staff; and Jeff Ashford, Kris Mallard, Kathy Kraninger, Miles Taylor, Rebecca Ore, Brian Rell, Mark Dawson, Anne Marie Malecha, and Ben Nicholson, who is the clerk of this committee, on the majority side.

I believe this bill reflects our best efforts to address our Nation's most urgent needs: security and fiscal discipline. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may utilize.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we're considering the fiscal year 2012 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill in a timely fashion and under an open rule. Chairman ADERHOLT has been a true professional in the drafting of this bill, and I appreciate his willingness to include input from our side all along the way. And I certainly want to share in his commendation of all of our staff on both sides of the aisle.

For the second year in a row, overall funding for the Department of Homeland Security will drop. The bill decreases funding for Homeland Security by 6.8 percent below the President's request and essentially returns funding to the 2009 level, which is concerning to many people, including myself.

This allocation has required Chairman ADERHOLT to make some tough decisions. He has been able to retain adequate funding for the frontline employees of the Department of Homeland Security to continue conducting critical operations along our borders, to protect our Nation's airports and seaports, and to respond to the wave of natural disasters that our country has experienced this spring.

The same, however, is not true, unfortunately, of Homeland Security grant programs, which are cut radically. Providing a total of \$1 billion for all State and local grants, or 65 percent below the President's request, and providing \$350 million for firefighter assistance grants—that's almost 50 percent below an already reduced request—breaks faith with the States and localities that depend on us as partners to secure our communities. These cuts will be especially harmful as many of our States and municipalities are being forced to slash their own budgets.

For example, according to the International Association of Fire Fighters, 1,600 fewer local firefighters will be on the job if the cuts in this bill are enacted. I can't conceive of any defensible argument for cuts of this magnitude, cuts that come on top of cuts to grants already made in the fiscal 2011 appropriations. They will do great damage to local preparedness, to emergency response in our communities, and to the recovering economy.

These grant programs equip our State and local partners to be ready for a disaster so they can mitigate its impact and respond effectively. While this bill rightly seeks to help States and localities rebuild after a disaster strikes, it decimates the work required to prepare for a disaster before it happens. That exposes our communities to greater risk, and it potentially raises the cost of attacks and disasters when they do occur. And we shouldn't ignore the impact of first responder layoffs on our economic recovery.

This bill recommends other drastic reductions, for example, by cutting research funding in half. At this level, the Science and Technology Directorate informed us that it would concentrate its remaining resources on

aviation security and explosive detection devices and on two cutting-edge, near-term research projects. But other critical research underway, including research on cyber security, disaster resiliency, and detection of chemical and biological threats, this research simply wouldn't be funded in 2012, if ever.

The bill also greatly reduces funds for information technology needs and construction activities. It includes no funding for the new DHS headquarters that are already under construction and the related lease consolidation efforts. We've been told repeatedly by the administration that deferring these investments will ultimately affect frontline operations and cost us more money in the future, and I believe that they are absolutely correct.

□ 1550

Now, I recognize that the administrations budget left Chairman ADERHOLT some holes to fill, but the real problem here is the bill's allocation in the budget resolution. That's thanks to a completely unrealistic spending cap set by the House Republican budget. We are now seeing the real implications of that deeply flawed plan. It simply leaves no room to keep departmental operations strong, and at the same time to fund our dual responsibility to prepare for and respond to all hazards.

The majority further exacerbated the allocation's inadequacy by adding \$850 million in disaster relief beyond the President's request to respond to recent flooding and tornado emergencies. Now, that's fine; that's important to do. But contrary to bipartisan tradition, the additional spending was not designated as an emergency for budget purposes, and as a result these disaster funds come out of the hide of first responder funding.

We gave the majority two chances to correct this flaw by designating the funding increase, that is, the increase beyond the President's request, as an emergency, once in last week's appropriation committee markup and yesterday in the Rules Committee. Unfortunately, the majority refused and passed up the opportunity to get us to a point where both parties might be able to support this bill.

I want to close by reiterating my appreciation for the chairman's efforts, for the staff's efforts to work with us on many, many issues in this bill, and for their valiant efforts to sustain our frontline Federal homeland security operations; but the bill does fall short of our obligations in critical aspects. The inadequate allocation makes it difficult to repair this bill, but I and other Members will be offering amendments to move it in a positive direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ala-

bama about some concerns about the Chemical Facilities Antiterrorism Standards, known as CFATS.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has voted by more than two-thirds to favorably report to the House a bill to extend authorization for CFATS through fiscal year 2017. Our bill also contains authorizations for appropriations for the full 7 years, and that provision conforms to the majority leader's CutGo protocols. I recognize the need to fund the CFATS program for the next fiscal year, but I'm hoping that the gentleman will provide me with an indication of his support for the authorizing committee to get its job done on this matter.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I would be happy to. And I congratulate the Energy and Commerce Committee on pursuing the CFATS authorization on an expedited basis this year. We do hope and expect that CFATS will be authorized under regular order prior to the start of the new fiscal year. However, it was important that we include funding for the 2012 appropriation bill for CFATS, and we do not want that line item to appear to be in conflict with the currently enacted sunset date of October 4, 2011.

I look forward to a long-term authorization extension so that these chemical facilities and the people that work in them can have a long-range certainty with respect to antiterrorism plans and investments. We look forward to a good authorizing bill becoming law in time to guide our final 2012 agreements on the CFATS funding.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for his support.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of our full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I thank my friend, Ranking Member PRICE, for yielding.

I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman ROGERS, Chairman ADERHOLT and Ranking Member PRICE for their work on this bill, and to the committee staff that has worked long days and many late nights to produce the bill for our consideration today. I would also like to commend the majority's effort to accommodate many of the concerns of Members on the Democratic side. And I would also like to thank Chairmen ROGERS and ADERHOLT for bringing this bill to the floor through the regular order and working with us to bring it to the floor with a rule that allows Members to offer their amendments.

At the outset, let me state for the record that I believe the allocation for this bill is too low. The bill is about \$1.1 billion below the FY11 enacted level and \$2.9 billion below the President's request, and it would represent the second straight year of a declining Homeland Security budget.

Some parts of this bill are very good, and I commend the chairman for providing adequate funding for the front-

line employees of the Department of Homeland Security to continue to conduct critical operations along our borders, protect our airports and seaports, and to respond to the series of natural disasters we have experienced this spring. However, some serious gaps remain. My colleague, Mr. PRICE, has already described in great detail the dangerous reductions in our support for the Nation's first responders.

Also slashed in this bill is the budget for research and development activities at the Department. The bill approved by the full committee provides less than \$400 million for the Science and Technology Directorate's Research, Development, Acquisition and Operations account, a cut of more than 40 percent. At this level for 2012, S&T has informed us that many critical research efforts already under way on cybersecurity, disaster resiliency, and detection of chemical and biological threats would be halted. America's technological edge is one of our great assets, and in the fight against terrorism I believe that it would be a mistake to retreat from the aggressive pursuit of new solutions.

I also want to bring my colleagues' attention to another disturbing precedent-setting provision of this bill. It would require the President to submit a budget amendment for additional disaster relief funding 3 months before the balance of available funds reaches \$800 million, and it would require these additional funds to be fully offset from discretionary budget accounts. Certainly, Democrats as well as Republicans would like to see less reliance on supplemental appropriations to fund known disaster relief needs. But when disasters strike, victims need help and they need help quickly. We should not risk delaying disaster relief because of partisan battles over proposed offsets; nor should we create a mechanism that would tie up the relief process because a disaster did not do us the courtesy of providing 3 months' notice.

During our consideration of the bill, we will have the opportunity to address these and other serious flaws, and I am hopeful that we will be able to do so.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank Chairman ADERHOLT for the time; but, more importantly, I thank him for the great work that he has done in perfecting this bill and bringing it to the floor, along with the accolades that have already been said about the staff and the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, rise in support of this bill. When I became chairman of this committee, I promised to return to regular order, open rules, and the completion of as many appropriations bills as possible prior to the August recess; and I intend to stick by that promise. And I appreciate the

cooperation of my ranking member, Mr. DICKS, who has been very, very helpful in this process already. I look forward to an open amendment process and lively debate over the next several months.

I also vowed, Mr. Chairman, that we would cut spending wherever possible to help balance our budgets. The Appropriations Committee is dedicated to the careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and you will see that in each of the 12 bills we put out this year that will be a hallmark, careful stewardship of money.

We have had to make the most of our very limited resources in all areas of government, and that includes the Department of Homeland Security. We began this year with the Homeland Security appropriations bill because we can all agree that our national security is a number one priority. Every day our citizens worry about constant terrorist threats, the security of our air and seaports, and the defense of our borders; but we also face the very real dangers of uncontrolled spending and skyrocketing debt.

Americans deserve to live and work in a country that will protect not only their physical safety, but also their economic livelihood. This bill maintains the crucial measures that keep our citizens safe while also reining in out-of-control, dangerous deficit spending, providing \$40.6 billion in total emergency spending for the various programs within DHS. This is a decrease of \$1.1 billion below last year's level.

It funds the critical frontline personnel, operations and programs needed to uphold the highest levels of national security. Within this bill, we have bolstered our immigration and border security efforts, funded the maritime and security activities of the Coast Guard, and boosted security efforts to address air cargo threats.

□ 1600

The bill also addresses the President's overtly inadequate request for known disaster relief costs. It can be nearly impossible, in fact it is impossible, to plan for acts of God. But over the past few weeks, Mother Nature has wreaked havoc across our Midwest and South and other parts of the country, demonstrating the need for sufficient disaster relief funding.

I'm proud that we have added a billion dollars to the disaster relief fund while completely offsetting this increase by taking unused funding from the Department of Energy.

We've significantly reduced or eliminated ineffective and wasteful programs while requiring reforms in underperforming programs through heightened oversight to get the most out of each and every tax dollar. This includes long overdue reform on the State and local grant program under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which has been plagued by inefficiency. These grants often remain

in Federal coffers for years to come. Right now, as you've heard, there is a backlog of more than \$13 billion in unspent grant funds. Why should we pack a clogged pipe, as Chairman ADERHOLT has said, at a time when we are strapped for money as we are.

This bill reduces funding for that program by \$2.1 billion, changing the structure and requiring increased measurement and reporting, and getting the money out of the pipeline and into the hands of our first responders and our local communities and States.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. There is no money for advanced inspection technology body scanners or the staff. It prohibits funds to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to or within the U.S., and in accordance with the House rules, there are no earmarks in this bill.

The misleading budget request from the President for DHS included undefined and unspecified administrative savings and relied on \$650 million of revenue from fees Congress has not approved. This bill follows both the spirit and the letter of the law that we must make real budget cuts, and that's what we do in this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to one of our fine subcommittee members from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill which irresponsibly slashes over \$1 billion from programs that protect and support the ability of our local police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel to quickly and adequately respond to a disaster or a terrorist attack.

The destructive flooding across the Mississippi Basin and the devastating tornadoes in Alabama and Missouri have demonstrated the need for a rapid and effective response to save lives. This is true of other parts of our country, like my home city of Los Angeles, which is vulnerable to fires and earthquakes and is one of the top 10 targets for a terrorist attack.

My police departments, firefighters, and first responders have said that the cuts in this bill will delay their implementation of a badly needed interoperable communications system, which is critical to their emergency coordination efforts.

It was the lack of this kind of technology during the 9/11 attacks that contributed to hundreds of deaths. The cuts in this bill also jeopardize the security of our Nation's ports—the Port of Los Angeles, Long Beach, for example, tells us that the cuts to port security grants would seriously threaten their ability to protect the port and to continue critical security training programs. An attack on this complex alone would have devastating consequences on our economy.

FEMA director Craig Fugate testified before our subcommittee that degrading the capabilities of State and local governments would likely magnify the impact of a disaster and ultimately increase the total costs to taxpayers.

This bill turns a blind eye to these realities. It is a dangerous bill that weakens our national security and undermines the ability of our first responders to safely meet the dangerous challenges they face every day.

America cannot cut its way to greater security. Today's realities require that our first responders and our Department of Homeland Security receive funding commensurate with the scale and the severity of the threats America faces.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2017.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2012 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. This bill cuts \$1.1 billion from last year's level and \$3 billion from the President's request while still providing the resources needed to ensure that our borders are safe and secure and our homeland is safe and secure.

All frontline defenders, including the Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, Coast Guard, military personnel, and Secret Service agents are fully funded. In fact, this measure substantially increases funding for many of these frontline defenders over the President's budget request while eliminating waste in other areas.

It ensures our borders will be secure by providing both CBP and ICE with all necessary resources. It ensures our homeland will be protected from terrorist threats by giving TSA additional funds to conduct air cargo screening. It ensures that the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, will have the flexibility of funds needed to respond to disasters, including the floods along the Mississippi River Valley, the tornadoes that have swept the Nation, and the ongoing wildfires that have devastated my home State of Texas.

This bill also includes 169 oversight actions which will force the Obama administration to be accountable to the Congress and ultimately to the people of the United States.

