

1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2219.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 320 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. 2219.

□ 1233

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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 6, 2011, the bill had been read to page 161, line 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to furnish military equipment, military training or advice, or other support for military activities, to any group or individual, not part of a country's armed forces, for the purpose of assisting that group or individual in carrying out military activities in or against Libya.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is quite simple. It prohibits any funds in this bill from being used to conduct military operations in Libya, a place where I believe we are engaged in an illegal and certainly unauthorized conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I feel a little bit today like a lawyer with two very unpopular clients. One of them is Libya, and the other one is the United States Congress. But in this case, each one of them has an important point to make.

With respect to Libya, let me make it clear, I don't believe anybody in this Chamber supports Mr. Qadhafi, sup-

ports that regime, or wishes it well in any way. But Libya did not attack the United States of America. Libya did not attack any member of NATO. Libya has not allowed al Qaeda to operate with impunity out of its territory. A number of years ago, Libya turned over nuclear material to the United States.

Quite simply, however much we detest Mr. Qadhafi and his regime, we have no reason to be at war or conducting military operations in Libya. And, frankly, if we allow that situation to continue, I think we have to ask ourselves: Are we willing to attack any nation any time that we disagree with a regime that we don't like simply because the President chooses to do so?

More troubling than the attack on Libya, in my view, is the circumvention of this body, the United States Congress, and its warmaking authority under both the Constitution and the War Powers Act. Only Congress has the ability to authorize and fund military operations.

The administration consulted with NATO. The administration consulted with the United Nations. The administration consulted with the Arab League. It never, in any real sense, consulted with the Congress of the United States before beginning military operations in Libya.

Two weeks ago, this House made clear its opposition to the Libyan venture by refusing to authorize even the limited use of force. We should build on that by removing funding today.

Some may question whether or not this amendment is germane to this particular piece of legislation. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I worked very carefully with the Parliamentarian on the language, and, more importantly, it's modeled after the famous Boland amendment of 1983 to the Defense appropriations bill that year that was approved by this body 411-0.

Some may argue, like the administration, that we really aren't engaged in hostilities in Libya. That simply is laughable. Attorneys at both the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice of this administration believe that our activity requires congressional authorization under the War Powers Act.

We've flown over a thousand combat sorties over Libyan airspace. We've launched 228 Tomahawk missiles. We've launched over a hundred Predators. We're refueling and supporting NATO aircraft that are engaged in attacking Libya every single day. If that's not war on our side of this situation, I can assure you that people on the other side consider it war and certainly consider it hostile.

The reality is we should not be engaged in military action of this level unless it's authorized and funded by the Congress of the United States.

In Libya, the President has, quite simply, overreached. However, in Congress, we have so far allowed him to do so. We've not authorized this activity.

There's not a single line in the Defense authorization bill or in this bill which actually funds this activity, and we ought to explicitly prohibit the President from concluding.

I think, like many in this body, this is a very important moment for the Congress of the United States. Whether or not we claim warmaking authority and exercise our power under the Constitution is really the issue here. You could be for the Libyan venture and still be able to support this legislation, or you could be against it.

At the end of the day, it's extraordinarily important that we stop the erosion of the warmaking authority and responsibility of the Congress of the United States, that we end this ill-advised adventure in Libya, and that we reassert the rightful place of this institution in conducting war and authorizing it and funding it.

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

□ 1240

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Before I begin, I want to say that I have great respect for Congressman COLE, who serves on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He is one of our most thoughtful members.

The NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed a resolution adopted in the United Nations Security Council authorizing "all necessary measures."

This amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with NATO, which is also playing a major role in this. We will undoubtedly require support in the future in our dealings with NATO, and we get support in Afghanistan today.

I do support a wider debate and greater oversight of the use and the costs of U.S. military forces engaged in the Libya operation, both in the defense and foreign affairs-related committees as well as here on the House floor. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can overthrow Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The Constitution, Mr. Chairman, and the War Powers Act clearly say what the parameters are within which the President must act or follow: number one, a declaration of war; number two, a specific authorization; number three, a national emergency created by an attack

upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces.

None of these criteria were met by the President. He said he went in there because of humanitarian issues. He consulted, as we've said before on the floor, with France, England, the United Nations, NATO, and the Arab League. He had 2 or 3 weeks to do that, but he didn't have time to talk to the Congress of the United States, and he's gone in there and spent almost a billion dollars at a time when we just don't have the money.

Now if you're talking about humanitarian problems, in the Sudan, 2,300 Sudanese have been killed this year alone, and more than 500 people have died in the last 2 weeks. In Darfur, 450,000 to 480,000 have been displaced or killed. Just recently, and one of my colleagues talked about this a while ago, in the Nuba Mountains in the Sudan, they're killing people every single day. Horrible atrocities are taking place. Human rights violations. If you're talking about humanitarian issues, why wouldn't you go in there as well?

You look, also, at Syria right now. In Syria, there have been an awful lot of people killed. We all see that on television every night. There are wars of opportunity. If you go to Liberia, if you go and look back at the Khmer Rouge, we didn't get into those wars, and we're not getting into these wars right now because it's not in our national interest, and it's not a threat to the United States.

The President has taken us into a conflict. He said it's not a war, but it is a war. We've sent about 230 missiles in there at \$1.1 million per to kill people. We've flown sortie after sortie over there dropping bombs on people, and the President says it's not a war. It is a war, it's the United States' war, and it's being covered by NATO.

We shouldn't be going to war unless this body and the other body say it's okay. It's in the Constitution. It's in the War Powers Act. We should not be there. Nobody likes Muammar Qadhafi. Nobody thinks he should be there. But we can't be going into wars of opportunity every place, especially at a time when we're fiscally broke. I think it's extremely important that legislation like that which the gentleman from Oklahoma just offered should be passed, and I hope we will pass it. There's a whole host of these amendments that are going to be read today and we're going to be voting on, and we need to send a very clear signal to the White House that this must never happen again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Cole Amendment to H.R. 2219. Mr. COLE's amendment would restrict the use of funds for furnishing military equipment, military training or advice, and other military activities in Libya.

The President has failed to properly consult Congress on the engagement of hostilities in Libya. The President is also in violation of the

War Powers Resolution because of the continued military action past the 90 days allowed under the War Powers Resolution. The Administration's attempt to excuse the continued U.S. military actions in Libya by saying that the hostilities do not reach the threshold set by the War Powers Resolution is disingenuous.

The power of the purse plays an important part in the U.S. government's system of checks and balances. This amendment today will prohibit the President from continuing to conduct military operations in Libya until he can justify the actions to the Congress. I strongly support the limitation of funding of current military activities with respect to Libya. The President should not have a blank check to conduct wars without the consultation and authorization of Congress.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

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

Mr. DICKS. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the use of military force against Libya.

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

Mr. AMASH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for his tremendous leadership on this issue. There is a growing bipartisan support for this amendment. It's an amendment that gives us the opportunity to stop this unconstitutional war in Libya.

The United States has been at war against Libya for nearly 4 months. We have dropped bombs on Libyan buildings. We have flown sorties over Libyan airspace. It has been reported that we have even targeted Qadhafi himself.

We are at war. The Constitution vests Congress with the exclusive power to declare war, the President has not attempted to obtain Congress's authorization for the war, and yet at this moment, as we debate on the House floor, the war continues.

Instead of following the Constitution and seeking authorization, the President made strained arguments to justify the continued operation. At first, the operation was supposed to be "limited," as though that undefined term serves as a constitutional escape clause. My constituents certainly would be surprised if Congress established a limited religion, or subjected them to limited cruel and unusual punishment, or quartered soldiers in their houses, but only for a limited time.