At a time when China owns \$1.1 trillion of our publicly held debt, we must make hard choices on spending here in D.C. during these difficult economic times, just like families across this country do every day.

I would like to commend Chairman ADERHOLT and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership on this critical measure, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this very important bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in support of the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

As a member of the committee from a 9/11 State, I work daily to ensure that our State and Nation are prepared to meet any and all potential Homeland Security threats, whether those threats come from natural events or from activities of violent international extremists.

One month after Osama bin Laden was brought to justice, we cannot ignore the fact that terrorists are plotting and planning at this very moment to harm Americans everywhere. They're waiting for us to let down our guard so they can attack our communities and our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, it remains a dangerous world. We must remain vigilant.

However, we must also remember that one of the greatest threats to our national security is our growing \$14.3 trillion national debt. We've heard that from our civilian and military leaders. Consequently, our subcommittee has carefully examined the President's \$43.5 billion request, and we have had to make some hard choices. I congratulate Chairman ADERHOLT and Mr. PRICE for making those choices.

□ 1610

In this context, I must say for the record I am concerned about the extent of the reductions to FEMA's State and local grant programs included in the bill. With that said, and a lot more could be said, I also recognize that we have already made substantial investments in these important areas for over 9 years.

Mr. Chairman, I support the chairman's intent to force the Department to make tough decisions on spending. It's imperative that a Department with over 230,000 employees and dozens of agencies and directorates under its jurisdiction, that they make the hard choices. This bill will ensure that the Department is accountable for taxpayers' dollars. We have witnessed the infusions of many millions of taxpayers' dollars over the last 9 years.

And, lastly, as one of the three appropriators that are liaisons to the Intelligence Committee, I note that the bill fully funds the President's requested funding increases for intelligence gathering activities at the Department of Homeland Security. I support the bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2017, the Homeland Security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012. As we all know, we are closing in on the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and this week marks one month since the death of Osama bin Laden. Communities across the country, particularly in Ala-

bama, as ably represented by the chairman of this subcommittee, and Missouri, are reeling from some of the most devastating storms and tornadoes in their history.

I am pleased that the Homeland Security funding bill is the first of the FY12 appropriations bills to be considered on the floor this afternoon. H.R. 2017, this legislation, tackles both fiscal discipline and national security, both of critical importance to the American public.

With regard to fiscal responsibility, H.R. 2017 provides \$40.6 billion in discretionary funding, or almost \$3 billion, or 7 percent, below the request, and \$1.1 billion, or 3 percent, below the fiscal year 2011 level.

As for our national security, all of our front line personnel, including Border Patrol agents, CBP officers, ICE agents, and Coast Guard military personnel are fully funded to sustain their forces and meet mission objectives. Obviously, we wish we could do more in this legislation, but I think this is a very important start that should move this process forward.

Furthermore, this bill, 2017, does not shy away from oversight to ensure the Federal Government is a good steward of the American public's tax dollars. For instance, the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, will be required to cap their full-time screeners and generate a plan to improve the integration of screening technology and the deployment of its existing workforce. Having served on the authorizing committee for 6 years, I very much appreciate this initiative and have paid very close attention to these TSA issues over the years.

I do believe this bill we are considering today is timely and specifically targets our Nation's security needs. I know that we are going to have a robust debate on some of these amendments that can further enhance this legislation.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT for his hard work and his leadership, as well as the minority staff.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Let me just at the outset commend him for his professionalism and his courtesy throughout this entire process, and also for the effort that he made to preserve the Secure the Cities program in the Homeland Security bill. Having said that, I must reluctantly oppose the bill in its current form.

Mr. Chairman, the threat level is the highest in our country since 9/11. That has only been increased since the death of Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden specifically stated, we find in his documents, that he wanted to attack mass transit, wanted to attack maritime shipping. Yet we are reducing our mass transit security funding by 50 percent. We are reducing our port security fund-

ing by 50 percent. We are reducing overall aid for Homeland Security grants, which was the purpose for which the Department was created. We are reducing that by 50 percent. This, I believe, is putting us at risk.

I can speak, for instance, for New York. We have 5 million people, 5 million passengers every day on our subway system, hundreds of thousands on the commuter lines; yet we are cutting security by 50 percent. We have a thousand police officers working on counterterrorism, carrying out a Federal purpose, doing not what they were doing before September 11, but working entirely on counterterrorism and intelligence. Yet their funding will be significantly cut.

We have the Lower Manhattan Security Initiative, which is going to provide a camera system of protection in the Lower Manhattan area. And I can go through program after program. Every penny is accounted for. And I would say that as we go forward, as we look to the future, it's important that cities and governments have some sense of continuity of where the funding will come from as they put their programs in place. To have a 50 percent cut this year is going to put us at a severe disadvantage.

And as we do approach the 10th anniversary of September 11, do we really want to cut our police departments, our counterterrorism units, our intelligence units, our mass transit security, our port security by 50 percent? To me, this is an invitation to an attack. We cannot put ourselves in that position. Because of that, despite my great regard for the chairman, I must reluctantly oppose this legislation.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of increased funding for important state and local grant programs which have been irresponsibly slashed in this bill.

This bill consolidates nine distinct grant programs into one and cuts the overall funding level by 55 percent from FY 2011 levels.

This bill cuts programs that our communities rely on to detect and prevent terrorism, train emergency responders, secure transit and ports, and address other critical needs.

Have the threats our communities face diminished by 55 percent in the past year?

No.

In fact, in the past few months we have dealt with numerous natural disasters—tsunamis, tornadoes, and floods.

Early today, 40 Honolulu Firefighters were called to extinguish a fire that damaged three businesses in Hawaii—which they did successfully.

And even with the death of Osama Bin Laden, we all know that we must remain vigilant against the likelihood of possible terrorist attacks.

If anything, we should be increasing funding for detecting, preventing, and responding to these types of threats.

Instead, the majority's cut and consolidate proposal will undermine Hawaii's preparedness. This bill will prevent Hawaii from receiving Urban Area Security Initiative funds, which have been crucial to our ability to detect and guard against terrorist attacks, and prepare for natural and man-made disasters.

Additionally, port and transit security funds received a combined \$500 million in FY 2011. Under this “cut and consolidate” proposal, these programs now must compete with seven other programs for a total allocation of \$1 billion.

This bill as written fails to adequately address a key objective of the Department of Homeland Security—ensuring that our nation is prepared for unforeseen emergencies.

The National Association of Counties also opposes this “cut and consolidate” approach. I request that a letter I received from the Association outlining its concerns be included in the RECORD.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting amendments like this one and providing adequate resources to keep our communities safe.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
May 25, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS: On behalf of National Association of Counties (NACo) and the elected and appointed officials we represent from our nation's 3068 counties, we write to urge you to protect essential public safety funding for our communities as you debate the FY2012 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appropriations bill on the House floor soon. Specifically, we strongly urge you to fund DHS State and Local Programs, Fire Grants, SAFER Grants at FY 2010 or even 2011 levels. Additionally, we ask that you oppose efforts to consolidate DHS State and local programs into a single line item and allow future grant awards to be distributed at the discretion of the DHS Secretary.

Currently, these programs assist States, local governments and public safety agencies in securing our borders, enforcing our immigration laws, improving our nation's preparedness, prevention, response, and recovery from all hazard threats. Furthermore, these programs have assisted in expanding regional collaboration at all levels of government and public safety disciplines, strengthening information sharing, enhancing interoperable communications capabilities, supporting medical surge and mass prophylaxis capabilities and increasing citizen preparedness.

Since September 11, all communities—of all sizes have had to enhance their level of preparedness to deal with all hazards threats, including potential nuclear, chemical, and/or biological attacks. This effort has continued and requires a great deal of state and local planning, coordination and investment by all stakeholders. Recent and past natural catastrophic disasters affecting our states and local communities and intelligence that showcases foreign terrorists' willingness to target both large and small communities further strengthens our resolve that now is not the time to reduce or consolidate these critical programs.

While we understand the severity of the federal budget challenges that must be addressed, we strongly believe it is imperative that we remain vigilant about meeting our public safety commitments to our nation's citizens. States and local governments can only achieve the highest level of prepared-

ness, response and recovery if the federal government properly continues to fund these critical programs. Preserving these funds will continue to aid state and local governments in our efforts to implement statewide and regional strategies, provide necessary resources to our first responders, and enhance basic levels of prevention and preparedness across the nation. Thank you for your consideration, and we again urge you to protect essential public safety funding for our communities as you begin deliberations.

Sincerely,

B. GLEN WHITLEY,
President, National
Association of Counties.

LARRY E. NAAKE,
Executive Director,
National Association
of Counties.

Mr. PIERLUISSI. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the various amendments offered by my colleagues to either increase funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative or to maintain current funding levels but ensure that they are more fairly distributed among U.S. cities.

The amendment would strike a provision in the bill that would make more than 50 cities ineligible to receive funding under the Urban Areas Security Initiative. This discretionary grant program provides federal funding to metropolitan areas to purchase equipment, conduct exercises, develop plans, and train and compensate first responders. The funds are allocated to high-risk urban areas based on vulnerability and threat assessments conducted by DHS.

In the case of Puerto Rico, the City of San Juan received \$3.1 million in funding through this program in 2010. These resources have allowed law enforcement and emergency responders in San Juan to prepare for national security incidents, without compromising other parts of their missions. If San Juan loses access to these funds, it may be forced to shift money that it had allocated to combat crime to address its counter-terrorism needs instead. This is a choice that the City should not be compelled to make.

Indeed, it is illogical to eliminate funding for certain high risk urban areas, like San Juan, just because other cities have a higher risk. All high risk urban areas should receive funding proportional to their relative risk assessment. And this is exactly how funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative is currently divided. In 2011, the 11 highest risk urban areas were eligible for \$540 million, while the next 20 highest risk urban areas were eligible for \$122 million. This allocation—where the very highest risk areas receive greater funding than other high risk areas—makes sense and should be continued.

To leave San Juan, San Antonio, and Syracuse to their own devices, while devoting all funding under this program to larger cities that already receive robust federal and local support is not prudent.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan, budget-neutral amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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. 2017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$126,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$60,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses, of which \$20,000 shall be made available to the Office of Policy for Visa Waiver Program negotiations in Washington, DC, and for other international activities: *Provided further*, That consistent with the requirements specified within Presidential Policy Directive-8, dated March 30, 2011, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than October 15, 2011, the National Preparedness Goal and not later than January 15, 2012, the National Preparedness System: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$63,350,000 may not be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives receive (1) the National Preparedness Goal and the National Preparedness System consistent with Presidential Policy Directive-8, and (2) the Secretary's determination on implementation of biometric air exit.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$63,350,000”.

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$117,470,000”.

Page 4, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$139,180,000”.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$55,672,000”.

Page 4, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “reduced by \$83,508,000”.

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$320,000,000”.

Page 50, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$135,000,000”.

Page 50, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “increased by \$185,000,000”.

Mr. LATOURETTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. First of all, I want to indicate that I am offering this amendment with my friend and neighbor. Actually, he is in the office next door, Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey. And this deals with the Fire and the SAFER grant programs. I also want to indicate that I have nothing but respect for the full committee chairman and the subcommittee chairman, who have been dealt a difficult hand with the 302(b) allocations made in front of them, and as they face the awesome responsibility of funding the programs that defend our country.

However, the Chair I think may remember during the discussion of the continuing resolution in H.R. 1 that there was some discussion about what funding levels were appropriate for fiscal year 2011 for these two grant programs which aid our first responders. In the one iteration of H.R. 1, there was something along the lines of a 75 percent reduction from these funds. Those funds, however, were restored by overwhelming votes of the whole body. Over 300 Members supported Mr. PASCRELL's amendment to put the level back up at \$820 million for fiscal year 2011, and just shy of 260 Members supported Mr. PRICE of North Carolina's amendment that dealt with how those funds could be utilized and spent.

□ 1620

Now, again, faced with the difficult decisions that the chairs find themselves in, the average reduction, and this isn't a bill that came to the floor with across-the-board cuts, but the average reduction in spending is about 14 percent for the bills that the Appropriations Committee is considering. Yet these funds have gone from \$820 million to \$350 million, which is on the order of about a, well, 60 percent reduction.

The amendment that I offer with Mr. PASCRELL would transfer funds out of the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management, the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer to restore those funds not to the \$820 million that 300 Members of the House indicated should be spent in the last fiscal year, but restores them to \$670 million equally divided between the two programs that I have indicated.

Now, at that level, these funds will still receive a 19 percent reduction from fiscal year 2011 and, again, citing my great respect for the chairs of the committee, on more than one occasion I have heard it remarked that this is a national Homeland Security bill and there needs to be some nexus between this funding and a national purpose, that we should not be in the business of funding every local and/or volunteer

fire department in the Nation, and I agree with that sentiment.

However, I can just tell you that faced with amazing budget pressures back in our local communities, when the Grand River in Painesville, Ohio, flooded a couple of years ago, it wasn't FEMA, it wasn't the Coast Guard, it wasn't the National Guard that plucked these folks out of their homes and plucked them out of the river and saved their lives and saved their properties. It was our firefighters and our police officers.