After that "limited" argument ran its course, the President turned to a U.N. Security Council resolution and an invitation from an organization of Arab states to justify our involvement. Those organizations were not around at the time the Constitution was written, much less are they listed in its text.

The administration now has retreated from its constitutional arguments in public and claims that at least the War Powers Resolution does not forbid the strikes because we're not involved in, quote, hostilities against Libya. Imagine that the shoe were on the other foot, that Libya was bombing us. Would we view the Libyan air force's bombing of our infrastructure as a hostile act? Of course we would.

Last week, a member of the other Chamber called the President's arguments, quote, cute. I would use a different term: embarrassing. It's embarrassing that the administration attempts to hide behind these transparently strained and flimsy arguments, especially when we're dealing with such a grave issue.

But do you know what would be more embarrassing? If this Congress did nothing. More embarrassing than the President's contortions of the law and disregard for the Constitution would be if Congress, with full knowledge that it was occurring, gave him a pass. In the face of an attack on the Constitution, in the face of an attack on this institution and our powers as a coequal branch, we must stand up and say stop. If we don't, we should be the ones who are embarrassed.

The Amash-Kucinich amendment prohibits funds from being used for military force against Libya. To be clear, I believe that Congress doesn't need to do anything to stop the President from ordering force against Libya; because the President has not received authorization, the use of force is already illegal. However, to reinforce our constitutional position, our amendment says that beginning at the start of the fiscal year, on October 1, the Armed Forces may not drop bombs on Libya or otherwise use military force. Unlike the bill we considered the week before last, our amendment does not implicitly authorize any actions against Libya. It simply says force may not be used because the President has not sought nor has he received authorization for force.

Please vote "yes" on the Amash-Kucinich amendment and defend our constitutional role in war powers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1250

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if this were a debate on policy, or a debate on philosophy, or a debate specifically on the War Powers Act, the

position that I would take would be somewhat different than I must take today. But as the manager of this bill, what I have to work with is the bill before the House and the amendment before the House.

Now, the amendment is simple. None of the funds made available by this act may be used for the use of military force against Libya. What I would say to the Chair is that there are no funds in this bill, in this act, for Libya. I was curious about that. And as chairman preparing to write this bill, in conjunction with Mr. DICKS, the ranking member, I wrote to the President on April 1, and I sent each of our Members a copy, asking the President specific questions about the scope of this activity, the expected cost, et cetera.

On June 22, the White House finally responded, and said that it will not plan to ask for a supplemental appropriations bill. And there is no money in this bill for Libya. The administration says that it will not ask for a supplemental bill to pay for Libya, that they will use funds in the base budget. I wonder from where the administration is going to take money out of the base budget. Now, as chairman of the subcommittee, this worries me. From where do they plan to take the money? That's only part of the argument. There is no money in this act for Libya to start with.

But, secondly, if this amendment should become effective, there are many things that we would not be able to do. We would not be able to fly or perform search and rescue missions of American forces who may be flying aerial activity and have planes go down. Early in the operation, we lost an F-15. Two American pilots went into Libya and safely rescued the pilot of that F-15. We wouldn't be able to do that under this amendment.

What we are providing today is surveillance, intelligence, and reconnaissance. We wouldn't be able to do that under this amendment. We wouldn't be able to provide aerial refueling to our coalition partners, and they are our partners and we have an agreement with those partners. We provide aerial refueling because most of them do not have the capacity to refuel their aircraft in the air. Under this amendment, we would not be able to provide aerial refueling. We couldn't even provide operational planning, sitting down and talking with our coalition partners about the plan for Libya.

So while this amendment would sound good if we were discussing philosophy and if we were determining a policy, the policy has already been established. And this amendment does not change the policy. It affects something in the bill that's not even in the bill. So there are no funds in this bill for Libya; and according to the letter from the White House, supplemental funds will not be requested. The administration will just pay for the operation out of existing funds. That remains a good question, and I say that again, I

am really curious to know what base funds they intend to use to pay for this operation in Libya. I don't have the answer today. I am hoping that one day soon I may have that answer.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I rise in support of the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

The esteemed chair, my good friend, of the Defense Appropriations raises a question: Where are they getting the money? The money is not, as he points out, expressly in the bill.

Well, this legislation, the Amash-Kucinich amendment, isn't to delete funds that have already been appropriated. This is to forbid the administration, forbid the administration, from using funds that are appropriated in this act.

Now, there is no way that Congress could or would intervene to stop a search and rescue mission. And that's not relevant unless you're talking about that this Congress is finally going to search this defense budget, figure out where the President is getting the money, and rescue the American taxpayers from a wasteful war and rescue the Constitution from an illegal war. That is what makes it a search and rescue mission. But no search and rescue is prohibited by the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

I want to say that I am proud to have worked with Mr. AMASH to come together with this bipartisan agreement. And the support for it is growing. We have Mr. PAUL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BURTON, Ms. BARBARA LEE, Mr. POE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HONDA. The support is growing. And Members can call either Mr. AMASH's office or my office right now if they want to cosponsor.

This is our moment in Congress; this is our moment to reclaim the Constitution of the United States, which the Founders envisioned that under article I, section 8, we have the power to determine whether or not this Nation goes to war, not some rebel group in Benghazi. Because when you reduce it to its ultimate, a group of Benghazi rebels made the decision to go to war against its own government, and before you know it NATO joins in, we're pulled into it. The administration went to everyone except getting the approval of the United States Congress.

This is our moment to reclaim the Constitution. Will we rise to the occasion? This isn't only about this Congress right now. History will judge us whether or not we understood the imperative of article I, section 8. This is about the Constitution. Certainly it's about a billion dollars that would be spent by September unless we intervene, at a time of rising debt, at a time of tremendous pressure on the budget, at a time when local governments in our communities are cutting public

services because they don't have the money. This administration determines they're going to take us into war, and they didn't even give so much as give this Congress an opportunity to have this debate before the decision was made. That was wrong.

I appreciate that we have been able to set aside any partisan disagreements that are part of the nature of this forum to understand that we have a higher calling here. And that higher calling is to defend this Constitution of the United States, which describes what our duties are when we come here. We take the oath to defend the Constitution. That's what we shall do today.

We shall rescue this Congress from the ignominy of having the rights that the people expect us to exercise on their behalf just trampled by an administration that doesn't think that we have any co-equal role in the government at all. This is our moment to stand up, Democrats and Republicans alike.

I am proud to work with Mr. AMASH in crafting this bipartisan Kucinich-Amash amendment.

This is our moment, Members. Let's not lose this opportunity to stand up and speak out on behalf of the United States Constitution, on behalf of the separation of powers, on behalf of the co-equality of our House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States. Let's show the Founders, and the spirit of the Founders is always with us in this place, let's demonstrate that we remember where we came from when this Constitution was set forth. Let's demonstrate that we have reached our moment where we stand up.

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

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, for more than 3 months, our Nation has been amidst a quiet constitutional crisis that carries immense implications. My friend, the gentleman from Florida, is sadly mistaken to dismiss this as a meaningless philosophical discussion. This strikes at the very heart of our constitutional form of government.

□ 1300

On March 19, completely without congressional authorization, the President ordered an unprovoked attack against another country. In so doing, he crossed a very bright constitutional line placed there specifically to prevent so momentous and fatal a question as war being made by a single individual.