So if we make a determination as a Congress that we are in the FEMA business—that is, emergency management business—and we will provide funds to help rebuild and reshape and fortify and all the other things, then we need to be in all parts of the emergency management business, and that includes the first responder portion of that.

Therefore, I know that we have attempted to come to some agreement on this amendment to try and get all parties on board. Sadly, we haven't been able to do that, not for lack of trying on the part of the chairman. But we find ourselves now with this simple amendment that transfers funds from the bureaucracy of the Department of Homeland Security and restores it to our local communities and our first responders.

Again, I want to thank Mr. PASCRELL for his sponsorship. I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. As I mentioned, I reluctantly rise to oppose this amendment, which would slash the funding for the Department's management functions below what is responsible for the Nation's security and move funding to the grants.

I was hoping that we would be able to work something out on this, but it was not possible. The committee has already cut the Department's headquarters management at historic levels. In fact, the bill reduces the funding for these activities 21 percent below what the President requested himself.

This includes zeroing out the Department's new headquarters in Washington, D.C., zeroed out the funding for data center migration, and we have slashed other initiatives we cannot afford at this time. Many of these cuts were unavoidable because the President's budget request for the Department of Homeland Security was filled with phony offsets.

Since 9/11, Congress has provided \$6.7 billion for this program and for the last 3 years has included a waiver for the cost share requirements with local governments. Given our Nation's dire fiscal situation, we must take a stand that it's not the Federal Government's job to bail out every municipal budget

or to serve as a fire marshal for every city and town across the Nation. In today's fiscally constrained environment, the 350 million that we have included in here is a lot of money.

Again, while I support the gentleman's intentions, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. First, I want to thank Mr. LATOURETTE for, as usual, taking on a very, very exquisite subject here and not coming late to the fight. So I am proud to rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment. I want to thank my good friend from Ohio for his leadership and willingness to work across the aisle on this important issue.

To those who say that the Federal Government bears no responsibility about public safety, they are absolutely wrong. On one side of our mouth we say that we must protect and defend our first responders; on the other side of our mouth we say that we have no responsibility whatsoever in talking about our firefighters and our police officers. And that is why, just a short period of time ago in the 2011 CR, both sides came together. The majority of both parties supported putting money back into the budget.

We are debating a bill called the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. It's an ironic title because this legislation, as written, fails the American people and fails the very people who are on front lines of our homeland security. It is our firefighters and our police officers who will respond to a national tragedy before the Federal Government. This is what we said in 9/11. This is what we said in every year since 9/11, and it has not changed.

We understand the financial realities this country faces, and I am prepared to work across the aisle to find common solutions as we did 6 months ago. But what we cannot afford is to sacrifice our country's security at the altar of spending cuts, and that's precisely what the bill, as written now, does.

The FIRE and SAFER programs, these programs, supported by both Democrats and Republicans, reached across the lines, across that center aisle that goes down between us, and said let's work together on the national security of this country. Remember, the FIRE Act was written before 9/11 when places in the far west had to push their equipment to a fire. Simply put, that's not acceptable in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world.

And when we ask our first responders to be ready, to protect us, to protect the community, we need to know that they have the resources necessary. And, as you know, not only in the past

several years have our local communities been unable, small and large communities, to have all of those resources at their hands, now it's even more difficult. What you are asking here is a cut of 57 percent compared to the 2010 and 2011 budget. Unacceptable.

I support adequate funding for all of the agencies funded in this bill, but we are shortchanging the very people who ran into the burning buildings on September 11. You can't tell me those folks weren't on the front lines that day. I don't believe you if that's what you are telling me, and I know you don't mean that, but then don't say it.

The FIRE Act was signed by President Clinton before September 11. We are talking about basic equipment needs for our fire departments to protect all of our constituents, and hasn't that changed since 9/11. What their responsibilities are and what they need to respond to is much different than 9/11.

September 11 changed the relationship we had with our first responders, solidified our decision that no longer would this funding be a solely local issue. Firefighters and police officers are an integral part of homeland security, and ensuring they are well staffed and equipped would be partly a Federal responsibility.

□ 1630

Since they were originally authorized back in 2000, these programs have provided nearly \$7 billion to our local fire departments in nearly every congressional district in this country. The fact is that our firefighters rely on this funding for the equipment, for the training and for the personnel, especially in these tough economic times.

An independent evaluation of the FIRE program, Mr. Chairman, published by the U.S. Fire Administration, concluded it was highly effective in improving the readiness. And this is the most efficient Federal program in the entire Federal budget. Hear me.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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 rise in qualified support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment. The bill before us more than halves the total amount of funding for firefighter assistance grants compared to 2011 and 2010.

If this bill is adopted as written, the hiring grants known as SAFER grants are going to be cut by 63 percent below 2011, and equipment grants will be cut by 51 percent. That is simply unacceptable. These cuts would result in thousands of fewer firefighters on the job. It would leave fewer departments able to maintain safe staffing levels. It would prevent many fire departments from purchasing equipment, purchasing breathing apparatus and protective

gear that our firefighters depend on during a time of emergency.

This bipartisan amendment provides \$320 million to restore this funding to the President's requested level. Mind you, that's still below the 2011 level, but it comes at least to the President's requested level. And it would divide the funds between SAFER and equipment grants as we've been urged to do by the various fire associations.

Retaining this funding when local governments are cutting firefighter budgets will help preserve public safety and security. This amendment will help keep thousands of firefighters on the job.

And the notion that we are talking here about some kind of Federal takeover of local security responsibilities, I think everyone in this Chamber knows that that is not an accurate characterization of what's going on here. Of course, these expenditures are still mainly occurring at the local level, but we're in a world where our fire departments are being asked to equip themselves in new ways, to train themselves in new ways, to meet new kinds of threats and hazards, and these FIRE grants—the personnel grants and the equipment grants—have been a critical way of establishing a partnership whereby our local fire departments can do what they need to do in this new era when they confront all kinds of new hazards.

Now, I don't believe the offsets in this amendment are workable at the end of the day. I want to acknowledge that. But the inadequate Republican budget allocation, combined with the decision to transfer \$850 million from first responder grants to disaster relief and to refuse emergency designation for disaster relief leaves my colleagues no good place to cut and no good options to find offsets for the absolutely essential restoring of these grants to firefighters.

So I support the amendment, but I will work diligently to restore these funding cuts as the bill progresses; and we will get down, at the end of day, I trust, to responsible budget negotiations with the Senate and the White House.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment, and I too recognize the challenges that Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. PRICE faced in the confines of trying to address some difficult times. But as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee, I believe it is imperative that we look at the reality of the world in which we live. In an article dated April 24, 2011, out of the State of Texas, reads: hundreds of weary firefighters were racing against the clock on Sunday, pushing

back massive brush fires that have destroyed near-record swatches of Texas countryside. Firefighters were hoping to make as much progress as possible before low humidity and strong winds set the stage for more potential flare-ups late Monday and Tuesday.

Fires were still burning in Texas. Firefighters are still being called upon. Cities and States across America are laying off firefighters. And we are reminded of the needs, if you will, that were addressed on 9/11 when firefighters from the City of New York rushed in to save their fellow New Yorkers and others, and many of them, many of them perished.

They are, in fact, first responders. And I believe it is important that we make the sacrifice, we find the adequate offset, and we support this amendment. I'm also reminded of a story that many of you may have heard, the sad story, it aired on local television, where firefighters from some locality watched while a man drowned and could not save him. The reasoning was that the particular team that would have had the skills and the equipment to save this drowning man in what has been called the most powerful Nation in the world, was fired, laid off, eliminated. And, therefore, from the shoreline many looked in horror as this particular man drowned.

Is this what America has come to?

I believe this amendment is extremely important, one, to be able to show appreciation to the firefighters across America who come to the aid of those in need from different States when a crisis or tragedy occurs.

I heard someone mention, it might have been Mr. LATOURETTE, but who is it that plucks you out of a burning house or rescues, when they do have the resources or the team, out of a predicament where you are stranded in some crisis, whether it is drowning, whether it's a fire, whether it is an emergency health condition or whether or not they are confronting a terrorist act? Firefighters are truly our first responders.

In the City of Houston they are considering closing out or shutting down 600-plus police officers. And firefighters have the same concerns.

So I think it is very important that we own up to our duties. And as I mentioned in a metaphor before, let the American people be winners today. Let the firefighters be present and accounted for. And let us be reminded of their great heroic acts of 9/11. This 10th year anniversary, let us not say thank you in the way that we deny them funding, but let us say thank you in the way that we provide them with the funding that they need.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, as

well, for several reasons. Number one, it's very obvious that our first responders, our firefighters, they are the first there to take care of the public when a natural disaster such as these tornadoes that have hit our country demolish homes and injure people.

But most importantly it is this: our local units of government right now don't have the money to properly equip and staff their firefighters. And here's why: their property values that they have depended on for their funding, well, they've been diminished because of the foreclosure crisis, a crisis that this Congress has failed to effectively address.

So there's one duty, however, that we can't turn our back on. And that's the safety of the American people. And that's why I urge you to at least partially restore funding for these important firefighter grants.

And while I may have a problem with the funding source of this amendment, I will tell you the appropriate way to fund our first responders, firefighters, police officers and emergency medical providers, take a share of the military aid that's going to Afghanistan right now; bin Laden is gone. We need to reassess our mission in Afghanistan and redirect some of that money to protect Americans right here at home. Let's put some of that money in the Homeland Security budget. It's our firefighters that are our first defense against a terrorist attack.

I support this amendment. We have the money. We just need to allocate it right. We've done enough in Afghanistan. Let's take some of that money and put it right here to protect the American people. Support homeland security, because the next threat that we likely will get from a terrorist will come from within our borders. Let's take care of our people right now.

□ 1640

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bill to restore funding for the Assistance to Firefighters and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant programs.

The AFG and SAFER programs are essential to our public safety and security. These programs improve the readiness of our Nation's firefighters, ensuring that the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day for the safety of our communities are prepared with the capabilities they need to continue protecting and serving our communities safely and effectively.

These grants provided by the AFG and SAFER programs are the single most important source of Federal assistance to volunteer fire departments.

They help fire departments equip, train and maintain their personnel so they are prepared to respond to all emergencies. These programs are able to address the immediate and individualized needs of fire departments efficiently and effectively because funding is awarded directly to fire departments instead of being funneled through other layers of government bureaucracies.

As a result of the recent economic downturn and budget constraints at all levels of government, many fire departments have been forced to cut personnel and services. Without adequate funding for AFG and SAFER, thousands of firefighters could be laid off, and communities across the country could be put further at risk.

There are more than 150 fire departments in my district alone, and each one plays a critical role in keeping local communities safe. Many of these fire departments have benefited from AFG funding. Beaver Falls, Hanover, New Brighton, and Raccoon Township fire departments are just a few of the many that have used the grants to purchase new equipment or to train additional personnel.

Just this year, Berkley Hills Fire Department used an AFG grant to purchase an aerial ladder fire truck that will help the department better protect the numerous multistory apartment complexes, retirement homes and businesses in Ross Township. The West Deer Township Volunteer Fire Company also received an AFG grant this year that allowed the fire company to replace outdated equipment with new portable radios and automated external defibrillators. These upgrades will not only increase firefighter safety; they will also improve the services provided to the communities those fire departments serve.

Enacting the cuts to the AFG and SAFER programs in the underlying legislation will only make it harder for fire departments to avoid layoffs and protect our communities. By adequately funding AFG and SAFER programs, we can help volunteer fire departments nationwide obtain the equipment and personnel they need to effectively respond to emergencies. According to the International Association of Firefighters, over 1,600 firefighters could lose their jobs as a result of the funding cuts that are in this bill.

I urge all Members to support firefighters in their districts and vote in favor of increased funding for firefighters and to support the amendment of Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the Chair for allowing me to speak in support of the LaTourette-Pascrell amendment to restore funding for FIRE and SAFER grants.

I would like to thank Congressman LATOURETTE and Congressman

PASCRELL for offering this amendment that enjoys bipartisan support and which I strongly support.

The onslaught of natural disasters that we have seen all across the country has shown that the need for first responders has increased, not decreased. Many of us have been strong advocates for this program and recognize the inherent value of making sure our Nation's first responders have the people and the equipment they need in order to ensure our safety in all of our local communities.

I support these programs. Why? Because they work.

After an independent evaluation of the FIRE grant program was implemented by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture concluded that this program was "highly effective in improving the readiness and capabilities of firefighters across the Nation."

Additionally, at a time when many local and State governments have been forced to make drastic cuts to their emergency staff and personnel, the SAFER program has been the only resource fire departments have had to ensure that their communities would be ready if they needed to respond.

In the Appropriations Committee report, it mentions that FEMA should maintain an "all hazards focus" in order to ensure that FEMA concentrates its efforts on where it is needed most. I strongly agree with this sentiment, which is why I think this amendment is critical to achieving our goals.