The American Founders were explicit on this point. For centuries, European monarchs had plunged their nations into bloody and debilitating wars on whim, and the Founders wanted to protect the American Republic from that fate.

James Madison explained why in this passage in a letter to Hamilton. He

said: "In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confines the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man. War is, in fact, the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war a physical force is to be created and it is the executive will which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked, and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. In war, the honors and the emoluments of office are to be multiplied, and it is the executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed. Those who are to conduct a war cannot, in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges whether a war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded."

The President has tried to justify this act in a variety of ways: that bombing another country is not really an act of war, that there wasn't time to consult Congress—though more than enough to consult the United Nations Security Council—or that it was a humanitarian act.

Mr. Chairman, never was there a greater provocation or clearer moral justification for war than the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. And never was there a more activist President than Franklin Roosevelt.

Yet within 24 hours of that attack, President Roosevelt appeared before a joint session of Congress in this very Hall. He clearly recognized that as Commander in Chief his authority only extended to ordering that "all measures be taken for our defense." He recognized that under the Constitution, anything more, even in this most historic attack, required an act of Congress, which he sought and obtained.

The unprovoked attack on Libya was not authorized by this Congress, and it is accordingly unconstitutional and illegal. Indeed, 2 weeks ago, the House considered a resolution authorizing a war with Libya, and it rejected that measure by a nearly 3-1 margin. It then considered a second measure to authorize acts of war against Libya just short of actual combat, including refueling tankers on their way to targets. The identification and selection of targets, operational support, operational planning, it rejected that measure as well.

The precedent being established right now by the President's deliberate defiance of the Constitution and the clear will of Congress has profound implications for our Nation's future. If this act is allowed to stand unchallenged, it means that the checks and balances painstakingly built into the Constitution on the supreme question of war and peace have been rendered meaningless.

Weeks ago, the House voted to deny authorization for the use of funds for the war on Libya effective October 1. This amendment simply follows through on that decision in the actual appropriations act.

Frankly, we need to do much more than this. Clearly, one of the conditions for increasing the debt limit must be to ensure that no funds, either borrowed or raised, should be used to continue to support this illegal act.

And we need to remember that a war once started cannot always be turned off by an appropriations act. Once we have attacked another country without provocation, we have created an aggrieved belligerent that now has cause to pursue that war regardless of what the Congress later decides.

That's why this precedent is so dangerous. That's why the President's actions are so devastating to our very form of government, and that's why we need to speak clearly and unequivocally through measures like that offered by the gentlemen from Michigan and Ohio today.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Amash-Kucinich amendment, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and at the same time call on other Members to join us on the floor right now for this important debate.

Mr. Chairman, I have been struck in recent days by the profound lack of seriousness in Washington when it comes to confronting this illegal war we are fighting in Libya. Last week at a news conference, the President dismissed congressional concerns about war powers authority and his Libya policy and, he said "all kinds of noise about process."

At the same time, the U.S. Senate essentially punted on the issue earlier this week, pulling the plug on an important debate that the country needs because a few Republican Senators complained that they canceled recess only to deal with the debt ceiling, and they were not going to discuss Libya.

But perhaps it was right here in the House that we have seen the most incoherence on Libya. Right before we adjourned almost 2 weeks ago, this body voted against authorizing the use of force in Libya; and then less than 2 hours later, the House voted to continue funding the war we had just refused to authorize.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has the "power of the purse," and we must be prepared to use it. We must use this opportunity to send a powerful message. A vote of no confidence in this Libya policy will prove that we do not and will not write another check for a war that Americans don't want and a war that we did not authorize.

Hostilities with Libya—and, let's be frank, these are hostilities—have now been going on for more than 100 days with the cost climbing toward a billion dollars, and that doesn't even include the moral costs and the cost of civilian lives. The people's money is too important and too precious, especially during this time of fiscal austerity.

No one believes that cutting off Libya alone is enough to make meaningful progress on deficit reduction; but I think it's outrageous that we are talking about cuts in Social Security benefits, and those cuts are on the table while we are discussing the debt ceiling negotiations while we continue to throw money at not one, not two, but three wars.

A Brown University study concludes that when it's all said and done Iraq and Afghanistan will suck the Treasury dry to the tune of at least \$3.7 trillion. Enough, already.

Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon is like that teenager. You keep giving the kid the keys to the car, and he keeps crashing it. It's time we cut him off.

We must draw the line, and we must draw it here. No more funding for Libya; no more continuance in Libyan hostilities. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the President says we have gone to war in the name of humanity. In other words, the President's little war in Libya is so that we can preserve humanity in Libya.

In the history of peoples, as the gentleman from California has pointed out, and the histories of countries, it has always been the king, the dictator, the tyrant, the chief, the leader that has sent that particular country to war.

So when our ancestors got together and they formed a new and perfect Union, they decided it would not be the leader, which we call the President, it would be the people that would decide if we went to war. They gave that power to the Congress of the United States and only Congress can declare war, not the President.

□ 1310

But this is the President's war; and the President, in my opinion, is in violation of the Constitution. He has led America to our third war. Whether or not the war powers resolution is constitutional or not, we can debate that. But he is in violation of it, too, because we're still engaged in war, whether you call it hostilities or not. Some say it's not hostile. Well, you be one of the recipients of one of those cruise missiles on the ground somewhere in Libya, and you might think that's a hostile environment towards you. But this country is spending money on a third war, and it is unconstitutional.

Our ancestors had comments about the leader, the king, leading us into war. The writer of the Constitution wrote a letter. James Madison said that "the Constitution supposes what the history of all governments has always demonstrated, that it is the executive branch most interested in war and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the

question in this country of war in the legislative body.”

The first Commander in Chief, the first President of the United States, George Washington, said that “the Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress, therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject and Congress has authorized such a measure.”

It is our history, it is our heritage, it is our Constitution, and it is our principle that Congress must declare war, Congress must be the one to engage in war. And in my opinion, the President has violated that Constitution. He has violated the law of the land and the war powers resolution; and it's Congress' duty now, it is our turn and it is our responsibility to weigh in on this war and stop money from going to this war.

Where the President got the \$700-plus million that has already been spent on this war, we don't know. We just want to make sure no more money is spent on this unconstitutional action.

Muammar Qadhafi is a tyrant. He's an outlaw. There are a lot of bad guys in the world, Mr. Chairman, and is it now the policy of the President to pick out the ones he does not like and start blowing up that country in the name of humanity? We don't know.

So Congress must resume, regain, its rightful authority and role and make sure that we do not fund the President's little war, or any other future wars, without congressional approval.

Mr. Chairman, instead of spending money blowing up Libya, we ought to spend that American taxpayer money in the United States building the United States and rebuilding America and not destroying somebody else's country and being involved in somebody else's civil war.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, we should not turn our backs on the Libyan people. I want to remind my colleagues that NATO's campaign in Libya has saved countless lives. Our actions and those of NATO were the only thing that stopped Qadhafi from committing unspeakable crimes against humanity. In fact, when the United States and NATO intervened, Qadhafi was on the footsteps of Misrata and threatening to kill without mercy. Qadhafi's forces were on the brink of Benghazi hours before NATO's operation began. Qadhafi literally said that he would kill people with “no mercy, no pity.” He said he would go “house by house, room by room.” Those are the words of a shameless, ruthless killer; and we had to do something, and I'm glad that we did.