As the Representative of the 37th Congressional District and as the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I understand the importance of having a fully staffed and equipped fire department. The San Miguel fire, the worst wildfire in California's history, burned through 90,000 acres of land and cost \$15.6 million. However, thanks to prior planning and fire prevention education efforts made possible by this critical grant program, not a single life was lost in this devastation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Unfortunately, with firefighters, we cannot always plan ahead. We have to be ready to respond, to do the rescue and then to do the recovery. This amendment should be made in order so as to eliminate the burden that our local and State governments and the firefighters feel of having to do more with less.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chair, I wish to strike the last word.

I rise today in support of an amendment to restore \$320 million in funding to the Department of Homeland Security's FIRE/SAFER grant programs that help provide firefighter jobs, equipment, and training for local fire departments.

Yesterday, I attended a rally in my district on Staten Island to save one of our fire companies, Engine 157. As it stands, New York

City's proposed budget will cut twenty fire companies from New York City—three from my district in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

While I have no vote on the City's budget, I do have vote in Congress, and I will not let the federal government turn its back on our nation's firefighters.

As a first responder during 9/11, I worked beside these brave and selfless first responders on the bucket brigade. I know how important it is to have well-equipped and well-trained firefighters when it comes to saving lives—whether they're saving victims from a major disaster or rescuing someone from a burning building.

As our nation remains on high alert, and as New York remains the number one terror target in the nation, we must remain vigilant and prepared to respond to any situation. Cutting FIRE/SAFER grants will only make that task more difficult.

Our nation's firefighters work tirelessly around the clock for our safety and protection.

They deserve our full gratitude and support, and that is why I stand today in support of restoring funding to the FIRE/SAFER grants program and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I understand the importance of cutting low-priority spending to get our budget under control. But there is nothing low-priority about the firefighters who protect our communities, our families, and our homes. Unfortunately, this appropriations bill shows badly misplaced priorities by cutting funding for the firefighters who keep us safe. Those cuts—\$320 million below the president's request—are shortsighted and reckless. They will take firefighters off the streets and put our communities at higher risk. So I support the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL, which will restore funding for the successful FIRE and SAFER grant programs to the level requested by the president.

FIRE and SAFER help fire departments across America recruit, train, and retain skilled firefighters. They help fire departments equip themselves with the up-to-date tools they need to protect property and save lives. What do we cut when we cut FIRE and SAFER? We cut protective equipment that helps brave men and women enter burning buildings. We cut power generators that keep fire stations running and providing vital services during emergencies. We cut staffing, so that fire stations are more likely to be sitting empty or under-prepared when disasters strike. Independent observers have found that FIRE and SAFER work: an independent study from the U.S. Fire Administration found that grants like these are making our fire departments more prepared and better equipped to protect our communities.

I want to make clear that I am not pleased with the offsets being used to restore this funding. However, I recognize that my colleagues were left with very few opportunities given the significant cuts made to the overall bill. I am hopeful that this will be addressed in conference with the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, fund FIRE and SAFER at the level requested by the president, and protect these vital investments in public safety.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PASCRELL to restore funds for FIRE and SAFER Grants in the FY2012 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill.

The Assistance to Firefighters (FIRE) and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant programs provide much needed support to local fire departments to help them afford critically-needed equipment and training as well as to hire additional firefighters. Funds from the FIRE and SAFER grants can be used by local fire departments to equip, train and maintain personnel, as well as to prepare them to respond to emergencies from natural disasters to terrorist attacks. These programs address the immediate, individualized needs of departments efficiently and effectively.

Unfortunately, the FY2012 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill slashes these critical programs by almost 50 percent the amount requested in the President's budget, an amount that was already lower than previous year's funding. I concur with Mr. PRICE's sentiments that these cuts "break faith with the states and localities that depend on us as partners to secure [and protect] our communities." In fact on Sunday alone, the Texas Forest Service responded to 20 fires consuming over 1,370 acres. This is in addition to three large ongoing fires that have consumed over 1,000 acres across Texas.

While our State and Federal agencies are working together to battle this inferno, we need to ensure that fire fighters have the equipment and resources that they need.

As local governments continue to face difficult times, these Federal grants help ensure that our communities continue to have the funds to hire and retain firefighters and purchase the equipment necessary to keep our communities safe. The FIRE grant program has provided over \$7 billion in funding to local fire departments across the country since it's authorization in FY2001. One of the most recent grants awarded to El Paso, Texas, which I represent, was over \$1 million to help offset the costs of constructing new fire stations across our quickly expanding city which has welcomed over 20,000 additional soldiers.

Indeed, the FIRE and SAFER grants are a critical piece to our security efforts, and I'm proud to say that I have supported legislation to strengthen these programs to ensure that communities facing financial hardship are able to apply for funds.

The LaTourette/Pascrell Amendment restores funding to the FIRE and SAFER Grants, and the spending increase is offset by cutting other funding.

I urge my colleagues to support our fire fighters by voting in favor of this amendment.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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 Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$336,000,000)".

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$337,000,000)".

Mr. CICILLINE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we suspend the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. This amendment is offered by me, along with my colleagues Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, Ms. MATSUI of California, Ms. BERKLEY of Nevada, and Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

I rise to offer this amendment that restores funding for State and local grants, which includes funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative, which is referred to as UASI.

This bill makes dangerous cuts to the Urban Areas Security Initiative, the UASI program, which is a program critical to the security of cities that have been deemed at high risk of terrorist attack. One of those cities is Providence, Rhode Island, in my congressional district, along with more than 50 other urban areas in our country.

Just last year, the Providence area was one of 64 cities with either critical assets or geography that was identified by Homeland Security experts as being most at risk of being targeted by terrorists. As a result, the city of Providence and other communities across this country have received critical Federal funding under UASI to support efforts to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and other emergencies. Providence also became the first city in America to have an accredited Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security.

However, the cuts that are proposed in this legislation will cripple the ability of cities to effectively ensure proper safety should an attack occur. The elimination of the UASI program means that staff will not be able to attend critical training, maintain certifications or purchase the equipment necessary to be prepared. Thousands of devices, like security cameras and radios and projects such as port sirens and watercraft, will not be able to be maintained. Emergency Operations Centers will not be able to be constructed or maintained.

□ 1650

These are urgent, urgent priorities for America's cities. Mr. Chairman, we cannot in good conscience spend billions of dollars protecting people all over the world at the expense of our own national security.

I urge Members to adopt this amendment.

I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to echo his sentiments. I rise in support of my joint amendment with Congressman CICILLINE to restore \$337 million to the Urban Areas Security Initiative grants program, which would fund the program at the FY 2010 level.

In my home State of Rhode Island, a counterterrorism fusion center, regional cyber defense measures, and chemical, biological, and nuclear detection assets support response efforts across southern New England. A Level I trauma center and the Port of Providence are also critical assets for the region. These homeland defense capabilities are in jeopardy, however, due to the cuts to the Urban Areas Security Initiative grant program in this bill.

The UASI grants were specifically designed to make sure that densely populated areas with critical assets were adequately funded and protected. Now, because of the cuts in this program, this is an example of what I believe are an irresponsible and arbitrary approach to budget cutting that jeopardizes safety throughout the region in case of an attack or natural disaster.

So I applaud my colleague and look forward to working with him on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the Cicilline-Langevin amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, which I am a proud cosponsor. This amendment will help protect our nation's most vulnerable cities and help effectively prevent and manage emergency situations in cities around the country.

Funding for Urban Area Security Initiative helps cities prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from disasters, including terrorism.

My district in Minnesota has benefitted greatly from the assistance of UASI. My district includes Minneapolis, a city that has been listed as one of the 31 most vulnerable cities by the UASI grant program and has received funding for projects to improve safety and response.

UASI Grant program funding has been essential to the ability of the City of Minneapolis to manage events such as the 35W Bridge collapse, the 2008 Republican National Convention and the response to the 2009 and 2011 Minneapolis tornados.

The UASI program has secured the metropolitan area's water supply, improved its emergency dispatch system, and provided protective gear for first responders. It also created special response teams for emergencies involving hazardous materials, the collapse of buildings and advanced bomb squads.

UASI grant dollars have paid for much of the technology associated with the city's new combined Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and first responder training facility providing real time situational awareness and communication capabilities that did not exist before.

Without these operations, the recent tornados in my district would have created confu-

sion and chaos in the aftermath. The speedy and effective response by the city is directly related to the funding they have received through UASI grants.

Without these important investments, public warnings and communications, disaster response, and first responder training will be compromised.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that all American cities with real security needs continue to have access to UASI funding.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today was born out of the need for reform. It consolidates various grant programs and provides discretion to the Secretary. These reforms include funding reductions, requirements for measurement, and requirements for spending languishing dollars.

In total, this bill provides \$1.7 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants. However, as we are all aware, not all programs are funded at the previous year's level.

The consolidation in this bill requires the Secretary to examine the intelligence and risk and put scarce dollars where they are most needed, whether it is a port, rail, surveillance, or access and hardening projects—or whether it is to high-risk urban areas or to States—as opposed to reverse engineering projects to fill the amount designated for one of many programs.

Additionally, as noted by the gentleman from Rhode Island, the bill limits the Urban Areas Security Initiative grants to the top 10 highest cities. Again, this puts scarce dollars where they are most needed. This does not mean lower risk cities will lose all funding; it just means the funds will come from other programs such as State Homeland grants that are risk and formula based.

These cuts will not be easy, but they are long overdue and necessary to address our out-of-control Federal spending.

Furthermore, the offset proposed by the gentleman is unacceptable. A reduction to the Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology account would: impact operations and maintenance on the border fence; reduce investments in critical border security communications; and affect the Border Patrol's ability to procure proven technologies to increase border security immediately.

I urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline, and I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, let me state it very plainly:

We need to increase funding for Urban Areas Security Initiative grants, UASI grants, to a minimum of the 2011 level of \$725 million. I offered amendments in full committee and asked for a waiver from the Rules Committee in order to do just that.

Now, the majority has taken over \$2.2 billion appropriated for these grant programs in 2011 and has consolidated them into a block grant of \$1 billion. If you take that \$1 billion, which includes all of these State and local grants, and then you reduce this for the statutory carve-outs, and then you reduce it again, assuming the minimum statutory funding for the States, what is going to be left? There is going to be half a billion dollars for UASI, for ports, for rail, for transit, and for other key grants all together. This is simply not enough.

Unfortunately, the proposed offset is also unacceptable. This bill, just like the 2011 final CR, greatly reduced fencing, infrastructure, and technology projects to secure our borders. While some of this reduction is due to a termination of the SBInet contract, this proposed additional cut would prevent CBP from acquiring off-the-shelf technology to support our Border Patrol along the southwest border, as well as to conduct pilot projects on our northern border. So the offset would be a damaging reduction.

But this simply illustrates the impossible dilemma posed by this bill. The root problem is an inadequate allocation, and it is compounded by the majority's refusal to call an emergency an emergency.

So I commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his initiative to address the dangerous gap left by the majority's bill when it comes to protecting our Nation's urban areas.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The intention of this amendment is to restore funding to the Urban Areas Security Initiative, or as we call it, UASI.

In my district of Sacramento, California, funding from the UASI program has gone to critical counterterrorism initiatives, giving law enforcement officials and first responders the tools and training to protect our community.

Sacramento is the capital of California, the most populous State in the Union and the seventh largest economy in the world. It is critical to continue to support the antiterrorist work being done there, and it is unacceptable to leave this region without appropriate funds for protection. With potential targets like the Folsom Dam, which is upstream of the city of Sacramento, key transportation systems, and numerous State and Federal facilities, UASI funding for the Sacramento region ensures protection from attacks

and cooperation among local, State, and Federal agencies.

Not receiving UASI funds would devastate one of the Nation's most proficient counter-terrorist and readiness task forces, located at the former McClellan Air Force Base in my district. This facility creates greater collaboration and communication among State and Federal law enforcement and first responders.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will bolster our Nation's security by giving our communities the tools and training necessary to keep us safe. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chair, this bill represents a gross abdication of our shared responsibility with our state and local governments to provide for the safety and security of our constituents and our communities.

Cuts to the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response, or SAFER, grants and the Assistance to Firefighters, or FIRE, grants will be devastating for communities in each of our home states. In addition, changes to the Urban Areas Security Initiative will put our high-risk communities at further risk.

As we prepare to mark the 10th anniversary of the attacks of 9/11 later this year, the wounds are still fresh in the memory in my home community of Northern Virginia. This bill will actually cut by more than 50 percent the very public safety assistance Congress deemed essential, on a bipartisan basis, to address public safety and security concerns in our communities as a result of those terrorist attacks.

How is that providing for the homeland security? I would argue that we're actually putting it at risk.

The threat of a terrorist attack has not dissipated. In fact, it probably has increased since U.S. forces killed Osama bin Laden earlier this spring.

In the wake of 9/11, we identified significant shortfalls in our public safety capabilities. Congress created these grant programs to help our cities and counties meet the demands for interoperable communication, hazardous materials response and other recommendations from local, state and federal threat assessments, including the 9/11 commission.

Still today, thousands of fire stations, both career and volunteer, across the country do not have sufficient staffing to adequately protect their communities. Many still do not have the ability to respond to all-hazards emergencies or communicate with one another.

The SAFER and FIRE grants help provide staffing, training and equipment to public safety agencies in every state. As the former Chairman of the largest local government in the National Capital Region and the Chairman of the region's Emergency Preparedness Council, I know firsthand how critical these funds are to ensure the safety of our communities.

Even before the recession, local governments had difficulties meeting their public safety needs, and now many have been forced to cut back on those services as their budgets are still reeling from the affects of the Great Recession. The reductions proposed by this legislation will only exacerbate the problem and further delay, if not gravely harm, our preparedness efforts.

Mr. Chair, we came together in a bipartisan fashion to turn back similar cuts in the Continuing Resolution for the current fiscal year, and I urge my colleagues to once again stand alongside our firefighters and public safety personnel in support of this critical funding.

Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LATOURETTE are once again offering a bipartisan amendment that would restore most of the requested grant funding. While the amendment does not preserve the entire funding request, it ensures that our local and state partners do not bear a further undue burden because the federal government is not living up to its own responsibility.

If this bill is supposed to represent our Homeland Security values, then it's done a pretty poor job by turning its back on those sworn to protect us on the front lines, namely the firefighters, police officers and other first responders in our communities. I urge my colleagues to either restore this funding or reject this attack on our basic public safety.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. 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:

Page 2, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment supported by Chairman LAMAR SMITH, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The reason he and I are in support of this is because this amendment reduces the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management account by \$1 million and increases funding for immigration and customs enforcement by \$1 million in order to facilitate new agreements under the 287(g) program. This bill, this amendment, will provide for better enforcement of our immigration laws.

□ 1700

287(g) has been very successful. It allows State and local law enforcement agencies to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security to enforce immigration law. It was enacted back in 1996, and Congress implemented this program to give local communities help with illegal immigration in their area.

A couple of points I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. There are maybe 5,000, 6,000 ICE agents in the United States. There are 650,000 State and local law enforcement officers—650,000. So the 10 million to 12 million illegal aliens in the country are much more likely to come into contact with local law enforcement than they are with an ICE agent. And for local law enforcement, it's important that they be properly trained so that they don't profile, don't discriminate, but properly identify those here illegally who are breaking our laws.

Now, there is a backlog of cities that want 287(g) agreements, and what this legislation does is assist in covering that problem. One of the reasons so many cities want to be involved in this is because criminal alien gangs generally victimize people in the cities, often are victimizing other immigrants, often victimize legal immigrants. And, frankly, law enforcement should be trained in how to identify and remove criminal aliens, and this assists in that.

It's a great force multiplier for ICE. It provides ICE with assistance such as following up on leads and performing investigative research and surveillance. It's had a positive effect on the workload for ICE by identifying removable aliens, and it gives ICE greater flexibility in directing its immigration law enforcement resources.

Now, I want to make another point here. The CBO scores this amendment as costing zero in budget authority. Also, I think we should reflect on the fact that given that one of the 9/11 hijackers, Mohammed Atta, was pulled over in traffic 2 days before the 9/11 attack, there is a significant benefit to checking the immigration status of all individuals who are arrested. Had the officer inquired about Atta, he then could have found out that Atta was in the country illegally and may well have prevented his participation in the attacks. That is one of the benefits of having local law enforcement trained in this area.

I also want to make an additional point. This brings tens of thousands of local law enforcement to help enforce our immigration laws. There are now 70 jurisdictions with these agreements, but many more communities want help. The 287(g) program also provides training to State and local police, giving them additional tools that they can use to prosecute crimes committed by illegal immigrants, especially gang violence and document fraud.

Over the last few years, the open borders lobby has been successful in getting the administration to curtail the use of this program. Well, the 287(g) program is a solid improvement in terms of enforcing immigration laws. Particularly with the gang activity that we have today, with the drug lords sending local gangs across the border in order to participate in crimes here, it is very clear that we need this kind of a program.

Before it was created, many illegal immigrants stopped by State and local law enforcement went free. Immigration laws were not enforced. Since the program was developed, it's helped the State and local law enforcement not only fight crime, as I've indicated, but get the gang leaders, get the serious criminals off the streets and enforce our laws.

So instead of curtailing the program, we should be promoting the expansion of it. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help local communities to enforce our immigration laws.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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 rise in opposition to this amendment.

The bill before us provides full funding for the Department's request for the 287(g) program, and \$1 million more simply is not needed.

The increase proposed by the gentleman comes at the expense of the Secretary for Homeland Security, an account which is already significantly reduced in this bill and will likely be reduced further, based on amendments that we have seen already. Further cuts in these accounts would eliminate key staffing positions, limiting the Department's ability to respond to national emergencies and to provide for stable leadership in the event of a large disaster or a terrorist attack.

I should also note that while this bill slashes funding for many worthwhile and needed Homeland Security programs that support first responders, it cuts Homeland Security research, much-needed research. But the bill piles more funding onto immigration enforcement. In fact, it adds \$28 million in unrequested funding for immigration detention and removal.

Now, the bill provides full funding for the Secure Communities program to continue expanding this program across the country, allowing Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, to identify criminal aliens who are in local custody. I bring up the Secure Communities program because it accomplishes the objectives of the 287(g) program but much more efficiently and without deputizing local police to enforce immigration law, a proposition that is rife with complications and potential abuses. So if we were really serious about deficit reduction and efficiency, we would tell ICE to transition out of this duplicative program, 287(g), and to concentrate on making Secure Communities work efficiently and fairly and well to identify and remove convicted criminal aliens.

I'd also like to note for my colleagues that GAO and the Inspector General have reviewed the 287(g) program, in some cases at our subcommittee's request; and they found serious flaws in the implementation of this program and in ICE's ability to oversee its operation in local communities. The IG found 33 major deficiencies in 287(g) last year and then found 16 more when it recently reassessed the program.

So this is an unwise and unneeded amendment, and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROYCE. 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 California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Home-

land Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), \$234,940,000, of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and \$16,686,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for the Human Resources Information Technology program.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. 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:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 24, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 25, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

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

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Homeland Security Committee, tragically, since the formation of the select committee and then ultimately the full committee.

For many of us who were here in the United States Congress and watched the plane attack the Pentagon and ultimately visited Ground Zero in the early stages are well aware of the need to protect America. As the ranking member of the Transportation Security Committee, working with my colleague from Alabama, the chairman, we well recognize the importance of transportation facilities and modes.

For some reason, terrorists are attracted to airlines and freeways and trains. So this amendment is a very simple amendment that I believe provides security to the American public.

□ 1710

It was no doubt that after the killing of Osama bin Laden discovered papers suggested that al Qaeda operatives were considering attacking the U.S. rail system on the 10-year anniversary of the September 11 attacks. Yes, it was 2010, but if we recall, we were unaware that we were going to be attacked on 9/11. Los Angeles MTA planned security upgrades in response to bin Laden's killing and the discovery of rail attack plans. That is the American public's sensitivity, that we must protect our modes of transportation.

My amendment is a simple amendment that restores \$5 million to the Transportation Security account at the President's submitted request by

reducing the Office of the Under Secretary for Management and Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing.

Since the demise of Osama bin Laden, it has come to light that al Qaeda had ambitious plans to launch an attack against our Nation's mass transit system and their riders, our constituents. Now more than ever we must ensure that our mass transit and surface transportation is secure by developing risk-based policies and programs that devote appropriate resources to securing these systems against a terrorist attack. This amendment would increase the surface transportation security account at TSA by \$5 million, bringing the account in line with the President's request for FY 2012. In Washington terms, \$5 million may not sound like much, but it is a critical increase to the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA, which has historically been underfunded. This account funds frontline homeland security personnel in the form of surface transportation inspectors who, in addition to reviewing regulatory compliance, consult with transit agencies and rail companies in improving security infrastructure and operational protocols.

The American public, whether it's Amtrak or long-distance rail, need our involvement. We cannot afford to diminish the protection of our rail lines that grandmothers and grandchildren, college students and commuters use. This is a smart investment at a critical time. Be reminded, we got no notice about 9/11, and we will get no notice about attacks on our rail system.

To fund this increase, my amendment simply reduces \$2.5 million from two different accounts. This is a wise decision at this time to help our communities and mitigate the terrorist threat to our local transit systems, as well as to improve security for passenger and freight rail. Just be the community that would be impacted by a horrific terrorist act. Whether it is through the neighborhoods of Houston, whether it's in Los Angeles or the Midwest, all of our communities and constituents are serviced by some form of surface transportation or mass transit, and as we have seen abroad, this mode of transportation is vulnerable to terrorist attack. From Spain to London, they know the truth, and we must stand vigilant. Providing this increased funding for our surface transportation inspectors is a wise investment on behalf of the American people, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation, but I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the bill already reduces the Office of Under

Secretary substantially, 6 percent below the request and 26 percent below the FY11 CR, reflecting the fact that the bill includes no funding to continue the construction of the Department of Homeland Security headquarters. The bill has reduced management to a bare minimum, with reduction of 29 percent to leadership and management offices.

The Department of Homeland Security is an agency of 230,000 employees. The number of employees in OSEM is 700, or less than one-third of 1 percent, and funding provided is also one-third of 1 percent for the total DHS budget. This is extremely small for assets needed to manage a major security department. Additional reductions would prevent filling key staffing positions and thus limit the ability of the Department to respond to national emergencies and provide stable leadership to the public and the Nation in the event of a large disaster or terrorist event.

These reductions are not compatible with running a Cabinet agency. No other Federal department is asked to manage such large responsibilities and operating components with such a small and stretched headquarters element. Therefore, I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. I would like to yield to my colleague from Texas so that she can respond to the last speaker.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the ranking member.

I think it's important; I listened to the gentleman, Mr. ADERHOLT, list a lot of numerical and factual points about personnel. Let me be very clear, as Senator LIEBERMAN said, all of our systems need to be on high alert and all of our citizens need to be on high alert as we approach the 10th anniversary of 9/11.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that something is awry with al Qaeda. Al Qaeda is interested in transportation modes, and they're interested in our rail systems. They have already done Mumbai, they have done London, and they have done Madrid; and therefore, they are looking at the United States. No, we don't have specifics, but we do have the potential of our rail lines crossing America being ripe targets for al Qaeda. This is a very small amount that would allow us to have surface inspectors who are truly crucial to the protection of the Nation's mass transit, freight, and long-distance rail.

Every State is impacted, from New Hampshire to Florida, from the Midwest to the West, Texas. Houston has as its city insignia a rail. Why? Because trains crisscross our community. Therefore, I think it behooves us to be bipartisan and to actually support an

amendment that provides a cushion of protection and a cushion and an armor, if you will, against the thoughts and the mindsets of al Qaeda. Yes, they are franchised, they are splintered, but that makes it all the easier for them to find their way here to the United States.

I remind my colleagues that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I ask my colleagues to consider the small investment it would take to be able to secure the Nation's railways. And as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, the authorizing committee, I can assure you that we are seeing these kinds of threats in terms of the vastness of our system, and we need to be able to protect our system.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise before you and my colleagues to take the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1071, "Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes." My amendment would increase the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) Surface Transportation Security's account by \$5 million and restore funding for this account at the President's submitted request, offset by reducing the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing (TTAC).

Since the demise of Osama bin Laden, it has come to light that al-Qaeda had ambitious plans to launch an attack against our Nation's mass transit systems and their riders, our constituents.

Now more than ever, we must ensure that our mass transit and surface transportation is secure by developing risk-based policies and programs that devote appropriate resources to securing these systems against terrorist attack.

This amendment would increase the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA by \$5 million, bringing the account in line with the President's request for FY 2012.

In Washington terms, \$5 million may not sound like much, but it is a critical increase to the Surface Transportation Security account at TSA, which has historically been underfunded.

This account funds front line homeland security personnel in the form of surface transportation inspectors who, in addition to reviewing regulatory compliance, consult with transit agencies and rail companies in improving security infrastructure and operational protocols.

Surface inspectors also help disseminate best practices to transit and rail entities across the Nation.

This is a smart investment at a critical time for surface transportation security.

To fund this increase, my amendment reduces \$2.5 million from the Transportation Threat and Credentialing program and \$2.5 million from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security. Both of these programs are well funded—TTAC at \$183 million and the Under Secretary's office at \$234 million.

This is a wise decision at this time to help our communities address and mitigate the terrorist threat to our local transit systems, as well as for improving security for passenger and freight rail.

All of our communities and constituents are serviced by some form of surface transportation or mass transit, and as we have seen abroad, this mode of transportation is vulnerable to terrorist attack.

We must be vigilant in recognizing the threat, make wise investment in security, and collaborate with industry stakeholders to secure this transportation mode that is essential to our economy and way of life.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Page 92, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$600,000)".

Mr. BROUN of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to H.R. 2017. My amendment simply cuts \$600,000 from the Office of the Under Secretary in the Department of Homeland Security and places those funds in the deficit reduction account.

During this economic emergency, we must find cuts wherever we can, especially when a Department is not being a good steward of the funding that Congress provides it.