Constituents of my district whose roots come from Libya have made it clear to me that they want me to stand

together with humanity, stand together with vulnerable people. But let me be clear, this is not Iraq, and this will not be the Iraq war. We did not unilaterally declare war on another country. On the contrary, our actions were with the international community, sanctioned by the United Nations, the Arab League and, most importantly, the Libyan people themselves.

Our role is limited and constrained, no boots on the ground. We essentially are helping to supply and refuel and add surveillance. Do we want to signal to other murderous dictators while the people are standing up for democracy that they have a free hand to slaughter their public? I hope not.

I say listen to regular Libyans on the street today. They want more NATO involvement, not less. They want the United States to remain involved. If we pull out now, the NATO coalition could fall apart and tens of thousands of refugees fleeing Qadhafi's wrath would jeopardize the fragile democratic transitions in both Egypt and Tunisia. This issue has regional implications. It's not limited to Libya alone.

As my constituents know, and my legislative record reflects, I was adamantly against the Iraq war and I am adamantly in favor of a faster withdrawal from Afghanistan. In fact, I'm almost always against the use of the military option. Seldom is it the right course, in my opinion. But “seldom” doesn't mean “always.” Srebrenica, Darfur and Rwanda all warranted our engagement as Libya does today. We made it to the Balkans, but we didn't make it to Darfur or Rwanda, and literally millions of people died because of that.

But at the same time, I cannot turn a blind eye to the slaughter of innocent people. My hope is that the day may never come when I will ignore the cries of innocent people being murdered by a dictator or while we cozy up to a murderous dictator. I cannot turn my back on people demanding the same freedoms we enjoy in America.

I understand my colleagues' aversion to military conflict. I share it. I understand their fear of mission creep. I share that. But I also understand that when people are being murdered wholesale, being ethnically cleansed, being the targets of genocide, the world, including the United States, cannot and must not stand back and watch. For the sake of the Libyan people and all demanding freedom in the Middle East, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution authorizing the use of limited force.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, today I was planning to offer my own amendment which would hold the President accountable to the War Powers Act with regard to his operation in Libya. My intention was to expose the Presi-

dent's clear violation of this important law. However, I was concerned some wording could have raised a point of order. That being said, I'm proud to cosponsor Mr. KUCINICH's important amendment, which will completely cut off funds for this illegal war.

Mr. Chairman, on March 19, President Obama announced he had authorized U.S. military forces to conduct operations in Libya. Unfortunately, the President did this without receiving authorization from Congress even though he made sure to get the U.N.'s approval. By not being open and honest with Congress, he left Members in the dark and unsure of what our ultimate mission was. To this day, the President hasn't come to Congress to ask for formal approval.

Initially, when the President committed our military operations in Libya, he said it would be days, not months. Well, now we are definitely talking months because it is a little over a week we've been engaged in military operations in Libya for nearly 4 months. In an effort to escape his responsibility, to this day the President has refused to acknowledge that the U.S. is engaged in hostilities in Libya. That being said, those in the Pentagon seem to disagree with the President on this issue.

While the President has turned a blind eye to truth, the Department of Defense has decided to award imminent danger pay to servicemembers who fly over Libya and for those who serve on ships within 110 nautical miles of the shore. As of June 3, 93 percent of the cruise missiles, 66 percent of the personnel, 50 percent of the ships, and 50 percent of the planes used in NATO operations against Libya were by the United States of America.

Mr. Chair, firing a cruise missile at Libya qualifies as hostilities. In early June, it was estimated that Libya was already costing the American taxpayers over \$700 million.

I have three sons that are currently in the military, and I will support our troops no matter where the President sends them. However, I cannot support Obama's decision to commit our military forces' operations without the required congressional authorization. That's why I cosponsored this amendment, the 2012 Department of Defense appropriations bill Kucinich amendment.

With that, I ask all my colleagues, all Members, to come down here on the House floor and to express support for this important amendment, to reclaim our Constitution, to reclaim the validity of this Congress as relates to committing troops to war.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I believe this is an important debate in the House today as we, appropriately, exercise congressional oversight of the use of force and the costs associated with our engagement in Libya.

In my judgment, the President's initial commitment of U.S. air power and naval forces to support the international effort was appropriate, and certainly within his power as Commander in Chief. In March, the President clearly outlined the rationale for our involvement in this military action. Now if I were advising the President, I would have said send up a resolution and get approval from the House and the Senate. There is no question that would have been the preferred course of action.

The U.S. effort was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, and it followed a resolution adopted in the United Nations Security Council authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect Libyan civilians attempting to overthrow the oppressive regime of Muammar al Qadhafi. The Qadhafi government's response to the uprising, inspired by the "Arab Spring" movement, was to use force against civilians and opposition forces, and the brutal measures prompted the international outcry and the United Nations action. While the direct U.S. leadership of this effort lasted a brief time, U.S. forces remain engaged in the NATO operation.

When I hear many of my colleagues speak in favor of abandoning this cause, I believe it is important to reflect on the fundamental reason why we are concerned here. This is the same individual, Muammar al Qadhafi, who had been planning terrorist actions against United States citizens and others for decades. This is the same terrorist leader against whom President Ronald Reagan authorized a military strike in 1986—and he didn't ask Congress for approval—following the bombings in Berlin and definitive proof of Qadhafi's involvement in other terrorist activity. At that time, President Reagan publicly denounced Qadhafi as the "Mad Dog of the Middle East" who espoused the goal of world revolution.

Mr. Chairman, I can only wonder what Ronald Reagan would say today about those who would propose immediate withdrawal of U.S. assistance to the broad coalition of nations attempting to finish the job that President Reagan started.

Now, just to make it clear, the administration, when they sent up their report under the Boehner amendment, I believe, they did list out the military cost for the operation. Daily operations up to June 3 were \$313.7 million; munitions, \$398.3 million; global lift and sustain, \$1.6 million. The subtotal for military operations was \$713.6 million. And then the drawdown of DOD supplies, \$1.3 million; humanitarian assistance, \$1.6 million; for a total of \$715.9 million.

Now munitions come out of the munition funds; daily operations come out

of O&M funds for the Army and the Navy. The estimate by September 30, 2011, is that daily operations will total \$618 million; munitions, \$450 million; global lift and sustain, \$10 million; for a total of \$1.078 billion. Drawdown of DOD supplies would be \$25 million and humanitarian assistance of \$1 million, for a total of \$1.104 billion. I think that is a pretty clear indication.

Now, our chairman is absolutely correct. They have not asked for a supplemental here. They are going to use existing funds that we have already appropriated to take care of this operation. And of course we would all like to see this thing resolved as quickly as possible, and a political settlement may be possible. But I think it would be wrong to undermine the President and our country and our involvement with NATO and with the U.N. and with our Arab allies on this subject.

I urge a "no" vote on the Amash-Kucinich amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, last month, the House voted against defunding the American military mission in Libya. That was the right decision, and it still is: along with our NATO allies, we intervened in Libya in response to Moammar Gadhafi's violent repression of his own people, and the explicit promise of worse to come. It's also important to remember that Gadhafi has more American blood on his hands than anyone other than Osama bin Laden. And we must remember that we intervened in response to calls from the Arab League, the United Nations, the European Union, and a unanimous NATO.