If you look at this bill, the Secretary is being allocated nearly \$127 million, of which \$6 million goes to the Office of Legislative Affairs. I think the American people would agree with me that \$6 million is a lot of money for political appointees who refuse to do their job and participate in the oversight process.

On several occasions this year, Mr. Chairman, the Department has either refused to sit on the same panel as other witnesses or has outright refused to appear before various House committees and subcommittees. In fact, as chairman of the House Science Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I held a hearing on behavioral science and security with the goal of understanding how science informed the development of TSA's SPOT program.

□ 1720

The Department refused my request for a witness from TSA for their own

program, and I'm not the only chairman who has received such shabby and unacceptable treatment. This pattern of arrogance makes fulfilling our oversight responsibilities of the executive branch very difficult, if not impossible.

In the end, it's the American people, Mr. Chairman, who lose if its government cannot perform its most basic constitutional responsibilities. If the Department is not going to meet its obligations of appearing before Congress when requested, it is prudent to apply the funds rescinded in this, my amendment, to more constructive uses such as reducing our deficit.

If 10 percent is good enough for the Lord, I think the Office of Legislative Affairs can part with 10 percent of their funding to aid in our efforts of reducing the burden of debt on our children and grandchildren.

I can think of no higher priority than reducing the deficit and creating jobs in America. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman from Georgia's amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I will not go on at length.

I simply don't think the case has been made for a further reduction. The suspicious passenger, the observation techniques programs that have been cited aren't even under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary being cut. And the bill already cuts \$4,993,000 off of the fiscal year 2011 level for the Office of Under Secretary for Management; and it cuts \$14,118,000 off of the administration's request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know this is an easy target. Who knows even what under Secretary for Management does. It's a very common technique around here to go after these accounts, these administrative and front office accounts, just for the sake of cutting or maybe to pay for something else that sounds good. But I don't think it's wise. I don't think it's responsible. And I would urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. 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:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the Chairman.

This amendment takes \$10 million from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management of DHS and moves it to the Border, Security, Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology account with the purpose of being used for border cell phone communications to help border residents disseminate border security-related information to Border Patrol and law enforcement for the protection of their lives and our border.

I appreciate the support of Congressman ALTMIRE from Pennsylvania in this bipartisan amendment.

This amendment really is the idea of Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS from Arizona. After having been to the border of Arizona with her staff, I learned firsthand the problems that not only Texas and other States but Arizona specifically has with communication when ranchers are on their property.

On March 27, 2010, rancher Bob Krentz of Arizona was murdered 20 miles north of the border from Mexico in an isolated area of Arizona. The lack of communications capability made Krentz more vulnerable than he would have been otherwise and complicated the search for the assailants. His wife believes it was in a cell phone dead zone where he was killed and that he was trying to call for help, but his cell phone would not work.

Since that time, Congresswoman GIFFORDS has been working diligently on this issue, and I have had the opportunity to work with her on other border security issues as well as this one.

These dead zones are so common that often times border ranchers in Arizona and Texas rely on shortwave radios to communicate and call for help when they are in trouble or they see illegal crossings into their property.

The inability of the U.S. Government to secure the U.S.-Mexico border creates public safety hazards for residents of border areas and the law enforcement agents who patrol them. Many border areas are rural and lack wireless communication capabilities like phone service, and they exacerbate the border-related public safety concern.

Once again, I want to thank Congresswoman GIFFORDS and her staff for this legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and we are joining the Office of Congresswoman GIFFORDS in offering this amendment.

I had the opportunity last week to travel to Congresswoman GIFFORDS' district and the 114-mile border that she has along the Mexican border and her district. And when you see, as my colleague from Texas knows, these ranchers and the territory that they have to cover—and we have a national community campaign now: "If you see something, saying something." Well, these are areas where you don't have the communications. Even if you see

something, there's no one to tell. There's no way to get that message out.

So what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do with this amendment is trying to make sure that the equipment is there so that these ranchers and community citizens, if they see somebody coming across the border, if they see something that is alarming to them, they're able to communicate it. Right now that technology does not exist. They are literally in the dark as far as communicating it. There is a public safety aspect to this amendment. And there is a Border Patrol aspect—the ability of our law enforcement personnel to communicate with each other and communicate with the local citizens who, in some cases, are out miles and miles away from any form of mobile communications.

So I strongly support this amendment. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in offering it, and I thank Congresswoman GIFFORDS and her office for leading the charge on this very important technology.

Mr. POE of Texas. This money is necessary so that people who live in border areas can communicate with law enforcement. Cell phone service is a basic necessity for security. It is a national security issue. It is a homeland security issue, and it is a border security issue. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ADERHOLT. I reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Again, this proposal would further create cuts to the Department's management functions below what is responsible for the Nation's security. The committee has already cut the Department's headquarters and management at historic levels.

As I had mentioned earlier, they include the zoning act, the zeroing out of the funding for the Department's new headquarters. It zeroes out funding for the data center migration. It slashes other activities we cannot afford at this time.

The Department must still have robust funding to manage the many organizations under its authority. The Department was created from nearly two dozen agencies and still faces challenges in achieving the unified homeland security enterprise.

More importantly, the gentleman's amendment proposes that the Department pay for cell towers to provide phone services to the general public.

I'm very sympathetic to the needs of rural communities. I'm from a rural community, and certainly I'm sympathetic to remote ranchers as well. But this is not a cause that the Homeland Security can bear at this time, especially under the constraints that we have. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. 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.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 19, after the period insert "In addition, for necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, remediate, equip, furnish, and occupy buildings and facilities for the consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security headquarters, \$500,673,000."

Ms. NORTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore \$500,673,000 to the Department of Homeland Security that has been cut entirely from this appropriation. This is the most important construction, private or public, ongoing in our country today, because it involves a secure facility that the Congress has voted to consolidate in order to protect the United States of America in the homeland.

This entire appropriation cuts billions of dollars in order to reduce spending. I wager that there is no cut quite like this one, because this cut guarantees that the taxpayers will be charged more precisely because of this cut. Already, the reduction in funding to the 2011 appropriation for consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security has cost taxpayers \$69 million. Increased costs for this construction of Federal property come from, in this case, lease holdovers, short-term lease extensions, and horrific inefficiencies now imposed because the integration of construction of this mammoth facility will be delayed and interrupted. Any further reduction in funding will substantially increase even more the total costs of this huge project, the largest since the Pentagon. Until now, it was on budget and on time.

Remember why Congress voted to consolidate these 22 agencies in the

first place. Congress has never formed one agency of 22 different agencies. They are spread all over this region. That is why the Bush and the Obama administrations and the Congress have pursued a consistent program to consolidate critical elements of the Department of Homeland Security.

These DHS tenants now reside in the most expensive lease space in the United States, because that's what it is in this region, barring none except perhaps New York City. DHS spends hundreds of millions of dollars on leases throughout the entire region. The rapid consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security now underway will save billions, that's B, billions, in real estate costs, in addition to directing lease revenue to the GSA Federal Buildings Fund, which instead of using appropriated taxpayer dollars, uses agency rental payments to fund the construction and maintenance of Federal real estate giving taxpayers added savings.

Currently, DHS is scheduled for full occupation by 2017. Every day of delay costs the taxpayers thousands of dollars. This is no way to do budget cutting. You don't cut what then costs you more in the short term and in the long term.

Significant progress has already been made. Forty-five percent of the construction is complete, including the Coast Guard National Operations Center and the Coast Guard headquarters. You just don't interrupt a massive, complex building like this unless you want to spend more money than was anticipated.

The timing of this amendment is critical to ensure that the project does not increase costs further. The continued dispersal of vital elements of this critically important agency, necessary for our security, undermines the DHS mission by impeding its operations here and throughout the country. We need quickly to fund this project.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to restore funding for the consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) headquarters construction at St. Elizabeths in the District of Columbia. This amendment would restore \$500,673,000 to the DHS management and operations appropriations account for the project. The amendment would fully fund the President's fiscal year 2012 DHS request for the project, as well as fund the outstanding balance of the President's fiscal year 2011 DHS request.

The reduction in funding in fiscal year 2011 is expected to increase the total project cost by \$69 million because of the loss of integrated construction sequencing and efficiencies between the U.S. Coast Guard building and the adjacent DHS Operations Center construction, in addition to the costs caused by lease holdovers and the short-term lease extensions for the delay for Mission Support consolidation. Any further reduction in funding will substantially increase the total cost of this huge project, which, until the cuts began, was on budget and on time.

The benefits of the consolidation of the DHS headquarters at St. Elizabeths are twofold.

First, Congress voted to consolidate the location of 22 DHS agencies because of the urgent need to improve the management of the agencies in the DHS, which are currently scattered in 40 different locations in the Washington metropolitan region. Consequently, the Bush and Obama Administrations and the Congress have pursued a program to consolidate critical elements of DHS on the federally-owned St. Elizabeths Campus. The DHS components identified for consolidation at the headquarters include the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, the Transportation Security Administration, Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and liaisons for agencies not being relocated there.

Second, the General Services Administration (GSA) will relocate DHS tenants currently in expensive leased space to federally-owned space. DHS annually spends hundreds of millions of dollars for leases throughout the Washington region. The rapid consolidation of DHS, which is now underway, will allow the federal government to save billions of dollars in real estate costs, in addition to directing lease revenue to the GSA Federal Buildings Fund, which, instead of using taxpayer dollars, uses agency rental payments to fund the construction and maintenance of the federal real estate portfolio, an additional saving to taxpayers. The consolidation on St. Elizabeths is expected to include 4.5 million gross square feet of office space, with 3.5 million square feet on the West Campus and 750,000 square feet on the East Campus. Currently, the St. Elizabeths site is scheduled for full occupation in 2017.

The DHS headquarters consolidation is expected to cost a total of \$3.6 billion, with \$2.2 billion coming from GSA and \$1.4 billion from DHS. To date, the project has received \$1.24 billion and there has been significant progress, including the groundbreaking for the first building on the site, a 1.2 million square foot project that includes a central utility plant and two seven-story parking garages, that will house the USCG headquarters. There has also been significant investment in the infrastructure of the campus, including construction of a perimeter fence and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. As of March 31, 2011, the USCG headquarters is 45% complete.

Full funding of the FY 2012 request would ensure complete funding for, and allow occupation and use of, the USCG headquarters. My amendment is critical to ensure that the cost of the project does not increase because of delays. The continued dispersal of vital components of DHS, a critically important department, undermines its mission by seriously impeding its operations here and throughout the country. As ranking member of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over GSA and this project, I have held nearly half a dozen hearings and roundtables on the co-location and consolidation of DHS at St. Elizabeths. I am anxious to move forward with this project and look forward to the completion of the consolidation so that DHS can turn its full attention to its core mission.

Unless somebody wants to speak on my amendment, I am prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly address the amendment.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I continue to reserve a point of order.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama continues to reserve his point of order.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend our colleague from the District of Columbia for her persistent advocacy for this headquarters consolidation and construction, and also for the history she has recounted for us today. I think it's time well spent to understand how both the Bush and Obama administrations and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security Appropriations, through both parties' leadership, have until now supported this project.

The bill before us, however, provides no funding for the new DHS headquarters or for the consolidation of leased property in 2012. That's a pennywise and pound-foolish decision. Already based on the delay in finalizing the 2011 bill and the reduced resources provided in that bill for DHS headquarters construction activities, the cost of the headquarters project has grown. It's grown by \$200 million, from a total cost of \$3.4 billion to \$3.6 billion.

The decision to deny an additional \$159.6 million in 2012 to finalize construction of the first phase of the headquarters project and to begin construction of the second phase will result in yet higher costs in the out-years, and will delay by at least 2 years when the Coast Guard can move into its new headquarters facility, which is already under construction.

Similarly, the bill doesn't provide \$55.6 million requested for lease consolidation activities. Last year, this subcommittee held a very informative hearing with DHS and the General Services Administration on this activity. We heard testimony about the significant financial benefits of reducing the number of leases DHS has from 70 buildings across 46 locations in the greater D.C. area to six to eight buildings. Witnesses testified that this massive footprint disrupts the effectiveness and the cohesiveness of departmental operations and adds needless layers of costs and complexities to facilities management. Additionally, the leases will consume an increasingly larger share of the Department's budget through overhead costs in the coming years.

In a time of fiscal constraint, the Department will not have extra dollars to pay for all of these lease increases without shortchanging frontline and mission-essential programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, at a time when real estate prices continue to be low in the greater Washington area and construction and material costs are relatively low as well, this is the time to make this kind of investment. Funding this activity would save taxpayers money for years to come.

With that, I again commend the gentlewoman for her passionate and effective argument on this point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1740

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POE

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill has to do with enough housing for people who are illegally in this country in order to be detained and deported back to where they came from.

This past Sunday morning in Houston, Texas, police officer Kevin Will was on patrol. He was working an accident scene, talking to a witness at that accident scene, when a person comes barreling through the police barricade, in spite of the warning lights that were on top of the police cruisers.