Our allies have taken the leading role in Libya, but it is crucial that America continue to support them. It's crucial because the campaign against Gadhafi has made significant progress, which would be dramatically set back by a sudden withdrawal of American support; because that sudden withdrawal of support could endanger civilian lives and stall democratic movements across the Middle East; and because it would represent a failure to keep faith with our NATO allies. As I said the last time this issue came to the floor: either we are in an alliance, or we are not. And if we are, that means supporting our allies in their time and place of need, so that they will continue to do the same for us—a principle that is especially important when civilian lives are at stake. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

An amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

An amendment by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for the second through the 11th vote. The final two votes will be 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 322, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

AYES—97

Amash	Frank (MA)	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Fudge	Paul
Baldwin	Garamendi	Petri
Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Polis
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Quigley
Boswell	Hinchee	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Richardson
Bralley (IA)	Hirono	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Holt	Rokita
Capuano	Honda	Rush
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	(TX)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (IL)	Scott (VA)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Serrano
Clyburn	Jones	Shuler
Coble	Kucinich	Sires
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Costello	Lee (CA)	Speier
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Cummings	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	McGovern	Tierney
Doyle	Michaud	Tonko
Duncan (TN)	Moore	Towns
Edwards	Murphy (CT)	Tsongas
Ellison	Nadler	Velázquez
Eshoo	Napolitano	
Farr	Neal	
Fattah	Oliver	
Filner	Pallone	

Visclosky
Waters

Watt
Waxman

NOES—322

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Insee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Logggett
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant

Welch
Woolsey

Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Blumenauer
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Cantor
Cleaver
Conyers
Culberson
DeLauro

Giffords
Keating
Lewis (GA)
Miller, George
Payne

Pelosi
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1351

Messrs. CONNOLLY of Virginia, MILLER of North Carolina, SCOTT of South Carolina, and LYNCH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, CROWLEY, and MURPHY of Connecticut changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 133, noes 295, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—133

Amash
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Flake
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Crowley

Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee

Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Loftgren, Zoe
Lujan
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berg
Berkley
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold

Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
E.
Frelinghuysen
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin

Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McDermott
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)

NOES—295

Royce Smith (NE) Walz (MN) Moran Reyes Stutzman Thornberry Walsh (IL) Womack
 Runyan Smith (NJ) Wasserman Murphy (CT) Rothman (NJ) Sutton Tiberi Walsh (MN) Woodall
 Ruppberger Smith (TX) Schultz Roybal-Allard Thompson (CA) Tipton Webster Yoder
 Ryan (WI) Smith (WA) Napolitano Rush Thompson (MS) Turner West Young (AK)
 Scalise Southerland Ryan (OH) Tierney Upton Westmoreland Young (FL)
 Schilling Stearns Olver Sánchez, Linda T. Tonko Visclosky Wilson (SC) Young (IN)
 Schmidt Stivers Westmoreland Whitfield T. Sarbanes Towns Wittman
 Schock Stutzman Wilson (FL) Pascrell Sarbanes Tsongas Walden Wolf
 Schwartz Sullivan Wilson (FL) Pastor (AZ) Schakowsky Van Hollen Velazquez
 Schweikert Terry Wittman Paul Terry Schwartz Scott (VA) Schultz Wasserman
 Scott (SC) Thompson (PA) Wolf Paulsen Payne Pelosi Peters Serrano Waters
 Scott, Austin Thornberry Womack Woodall Yoder Waxman Welch
 Scott, David Tiberi Woodall Yoder Waxman Welch
 Sensenbrenner Tipton Yoder Womack Woodall Yoder Wilson (FL)
 Sessions Turner Young (AK) Young (FL) Young (IN)
 Sewell Van Hollen Young (FL) Young (IN)
 Shimkus Walberg Young (IN) Quigley
 Shuster Walden Young (IN) Rahall
 Simpson Walsh (IL) Rangel

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson Giffords Keating

□ 1357

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 174, noes 251, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—174

Ackerman Davis (IL) Honda
 Andrews DeFazio Hoyer
 Baca DeGette Insee
 Bachmann DeLauro Israel
 Baldwin Deutch Jackson (IL)
 Bass (CA) Dingell Jackson Lee
 Becerra Doggett
 Berkley Donnelly (IN) Johnson (GA)
 Berman Doyle Johnson, E. B.
 Bishop (NY) Edwards Jones
 Blumenauer Ellison Kaptur
 Boswell Engel Kildee
 Brady (PA) Eshoo Kissell
 Braley (IA) Farr Kucinich
 Brown (FL) Fattah Langevin
 Burgess Filmer Larsen (WA)
 Burton (IN) Foxx Larson (CT)
 Butterfield Frank (MA) Lee (CA)
 Capps Franks (AZ) Levin
 Capuano Fudge Lewis (GA)
 Carnahan Garamendi Lipinski
 Carney Gibson Loeb sack
 Carson (IN) Gonzalez Loggren, Zoe
 Castor (FL) Goodlatte Lowey
 Chu Green, Al Lujan
 Cicilline Green, Gene Lynch
 Clarke (MI) Griffith (VA) Maloney
 Clarke (NY) Grijalva Markey
 Clay Gutierrez Matsui
 Cleaver Hanabusa McCarthy (NY)
 Clyburn Hastings (FL) McCollum
 Cohen Heinrich McDermott
 Connolly (VA) Higgins McGovern
 Conyers Himes McIntyre
 Costello Hinchey McNerney
 Courtney Hirono Meeks
 Crowley Michaud Miller, George
 Cummings Holden Miller, George
 Davis (CA) Holt Moore

Murphy (CT) Nadler
 Napolitano Neal
 Olver Pallone
 Pascrell Pastor (AZ)
 Paul Terry
 Paulsen Payne
 Pelosi Peters
 Pिंगree (ME) Polis
 Price (NC) Quigley
 Rahall Rangel

NOES—251

Adams Gallegly Mica
 Aderholt Gardner Miller (FL)
 Akin Garrett Miller (MI)
 Alexander Gerlach Miller (NC)
 Altmire Gibbs Miller, Gary
 Amash Gingrey (GA) Mulvaney
 Austria Gohmert Murphy (PA)
 Bachus Myrick Gosar
 Barletta Gowdy Noem
 Barrow Granger Nugent
 Bartlett Nunes
 Barton (TX) Graves (GA) Nunnelee
 Bass (NH) Graves (MO) Olson
 Benishek Griffin (AR) Olsson
 Berg Grimm Owens
 Biggert Guinta Palazzo
 Bilbray Guthrie Pearce
 Bilirakis Hall Pence
 Bishop (GA) Harper Perlmutter
 Bishop (UT) Harris Peterson
 Black Hartzler Petri
 Blackburn Hastings (WA) Pitts
 Bonner Hayworth Platts
 Bono Mack Heck Poe (TX)
 Boren Hensarling Pompeo
 Boustany Herger Posey
 Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler Price (GA)
 Brooks Hinojosa Quayle
 Broun (GA) Huelskamp Reed
 Buchanan Huizenga (MI) Rehberg
 Bucshon Hultgren Reichert
 Buerkle Hunter Renacci
 Calvert Hurl Ribble
 Camp Issa Richardson
 Campbell Richmond
 Canseco Jenkins Rigell
 Cantor Johnson (IL) Rivera
 Capito Johnson (OH) Roby
 Cardoza Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)
 Carter Jordan Rogers (AL)
 Cassidy Kelly Rogers (KY)
 Chabot Kind Rogers (MI)
 Chaffetz King (IA) Rohrabacher
 Chandler King (NY) Rokita
 Coble Kingston Rooney
 Cole Kinzinger (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Conaway Kline Roskam
 Cooper Labrador Ross (AR)
 Costa Lamborn Ross (FL)
 Cravaack Lance Royce
 Crawford Landry Runyan
 Crenshaw Lankford Ruppberger
 Critz Latham Ryan (WI)
 Cuellar LaTourette Sanchez, Loretta
 Davis (KY) Latta Scalise
 Denham Lewis (CA) Schilling
 Dent LoBiondo Schmidt
 DesJarlais Long Schock
 Diaz-Balart Lucas Schrader
 Dicks Luetkemeyer Schweikert
 Dold Lummis Scott (SC)
 Dreier Lungren, Daniel Scott, Austin
 E. Mack Scott, David
 Duffy Manzano Sensenbrenner
 Duncan (SC) Manullo Sessions
 Duncan (TN) Marchant Shimkus
 Eilmers Marino Shuler
 Emerson Matheson Shuster
 Farenthold McCarthy (CA) Simpson
 Fincher McCaul Smith (NE)
 Fitzpatrick McClintock Smith (NJ)
 Flake McCotter Smith (TX)
 Fleischmann McHenry Southerland
 Fleming McKeon Stearns
 Flores McKinley Stivers
 Forbes McMorris Sullivan
 Fortenberry Rodgers Terry
 Frelinghuysen Meehan Thompson (PA)

Walsh (IL) Womack
 Walz (MN) Woodall
 Webster Yoder
 West Young (AK)
 Westmoreland Young (FL)
 Wilson (SC) Young (IN)
 Wittman
 Wolf

NOT VOTING—6

Coffman (CO) Giffords Neugebauer
 Culberson Keating Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1400

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 504, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 297, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—131

Adams Gerlach Miller, Gary
 Amash Gibson Mulvaney
 Baldwin Gohmert Napolitano
 Barton (TX) Goodlatte Nugent
 Bass (NH) Gowdy Oliver
 Benishek Graves (GA) Pallone
 Berg Graves (MO) Paul
 Bishop (UT) Green, Gene Payne
 Black Griffith (VA) Pearce
 Blumenauer Hall Peters
 Braley (IA) Heck Petri
 Brooks Herrera Beutler Pिंगree (ME)
 Broun (GA) Higgins Poe (TX)
 Buchanan Holt Posey
 Buerkle Honda Price (GA)
 Burgess Huizenga (MI) Reed
 Campbell Hultgren Rohrabacher
 Capuano Hunter Rokita
 Chaffetz Hurt Rooney
 Clarke (MI) Jackson (IL) Ross (FL)
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (IL) Royce
 Clay Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Loretta
 Cleaver Jones Schilling
 Coble Jordan Schrader
 Cohen Kaptur Sensenbrenner
 Conyers Kucinich Serrano
 Costello Labrador Sessons
 Cummings Landry Slaughter
 DeFazio Lankford Southerland
 DesJarlais LaTourette Stark
 Doggett Lee (CA) Stearns
 Duffy Lewis (CA) Stutzman
 Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Thompson (PA)
 Duncan (TN) Lummis Lynch
 Edwards Tiberi Tierney
 Emerson Marchant Tonko
 Engel Markey Velazquez
 Filner McCaul Walsh (IL)
 Fincher Fincher Waters
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick Welch
 Frank (MA) Michaud West
 Garrett Miller (NC)

Westmoreland
Woodall

Woolsey
Wu

Yoder
Young (AK)

Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt

Waxman
Webster
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner

Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth

Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts

NOES—297

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Gosar
Granger
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson
Giffords
Keating

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

□ 1404

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE
The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 114, noes 314, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

AYES—114

Amash
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Benishke
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr

Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Himes
Hinchev
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone

Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Velazquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

Bishop (PA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm

Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Wilson (SC)
Nugent
Nunes

NOES—314

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander

Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus

Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)

Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm

Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neugebauer
Wilson (SC)
Nugent
Nunes

Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walsh (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack Yoder Young (FL)
Woodall Young (AK) Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson Giffords Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1408

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 210, noes 217, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

AYES—210

Amash Doyle Kaptur
Andrews Duffy Kind
Baca Duncan (SC) Kissell
Baldwin Duncan (TN) Kucinich
Bass (CA) Edwards Labrador
Bass (NH) Ellison Lankford
Becerra Emerson Larsen (WA)
Benishek Engel Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA) Eshoo Lee (CA)
Bishop (NY) Farr Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer Fattah Lipinski
Boswell Filner Loeb sack
Brady (PA) Fitzpatrick Lofgren, Zoe
Bralley (IA) Fortenberry Lujan
Brooks Foxx Lynch
Broun (GA) Frank (MA) Maloney
Brown (FL) Fudge Marchant
Butterfield Garamendi Markey
Campbell Garrett Matsui
Capps Gerlach McCollum
Capuano Gibson McGovern
Cardoza Gohmert McIntyre
Carney Goodlatte Meehan
Castor (FL) Gowdy Michaud
Chaffetz Graves (GA) Miller (MI)
Chu Graves (MO) Miller (NC)
Cicilline Griffith (VA) Miller, George
Clarke (MI) Grijalva Moore
Clarke (NY) Grimm Moran
Clay Gutierrez Mulvaney
Cleaver Hanabusa Murphy (CT)
Clyburn Hanna Murphy (PA)
Coble Hastings (FL) Napolitano
Cohen Heinrich Neal
Connolly (VA) Herrera Beutler Oliver
Conyers Higgins Pallone
Cooper Himes Pascarell
Costa Hinchey Pastor (AZ)
Costello Hirono Paul
Courtney Hochul Payne
Critz Holden Perlmutter
Crowley Holt Peters
Cummings Honda Peterson
Davis (CA) Hoyer Petri
Davis (IL) Huizenga (MI) Pingree (ME)
DeFazio Hurt Poe (TX)
DeGette Inslee Polis
DeLauro Jackson (IL) Posey
DesJarlais Jackson Lee Price (NC)
Deutch (TX) Quigley
Dicks Johnson (IL) Rahall
Doggett Johnson, E. B. Rangel
Dold Jones Reed

Ribble Scott, David Towns
Richardson Sensenbrenner Tsongas
Richmond Serrano Upton
Rigell Sewell Velázquez
Rohrabacher Sherman Visclosky
Rokita Shuler Walden
Rothman (NJ) Sires Walsh (IL)
Royce Slaughter Wasserman
Rush Speier Schultz
Ryan (OH) Stark Waters
Sanchez, Linda Stearns Waxman
T. Stutzman Welch
Sanchez, Loretta Sutton Woodall
Sarbanes Thompson (CA) Woolsey
Schiff Thompson (MS) Wu
Schradler Thompson (PA) Yarmuth
Scott (SC) Tierney Yoder
Scott (VA) Tonko Young (AK)