When Kevin Will saw that the car was coming towards him, he told this witness to jump out of the way. The witness jumps out of the way, and this individual runs over and kills Officer Kevin Will. He was charged with evading arrest, he was charged with possession of cocaine, and he was charged with intoxication manslaughter of a police officer, and he was in this country illegally. He had previously been deported twice.

The district attorney's office said this individual is a member of the MS-13 gang, and now he is still in the United States committing crimes.

There are not enough places to house these people like this criminal after they serve their time and house them so that they can be deported back where they came from.

What this bill does is allocate more money for detention beds so that we can detain these people while we are awaiting to deport them back where they came from so that we can have a safer community, so that these people aren't running loose somewhere in the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and their very capable staff in putting strong language in the bill and encouraging the Immigration and Customs Enforcement office to fill as many beds as possible. We have given the agency an unprecedented amount of money and leeway and guidance in this bill to fill every available bed, public, private, county, State bed with individuals who cross the border illegally, with individuals who are released from county and State prisons that are supposed to be deported criminally.

The solution to the problem of illegals crossing the border, the guns, the gangs, the drugs, the crime, is not complicated. It is called law enforcement. We want to enforce existing law with the support of the local community. We have very strong support from the communities on the border and, in fact, we are enforcing existing law, which is 6 months in jail if you cross the border illegally, with great success in the Del Rio sector, and it is being rolled out in the Laredo sector.

We are working together with my good friend, my colleague, HENRY CUELLAR, TED POE, and I with the support of the local community, the local prosecutors, the Border Patrol, the prosecutors, with great success.

If I could, I would like to yield briefly to my friend from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) controls the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank both of my colleagues from Texas. It is a program that does work. We have sat down, we have gone to Laredo. We have seen it work in the Del Rio area. We are now working in Laredo.

In fact, the last time we sat with Chief Harris we talked about how we can make this work. They do need some space, and so I certainly want to work with both of my colleagues to make sure we get more of that space, more of the beds to make sure it works.

All we are doing is enforcing a 1954 law that is on the books already, nothing new except enforcing the law. I support what you are doing.

Mr. POE of Texas. I would urge this amendment be adopted. What it does is provide more space so that we can detain people and deport them back where they came from.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI be-

cause the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the subcommittee, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. MCCAUL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have not seen the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is the gentleman objecting to the unanimous consent request propounded by the gentleman from Texas that the amendment be considered as having been read?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Yes, I am. We have not seen the amendment.

The CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will increase spending by \$50 million for Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine operations. It will include funding for at least 2 UAV systems, as well as much needed helicopters and marine vessels to assist CBP operations along the border.

This amendment will provide the resources to increase the number of flight crews, training, and ground operations needed to support the mounting requests for aerial surveillance missions and boat crews to patrol the rivers and lakes along our border.

CBP air marine support supplements our agents on the ground, allowing CBP to deploy fewer agents in a specific area. CBP air marine currently operates 7 UAVs and intends to grow the fleet to a total of 18 to 24 by 2016.

I have seen the benefits of these missions personally, along with my good friend and colleague from the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. CUELLAR, to whom I yield at this time.

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank my good friend from Texas. I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for everything they have done for border security. We really appreciate it.

We just feel that we ought to put a little bit of money to have the OM and, of course, the UAVs. We have gone down to Corpus. We have been there with General Kostelnik, who I think is doing a great job.

What they do is provide ICE, in the sky, flying at 19,000 feet, they can see what is happening, and it provides the intelligence to the State, Federal and local. It is certainly something I support.

I want to thank again my friend, Mr. MCCAUL, for the work that you have done on this particular amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Similar to the last ruling, to be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill as argued by the chairman of the subcommittee, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read. The point of order is sustained.

□ 1750

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 45, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding for Operation Stonegarden by \$10 million. And while the underlying bill increases funding from \$50 million to \$55 million, it is not enough.

Operation Stonegarden is a grant program that provides funding to county-level governments along the border to prevent, protect against, and respond to border security issues as well as enhance cooperation and coordination between Federal, State, and local agencies.

At the last House Homeland Security Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee hearing, Sheriff Gonzalez of Zapata County and Sheriff Larry Dever of Arizona explained the need for drastic increases in this funding. While \$55 million is woefully inadequate when spread around, I believe an additional \$10 million would advance the cause.

With that, I yield again to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the work that they have done for border security.

Again, both Mr. MCCAUL and I feel that we ought to add a little bit more help to the local sheriffs and the police that get this assistance.

One of the things that we've seen is, of course, making sure that we don't have that spillover coming in from the Republic of Mexico. And by giving this assistance, whether it's the sheriff down there in Brownsville or going all the way up to El Paso, it's something that's needed, and I certainly support my friend to make sure we increase the funding for Stonegarden by the amount he has asked for.

Again, thank you for your leadership, and again, thank you to the chairman and ranking member for the work they have done on border security.

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

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. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any Member seek to speak on the point of order?

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this is just a question for my good friend from Alabama.

It's my understanding that these moneys are actually offset by the Under Secretary of Management's office. There is not an increased outlay.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard further?

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I insist on my point of order.

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

For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous ruling, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the salaries and expenses in order to increase the number of Border Enforcement Security Task Force teams.

I, along with Mr. CUELLAR, have been down to the border and seen the direct benefits of the BEST teams in terms of interdicting the southbound flow of cash and weapons. It's my sincere hope that with additional resources we could stop the flow of weapons going south into Mexico, but also seize the cash and asset forfeiture money that could then, in turn, help pay for our border security operations.

With that, I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Again, I want to thank my colleague from Texas. And again, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for all the work that they have done for border security.

The BEST program is the program that works. Basically what it does is it coordinates State, Federal, local and also our international partners, both Canadians and Mexicans, to work together to make sure that they are able to focus on the same thing, and that is fight transnational crime. It's an idea that worked very well—in fact, it got started in Laredo, Texas. It expanded now to both the northern and southern part of the United States.

And I certainly support my friend to make sure that we work and make sure that the BEST program gets stronger.

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

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. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under

clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 12, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase funding by \$10 million for border security fencing, infrastructure and technology. Secretary Napolitano's cancellation of the Secure Border Initiative delays the deployment of technology to secure the border.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman's reservation is not timely.

The gentleman from Texas has been recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The backbone of the new proposed system, integrated fixed towers, will not be in place until January 2013. In place of SBInet, a new border surveillance technology plan has been developed that abandons the fixed sensor tower nature of the original SBInet plan and replaces it with multiple technologies. As a result, the new plan consists of a reduced number of sensor towers envisioned in the SBInet plan, and in their place, lower cost technologies such as mounted radar and camera systems, portable and imaging systems, and thermal imaging devices.

The Secretary said that technology will not be deployed to cover the entire southern border until the year 2025. I believe that is unacceptable. This amendment provides funding for readily available technology that we can deploy quickly to secure the border before that timeframe.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, this will breach our outlays, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to back my chairman in this instance and also urge a rejection of the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment will increase funding for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office of Detention and Removal. While the underlying bill does increase funding by \$26 million, we need more.

DRO is the primary enforcement arm within ICE for the identification, apprehension and removal of illegal aliens from the United States. DRO is severely underresourced. It is overwhelmed and does not have the resources to do its job. ICE has stated repeatedly that they simply don't have the manpower and resources to deport illegal aliens, even criminal aliens identified through the 287(g) program. The Federal Government has its responsibility, and it needs to step up to the plate.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. For the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 17, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. This amendment will nearly triple the amount of funding for the popular 287(g) program, which authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security to permit specially trained State and local law enforcement officers to apprehend, investigate or detain aliens during a predetermined time frame and under Federal supervision by ICE.

It is an important force multiplier for ICE in allowing for enhanced capabilities to detain and remove illegal aliens identified by local law enforcement during the course of their duties.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Once again, for the reasons stated by the Chair in the previous rulings, the amendment may not avail itself of clause 2(f) of rule XXI to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

Page 14, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$32,000,000)”.

Page 63, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,000,000)”.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. I want to thank the chairman and, of course, our ranking member, Mr. PRICE, for all the work that they have done for border security.

This is an amendment similar to Mr. MCCAUL's. It adds \$32 million to the CBP Air/Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement. It takes \$60 million away from the Office of Under Secretary for Manage-

ment, another \$60 million from the Science and Technology Management Administration. Again, this is to purchase at least two additional UAVs and to make sure that they have the operations and maintenance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we oppose the amendment because we have already added \$30 million above the request. Therefore, we believe this is sufficient funding for this portion of the bill.

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 would like to underscore what our chairman has said about the generous addition in this bill for this function. These offsets, again, may be easy for Members for whom this looks like just an abstract, front office expenditure; but in fact, they carry real costs. I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CUELLAR. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$50,860,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$261,300,000, of which \$105,500,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$155,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That the Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for all information technology acquisition projects that are funded under this heading or are funded by multiple components of the Department of Homeland Security through reimbursable agreements: *Provided further*, That such expenditure plan shall include, for each project funded, the

name of the project, its key milestones, all funding sources, detailed annual and lifecycle costs, and projected cost savings or cost avoidance to be achieved: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for all information technology acquisition projects that includes—

(1) the proposed appropriations included for each project and activity tied to mission requirements, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered;

(2) the total estimated cost and projected timeline of completion for all multi-year enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities that are proposed in such budget or underway;

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance and contractor services costs; and

(4) a current acquisition program baseline for each project, that—

(A) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline;

(B) aligns the acquisition programs covered by the baseline to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how each increment will address such known capability gaps; and

(C) defines life-cycle costs for such programs.

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$344,368,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$58,757,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$124,000,000, of which not to exceed \$300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

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. LATOURETTE of Ohio.

An Amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ROYCE of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. POE of Texas.

An Amendment by Mr. CUELLAR of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) 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 333, noes 87, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—333

- Ackerman Adams Akin Alexander Altmire Andrews Austria Baca Bachus Baldwin Barletta Barrow Bartlett Barton (TX) Bass (CA) Bass (NH) Becerra Berg Berkley Berman Biggett Bilirakis Bishop (GA) Bishop (NY) Black Blackburn Blumenauer Bonner Bono Mack Boren Boswell Boustany Brady (PA) Braley (IA) Brooks Brown (FL) Buchanan Buchanan Buerkle Burgess Burton (IN) Butterfield Camp Canseco Capito Capps Capuano Cardoza Carnahan Carney Carson (IN) Cassidy Castor (FL) Chabot Chandler Chu Cicilline Clarke (MI) Clarke (NY) Clay Cleaver Clyburn Coble Coffman (CO) Cohen Cole Connolly (VA) Conyers Cooper Costa Costello Courtney Cravaack Crawford Critz Crowley Cuellar Cummings Davis (CA) Davis (IL) Davis (KY) DeFazio DeGette DeLauro Denham Dent DesJarlais DesJarlais Deutch Dicks Dingell Doggett Dold Donnelly (IN) Doyle Duffy Duncan (TN) Edwards Ellison Emerson Engel Eshoo Farenthold Farr Fattah Filner Fincher Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Fleming Forbes Fortenberry Frank (MA) Frelinghuysen Fudge Gallegly Garamendi Gardner Garrett Gerlach Gibbs Gibson Gingrey (GA) Goodlatte Granger Graves (MO) Green, Al Green, Gene Griffin (AR) Griffith (VA) Grijalva Grimm Grimmer McGovern Guthrie Guthrie Hall Hanabusa Hanna Harper Harris Hastings (FL) Hayworth Heck Heinrich Herrera Beutler Himes Hinchey Hinojosa Hirono Hochul Holden Holt Honda Hoyer Hultgren Hurt Inslee Israel Jackson (IL) Jackson Lee (TX) Johnson (GA) Johnson (IL) Johnson (OH) Johnson, E. B. Jones Kaptur Keating Kelly Kildee Kildeer Kind King (NY) Kinzinger (IL) Kissell Kline Kucinich Lance Landry Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Latham LaTourette Lee (CA) Levin Lewis (GA) Lipinski LoBiondo Loeb sack Lofgren, Zoe Lowey Luetkemeyer Lujan Lungren, Daniel E. Lynch Maloney Marchant Marino Markey Matheson Matsui McCarthy (NY) McCaul McClintock McCollum McCotter McDermott McGovern McHenry McIntyre McKinley McNerney Meehan Meeks Michaud Miller (MI) Miller (NC) Miller, George Moore Moran Murphy (CT) Murphy (PA) Nadler Napolitano Neal Noem Nugent Nunes

- Olver Owens Pallone Pascrell Pastor (AZ) Paul Paulsen Payne Pelosi Perlmutter Peters Peterson Petri Pingree (ME) Platts Poe (TX) Polis Price (GA) Price (NC) Quigley Rahall Rangel Reed Rehberg Reichert Renacci Reyes Ribble Richardson Richmond Rigell Rivera Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (MI) Rooney Ros-Lehtinen Ross (AR) Rothman (NJ) Roybal-Allard Runyan Ruppertsberger Rush Ryan (OH) Sánchez, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes Scalise Schakowsky Schiff Schilling Schmidt Schock Schrader Scott (VA) Scott, David Sensenbrenner Serrano Sessions Sewell Sherman Shimkus Shuler Shuster Simpson Sires Slaughter Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smith (WA) Speier Stark Stearns Stivers Sutton Terry Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Tiberi Tipton Tonko Towns Tsongas Turner Upton Van Hollen Velázquez Visclosky Walberg Walden Waters Watt Waxman Weiner Welch West Whitfield Wilson (FL) Wittman Womack Woodall Woolsey Wu Yarmuth Young (AK) Young (FL)