NOES—217

Ackerman Green, Al Nugent
Adams Green, Gene Nunes
Aderholt Griffin (AR) Nunnelee
Akin Olson Guinta
Alexander Guthrie Owens
Altmire Hall Palazzo
Austria Harper Paulsen
Bachmann Harris Pearce
Bachus Hartzler Pelosi
Barletta Hastings (WA) Pence
Barrow Hayworth Pitts
Bartlett Heck Platts
Barton (TX) Hensarling Pompeo
Berg Herger Price (GA)
Berkley Hinojosa Quayle
Berman Huelskamp Rehberg
Biggert Hultgren Reichert
Bilbray Hunter Renacci
Bilirakis Israel Reyes
Bishop (UT) Issa Rivera
Black Roby
Blackburn Johnson (GA) Roe (TN)
Bonner Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)
Bono Mack Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY)
Boren Jordan Rogers (MI)
Boustany Kelly Rooney
Brady (TX) Kildee Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan King (IA) Roskam
Bucshon King (NY) Ross (AR)
Buerkle Kingston Ross (FL)
Burgess Kinzinger (IL) Roybal-Allard
Burton (IN) Kline Runyan
Calvert Lamborn Ruppertsberger
Canseco Lance Ryan (WI)
Cantor Landry Scalise
Capito Langevin Schakowsky
Carnahan Latham Schilling
Carson (IN) LaTourrette Schmidt
Carter Latta Schock
Cassidy Levin Schwartz
Chabot Lewis (CA) Schweikert
Chandler LoBiondo Scott, Austin
Choffman (CO) Long Sessions
Cole Lowey Shimkus
Conaway Lucas Shuster
Cravaack Luetkemeyer Simpson
Crawford Lummis Smith (NE)
Crenshaw Lungren, Daniel Smith (NJ)
Cuellar E. Smith (TX)
Davis (KY) Mack Smith (WA)
Denham Manzullo Southerland
Denham Marino Stivers
Dent Matheson Sullivan
Diaz-Balart Matheson Terry
Dingell McCarthy (CA) Thornberry
Donnelly (IN) McCarthy (NY) Tiberi
Dreier McCaul Tipton
Eilmers McClintock Turner
Farenthold McCotter
Fincher McDermott Van Hollen
Flake McHenry Walberg
Fleischmann McKeon Walz (MN)
Fleming McKinley Watt
Flores McMorris Webster
Forbes Rodgers West
Franks (AZ) McNeerney Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen Meeks Whitfield
Gallegly Mica Wilson (FL)
Gardner Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
Gibbs Miller, Gary Wittman
Gingrey (GA) Myrick Wolf
Gonzalez Nadler Womack
Gosar Neugebauer Young (FL)
Granger Noem Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Camp Giffords
Culberson Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1411

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from to “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 507 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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 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 145, noes 283, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—145

Amash Garamendi Pastor (AZ)
Baca Garrett Paul
Baldwin Goodlatte Payne
Bass (CA) Gowdy Peters
Bass (NH) Graves (GA) Petri
Becerra Griffith (VA) Pingree (ME)
Benishek Grijalva Poe (TX)
Bishop (NY) Hanabusa Polis
Blumenauer Hastings (FL) Posey
Boswell Herrera Beutler Quigley
Bralley (IA) Higgins Rahall
Brooks Himes Rangel
Broun (GA) Hirono Ribble
Brown (FL) Hochul Richardson
Butterfield Buchanan Holden Rigell
Campbell Campbell Holt Rohrabacher
Capps Honda Rokita
Cardoza Hurt Rothman (NJ)
Carney Chaffetz Inslee Royce
Castor (FL) Chu Jackson (IL) Rush
Chaffetz Cicilline Jackson Lee Ryan (OH)
Chu Clarke (MI) (TX) Sanchez, Linda
Cicilline Clarke (NY) Johnson (IL) T.
Clay Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver Jones Schradler
Coble Kind Schweikert
Conyers Kissell Scott, David
Costa Kucinich Sensenbrenner
Costello Labrador Serrano
Cummings Larsen (WA) Sewell
DeFazio Lee (CA) Shuler
DeGette Lewis (GA) Sires
DesJarlais Loeb sack Slaughter
Deutch Lofgren, Zoe Speier
Doggett Lummis Stark
Doyle Maloney Stearns
Duffy Matsui Stutzman
Duncan (SC) McGovern Thompson (CA)
Duncan (TN) McIntyre Thompson (MS)
Edwards Mica Tonko
Ellison Michaud Towns
Engel Miller (MI) Upton
Eshoo Miller, George Velázquez
Farr Mulvaney Waters
Fattah Murphy (CT) Walsh (IL)
Filner Napolitano Welch
Foxx Neal Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA) Oliver Woodall
Fudge Pallone Woolsey

NOES—283

Ackerman Gosar Nunes
 Adams Granger Nunnelee
 Aderholt Graves (MO) Olson
 Akin Green, Al Owens
 Alexander Green, Gene Palazzo
 Altmire Griffin (AR) Pascrell
 Andrews Grimm Paulsen
 Austria Guinta Pearce
 Bachmann Guthrie Pelosi
 Bachus Gutierrez Pence
 Barletta Hall Perlmutter
 Barrow Hanna Peterson
 Bartlett Harper Pitts
 Barton (TX) Harris Platts
 Berg Hartzler Pompeo
 Berkley Hastings (WA) Price (GA)
 Berman Hayworth Price (NC)
 Biggert Heck Quayle
 Bilbray Heinrich Reed
 Bilirakis Hensarling Rehberg
 Bishop (GA) Herger Reichert
 Bishop (UT) Hinchey Renacci
 Black Hinojosa Reyes
 Blackburn Hoyer Richmond
 Bonner Huelskamp Rivera
 Bono Mack Huizenga (MI) Roby
 Boren Hultgren Roe (TN)
 Boustany Hunter Rogers (AL)
 Brady (PA) Israel Rogers (KY)
 Brady (TX) Issa Rogers (MI)
 Bucshon Jenkins Rooney
 Buerkle Johnson (GA) Ros-Lehtinen
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Roskam
 Burton (IN) Johnson, Sam Ross (AR)
 Butterfield Jordan Ross (FL)
 Calvert Kaptur Roybal-Allard
 Camp Kelly Runyan
 Canseco Kildee Ruppertsberger
 Cantor King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Capito King (NY) Sarbanes
 Capuano Kingston Scalise
 Carnahan Kingzinger (IL) Schakowsky
 Carney Kline Schiff
 Carson (IN) Lamborn Schilling
 Carter Lance Schmidt
 Cassidy Landry Schock
 Castor (FL) Langevin Schwartz
 Chabot Lankford Scott (SC)
 Chandler Larson (CT) Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Latham Scott, Austin
 Coffman (CO) LaTourette Sessions
 Cohen Latta Sherman
 Cole Levin Shimkus
 Conaway Lewis (CA) Shuster
 Connolly (VA) Lipinski Simpson
 Cooper LoBiondo Smith (NE)
 Courtney Long Smith (NJ)
 Cravaack Lowey Smith (TX)
 Crawford Lucas Smith (WA)
 Crenshaw Luetkemeyer Southernland
 Critz Lujan Stivers
 Crowley Lungren, Daniel Sullivan
 Cuellar E. Sutton
 Davis (CA) Lynch Terry
 Davis (IL) Mack Manzullo
 Davis (KY) Manzullo Marchant
 DeLauro Marchant Marino
 Denham Marino Tiberi
 Dent Markey Tierney
 Diaz-Balart Matheson Tipton
 Dicks McCarthy (CA) Tsongas
 Dingell McCarthy (NY) Turner
 Dold McCaul Van Hollen
 Donnelly (IN) McClintock Visclosky
 Dreier McCollum Walberg
 Ellmers McCotter Walden
 Emerson McDermott Walz (MN)
 Farenthold McHenry Wasserman
 Fincher McKeon Schultz
 Fitzpatrick McKinley Watt
 Flake McMorris Waxman
 Fleischmann Rodgers Webster
 Fleming McNeerney West
 Flores Meehan Westmoreland
 Forbes Meeks Whitfield
 Fortenberry Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
 Franks (AZ) Miller (NC) Wittman
 Frelinghuysen Miller, Gary Wolf
 Gallegly Moore Womack
 Gardner Moran Wu
 Gerlach Murphy (PA) Yarmuth
 Gibbs Myrick Yoder
 Gibson Nadler Young (AK)
 Gingrey (GA) Neugebauer Young (FL)
 Gohmert Noem Young (IN)
 Gonzalez Nugent Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson Giffords Keating
 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR
 The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1415