NOES—87

- Aderholt Amash Bachmann Benishek Bilbray Bishop (UT) Brady (TX) Broun (GA) Calvert Campbell Cantor Carter Conaway Crenshaw Culberson Diaz-Balart Dreier Duncan (SC) Ellmers Flake Flores Foxx Franks (AZ) Gosar Gowdy Graves (GA) Hartzler Hastings (WA) Hensarling Herger Huelskamp Huizenga (MI) Hunter Issa Jenkins Johnson, Sam Jordan King (IA) Kingston Labrador Lamborn Lankford Latta Lewis (CA) Long Lummis Mack McCarthy (CA) McKeon McMorris Rodgers Mica Miller (FL) Miller, Gary Mulvaney Neugebauer Nunnelee Olson Palazzo Pearce Pence Pitts Pompeo Posey Quayle Roby Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Roskam Ross (FL) Royce Ryan (WI) Schweikert Scott (SC) Scott, Austin Southerland Stutzman Sullivan Thompson (PA) Thornberry Walsh (IL) Webster Westmoreland Wilson (SC) Wolf Yoder Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

- Chaffetz Giffords Gohmert Gonzalez Higgins Lucas Manzullo Myrick Schwartz Tierney Walz (MN) Wasserman Schultz

□ 1838

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California, PEARCE, PENCE, WESTMORELAND, MACK, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SERRANO, SCHOCK, BECERRA, NUNES, SESSIONS, FLEISCHMANN, SCALISE, FARENTHOLD, SHIMKUS, WITTMAN, FORBES, WOODALL, GARRETT, GALLEGLY, KLINE, HULTGREN, RIGELL, BONNER, MARCHANT, CRAWFORD, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, GUTHRIE, WOMACK, KELLY, BURGESS, ROGERS of Michigan, ALEXANDER, FLEMING and COLE, and Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms.

BUERKLE 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. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the 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 154, noes 266, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—154

Ackerman	Green, Al	Olver
Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Baca	Grimm	Pallone
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanna	Paul
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Berman	Higgins	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinchee	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hochul	Quigley
Burgess	Holt	Rangel
Butterfield	Honda	Reyes
Capps	Hoyer	Richardson
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Rush
Cassidy	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	King (NY)	Schrader
Cleaver	Lance	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Stark
DeGette	Maloney	Sutton
DeLauro	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Dingell	McCaul	Towns
Doggett	McColum	Tsongas
Doyle	McDermott	Van Hollen
Edwards	McGovern	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Visclosky
Engel	Michaud	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Moore	Weiner
Fattah	Moran	Welch
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Woolsey
Fudge	Napolitano	Wu
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth

NOES—266

Adams	Barletta	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Akin	Bartlett	Bishop (NY)
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Altmire	Bass (NH)	Black
Amash	Benishek	Blackburn
Austria	Berg	Bonner
Bachmann	Biggert	Bono Mack
Bachus	Bilbray	Boren

Boswell	Hayworth	Pitts
Boustany	Heck	Platts
Brady (TX)	Heinrich	Poe (TX)
Brooks	Hensarling	Pompeo
Broun (GA)	Herger	Posey
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Bucshon	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Buerkle	Holden	Quayle
Burton (IN)	Huelskamp	Rahall
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Camp	Hultgren	Rehberg
Campbell	Hunter	Reichert
Canseco	Hurt	Renacci
Capito	Inslee	Ribble
Cardoza	Issa	Rigell
Carter	Jenkins	Rivera
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Roby
Chandler	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Coffman (CO)	Kelly	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Kind	Rohrabacher
Conaway	King (IA)	Rokita
Conyers	Kingston	Ross (AR)
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)
Costello	Kissell	Royce
Cravaack	Kline	Roskam
Crawford	Kucinich	Ross (AR)
Crenshaw	Labrador	Ross (FL)
Critz	Lamborn	Royce
Culberson	Landry	Runyan
Davis (CA)	Lankford	Ruppersberger
Davis (KY)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Dent	LaTourette	Scalise
DesJarlais	Latta	Schilling
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Dicks	LoBiondo	Schock
Dold	Loebsack	Schweikert
Donnelly (IN)	Long	Scott (SC)
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Luján	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Sherman
Ellmers	E.	Shimkus
Emerson	Lynch	Shuler
Farenthold	Mack	Shuster
Fincher	Marchant	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Smith (NE)
Flake	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Fleming	McClintock	Southerland
Flores	McCotter	Stearns
Forbes	McHenry	Stivers
Fortenberry	McIntyre	Stutzman
Fox	McKeon	Sullivan
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Terry
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Gallegly	Rodgers	Thornberry
Gardner	McNerney	Tiberi
Garrett	Meehan	Tipton
Garrett	Mica	Turner
Gerlach	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (NC)	Walden
Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Waxman
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Webster
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	West
Granger	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Noem	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Green, Gene	Nunes	Witman
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Womack
Guinta	Palazzo	Woodall
Guthrie	Paulsen	Yoder
Hall	Pearce	Young (AK)
Harper	Pence	Young (FL)
Harris	Peters	Young (IN)
Hartzer	Peterson	
Hastings (WA)	Petri	

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor	Lucas	Walz (MN)
Chaffetz	Manzullo	Wasserman
Giffords	Myrick	Schultz
Gohmert	Schwartz	
Gonzalez	Tierney	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1844

Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER and KUCINICH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) 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 268, noes 151, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—268

Adams	DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Akin	Dold	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Jones
Altmire	Dreier	Jordan
Amash	Duffy	Kelly
Austria	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Bachus	Ellmers	Kingston
Barletta	Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)
Barrow	Farenthold	Kissell
Bartlett	Fincher	Kline
Bass (NH)	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Benishek	Flake	Lamborn
Berg	Fleischmann	Lance
Berkley	Fleming	Landy
Biggert	Flores	Lankford
Bilbray	Forbes	Latham
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latta
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Bonner	Gallegly	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Gardner	Loebsack
Boren	Garrett	Long
Boswell	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Gibbs	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Brooks	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Mack
Buchanan	Gosar	Marchant
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marino
Buerkle	Granger	Matheson
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McCaul
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McClintock
Campbell	Grimm	McCotter
Canseco	Guinta	McHenry
Cantor	Guthrie	McIntyre
Capito	Hall	McKeon
Carney	Hanna	McKinley
Carson (IN)	Harper	McMorris
Carter	Harris	Rodgers
Chabot	Hartzer	Meehan
Chandler	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Coble	Hayworth	Michaud
Coffman (CO)	Heck	Miller (FL)
Cole	Heinrich	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Connolly (VA)	Herger	Mulvaney
Cooper	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Costello	Higgins	Neugebauer
Cravaack	Hochul	Noem
Crawford	Holden	Nugent
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Nunes
Critz	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Cuellar	Hultgren	Olson
Culberson	Hunter	Palazzo
Davis (KY)	Hurt	Pascrell
DeFazio	Inslee	Paul
Denham	Issa	Paulsen
Dent	Jenkins	Pearce

Pence
Peters
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
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns

NOES—151

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge

Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Townsend
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)
Chaffetz
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez

Lucas
Manzullo
Myrick
Schwartz
Slaughter

Tierney
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). One minute is remaining in this vote.

□ 1848

Messrs. PALLONE and SCHIFF changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 327, noes 93, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—327

Ackerman
Adams
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Caldwell
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar

Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
DesJarlais
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Insee
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebback
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

McMorris
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Olver
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert

Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—93

Aderholt
Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Butterfield
Cantor
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo

Farr
Filner
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Himes
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Keating
Lance
Larsen (WA)
McCollum
McDermott
Meeks
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nunnelee
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Peterson
Quigley
Reed
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schrader
Smith (NE)
Stark
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Townsend
Waxman
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—12

Chaffetz
Giffords
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Lucas

Manzullo
Myrick
Schwartz
Slaughter
Tierney

Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1851

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) 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 Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 256, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—162

Ackerman	Gardner	Pearce
Adams	Gibson	Pelosi
Andrews	Granger	Perlmutter
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Peters
Barletta	Green, Gene	Petri
Barrow	Hall	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hanna	Platts
Bass (NH)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Benishkek	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Berg	Herger	Quayle
Berkley	Herrera Beutler	Rahall
Bilbray	Higgins	Rehberg
Bishop (UT)	Hinojosa	Reichert
Blackburn	Hochul	Renacci
Bono Mack	Holden	Reyes
Boren	Huelskamp	Richardson
Boswell	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Insee	Rogers (MI)
Brady (PA)	Israel	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Issa	Ross (AR)
Bralley (IA)	Kaptur	Ross (FL)
Brooks	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Broun (GA)	Kelly	Royce
Burgess	Kind	Ruppersberger
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Camp	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Campbell	Latham	Schiff
Canseco	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Castor (FL)	Loeback	Schrader
Chabot	Lynch	Schweikert
Chandler	Mack	Scott, Austin
Clarke (MI)	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Marino	Sessions
Coffman (CO)	Matheson	Sherman
Conaway	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Critz	McCaul	Shuler
Cuellar	McClintock	Sires
Culberson	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Cummings	McKeon	Southerland
DeFazio	McMorris	Stearns
Deutch	Rodgers	Sullivan
Doggett	Michaud	Sutton
Donnelly (IN)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Doyle	Miller (MI)	Towns
Duffy	Miller, Gary	Upton
Duncan (SC)	Moore	Webster
Engel	Murphy (PA)	Weiner
Farenthold	Neugebauer	West
Fattah	Nugent	Young (AK)
Fitzpatrick	Nunes	Young (FL)
Flake	Olson	Young (IN)
Fudge	Pallone	
Garamendi	Pascrell	

NOES—256

Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Carney
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)
Alexander	Black	Carter
Altmire	Blumenauer	Cassidy
Amash	Bonner	Cicilline
Austria	Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)
Baca	Buchanan	Clay
Bachus	Bucshon	Cleaver
Baldwin	Buerkle	Clyburn
Bartlett	Cantor	Cohen
Bass (CA)	Capito	Cole
Becerra	Capps	Connolly (VA)
Berman	Capuano	Conyers
Biggert	Cardoza	Cooper
Bilirakis	Carnahan	Costa

Costello	Jackson Lee	Pompeo
Courtney	(TX)	Posey
Cravaack	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Rangel
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ribble
Davis (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Richmond
Davis (KY)	Jones	Rigell
DeGette	Jordan	Rivera
DeLauro	Kildee	Roby
Denham	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Kissell	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rooney
Dicks	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Labrador	Roskam
Dold	Lamborn	Roybal-Allard
Dreier	Lance	Runyan
Duncan (TN)	Landry	Rush
Edwards	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Lankford	T.
Ellmers	LaTourette	Scalise
Emerson	Latta	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Schilling
Farr	Levin	Schock
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Scott (SC)
Fincher	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Scott, David
Fleming	Long	Serrano
Flores	Longfren, Zoe	Sewell
Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuster
Fortenberry	Lowey	Simpson
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Frank (MA)	Lujan	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Smith (WA)
Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Speier
E.		Stark
Maloney		Stivers
Markey		Stutzman
Matsui		Terry
McCarthy (CA)		Thompson (CA)
McCollum		Thompson (MS)
McCotter		Thompson (PA)
McDermott		Tiberi
McGovern		Tipton
McHenry		Tonko
McKinley		Tsongas
McNerney		Turner
Meehan		Van Hollen
Meeks		Velázquez
Mica		Visclosky
Miller (NC)		Walberg
Miller, George		Walden
Moran		Walsh (IL)
Mulvaney		Watt
Murphy (CT)		Waxman
Nadler		Welch
Napolitano		Westmoreland
Neal		Whitfield
Noem		Wilson (FL)
Nunnelee		Wilson (SC)
Oliver		Wittman
Owens		Wolf
Palazzo		Womack
Pastor (AZ)		Woodall
Paul		Woolsey
Paulsen		Wu
Payne		Yarmuth
Pence		Yoder
Peterson		
Pingree (ME)		
Polis		

NOT VOTING—14

Chaffetz	Lucas	Tierney
Chu	Manzullo	Walz (MN)
Giffords	Myrick	Wasserman
Gohmert	Schwartz	Schultz
Gonzalez	Slaughter	Waters

□ 1855

Mr. NEAL and Mrs. MALONEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan and BROOKS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman 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.

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

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-97) on the resolution (H. Res. 288) providing 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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.

□ 1858

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. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 6, line 22.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT, my good friend from Alabama, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for bringing this important legislation to the floor and for your hard work during these difficult budget times. As chairman of the subcommittee with sole authorizing jurisdiction over the Transportation Security Administration in the House, I welcome our continued