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN
 The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 119, noes 306, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—119

Amash Fudge Paul
 Baca Garamendi Payne
 Baldwin Gibson Peters
 Bass (CA) Gohmert Petri
 Becerra Gowdy Pingree (ME)
 Benishek Graves (GA) Polis
 Bishop (NY) Green, Gene Posey
 Blumenauer Grijalva Quigley
 Boswell Gutierrez Rahall
 Braley (IA) Hastings (FL) Rangel
 Broun (GA) Herrera Beutler Ribble
 Campbell Higgins Richardson
 Capps Himes Rigell
 Capuano Hirono Rohrabacher
 Chaffetz Chou Rokita
 Chu Holt Rush
 Cicilline Honda Ryan (OH)
 Clarke (MI) Inslee Sanchez, Linda
 Clarke (NY) Jackson (IL) T.
 Clay Johnson (IL) Sanchez, Loretta
 Cleaver Johnson, E. B. Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Jones Sensenbrenner
 Coble Kucinich Serrano
 Cohen Lee (CA) Sherman
 Conyers Lewis (GA) Slaughter
 Costello Lofgren, Zoe Speier
 Davis (IL) Maloney Stark
 DeFazio Markey Stearns
 DeLauro Matsui Thompson (CA)
 Deutch McGovern Thompson (MS)
 Doggett Mica Tonko
 Dold Michaud Towns
 Doyle Miller, George Velázquez
 Duncan (SC) Mulvaney Walsh (IL)
 Duncan (TN) Murphy (CT) Waters
 Ellison Nadler Welch
 Eshoo Napolitano Woolsey
 Farr Neal Wu
 Filner Olver Yarmuth
 Frank (MA) Pallone Young (AK)

NOES—306

Ackerman Bass (NH) Brady (PA)
 Adams Berg Brady (TX)
 Aderholt Berkley Brooks
 Akin Biggert Brown (FL)
 Alexander Bilbray Buchanan
 Altmire Bilirakis Buchon
 Andrews Bishop (GA) Buerkle
 Austria Bishop (UT) Burgess
 Bachmann Black Burton (IN)
 Bachus Blackburn Butterfield
 Barletta Bonner Calvert
 Barrow Bono Mack Camp
 Bartlett Boren Canseco
 Barton (TX) Boustany Cantor

Capito Cardoza Hurl
 Carnahan Carnahan Issa
 Carney Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) (TX) Price (TX)
 Carter Jenkins Price (NC)
 Cassidy Johnson (GA) Quayle
 Castor (FL) Johnson (OH) Reed
 Chabot Johnson, Sam Rehberg
 Chandler Jordan Johnson, Sam Reichert
 Coffman (CO) Kaptur Renacci
 Cole Kelly Reyes
 Conaway Kildee Richmond
 Connolly (VA) Kind Rivera
 Cooper King (NY) Roby
 Costa Kingston Rogers (TN)
 Courtney Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (AL)
 Cravaack Kissell Rogers (KY)
 Crawford Kline Rogers (MI)
 Crenshaw Labrador Rooney
 Critz Lamborn Roskam
 Crowley Lance Ross (AR)
 Cuellar Landry Ross (FL)
 Cummings Langevin Rothman (NJ)
 Davis (CA) Lankford Roybal-Allard
 Davis (KY) Larsen (WA) Royce
 DeGette Larson (CT) Runyan
 Denham Latham Ruppertsberger
 Dent LaTourette Ryan (WI)
 DesJarlais Latta Sarbanes
 Diaz-Balart Levin Scalise
 Dicks Lewis (CA) Schakowsky
 Dingell Lipinski Schiff
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo Schilling
 Dreier Loeb sack Schmidt
 Duffy Long Schock
 Edwards Lowey Schrader
 Ellmers Lucas Schwartz
 Emerson Luetkemeyer Schweikert
 Engel Lujan Scott (SC)
 Farenthold Lummis Scott, Austin
 Fattah Lungren, Daniel
 Fincher E. Scott, David
 Fitzpatrick Lynch Sessions
 Flake Mack Sewell
 Fleischmann Manzullo Shimkus
 Fleming Marchant Shuler
 Flores Marino Shuster
 Forbes Matheson Simpson
 Fortenberry McCarthy (CA) Sires
 Foyx McCarthy (NY) Smith (NE)
 Franks (AZ) McCaul Smith (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen McClintock Smith (TX)
 Gallegly McCollum Smith (WA)
 Gardner McCotter Southerland
 Garrett McDermott Stutzman
 Gerlach McHenry Sullivan
 Gibbs McIntyre Sutton
 Gingrey (GA) McKeon Terry
 Gonzalez McKinley Thompson (PA)
 Goodlatte McMorris Thornberry
 Gosar Rodgers Tiberi
 Granger McNeerney Tierney
 Graves (MO) Meehan Tipton
 Green, Al Meeks Tsongas
 Griffith (AR) Miller (FL) Turner
 Griffith (VA) Miller (MI) Upton
 Grimm Miller (NC) Van Hollen
 Guinta Miller, Gary Visclosky
 Guthrie Moore Walberg
 Hall Moran Walden
 Hanabusa Murphy (PA) Walz (MN)
 Hanna Myrick Wasserman
 Harper Neugebauer Schultz
 Harris Noem Watt
 Hartzler Nugent Waxman
 Hastings (WA) Nunes Webster
 Hayworth Olson West
 Heck Owens Westmoreland
 Heinrich Palazzo Whitfield
 Hensarling Pascrell Wilson (FL)
 Herger Reichert Wilson (SC)
 Hinchey Pastor (AZ) Wittman
 Hinojosa Paulsen Wolf
 Holden Pearce Womack
 Hoyer Pelosi Woodall
 Huelskamp Pence Yoder
 Huizenga (MI) Perlmutter Young (FL)
 Hultgren Peterson Young (IN)
 Hunter Pitts

NOT VOTING—6

Berman Giffords King (IA)
 Culberson Keating Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1419

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 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 140, noes 285, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

AYES—140

Adams	Gerlach	Moran
Amash	Gibson	Mulvaney
Baldwin	Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Nugent
Bass (NH)	Goodlatte	Paul
Benishek	Gowdy	Pearce
Berg	Graves (GA)	Petri
Berman	Green, Gene	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Black	Grijalva	Posey
Blumenauer	Hall	Price (GA)
Bralley (IA)	Harris	Renacci
Brooks	Heck	Richmond
Broun (GA)	Heinrich	Rigell
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Higgins	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hochul	Rokita
Campbell	Honda	Rooney
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Royce
Capps	Hultgren	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Hurt	Schilling
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Scott (SC)
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (OH)	Serrano
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Shuster
Coble	Jones	Slaughter
Cohen	Jordan	Southerland
Conyers	Kaptur	Speier
Costa	Kucinich	Stark
Costello	Labrador	Stutzman
Cummings	Landry	Sutton
DeFazio	LaTourette	Thompson (CA)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Thompson (PA)
Deutch	Loeb sack	Tiberi
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Tierney
Duffy	Lummis	Tonko
Duncan (SC)	Lynch	Velázquez
Duncan (TN)	Matsui	Visclosky
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Walsh (IL)
Eshoo	McCaul	Waters
Farenthold	McClintock	Welch
Filner	McKinley	West
Fincher	McNerney	Woodall
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Woodley
Foxx	Michaud	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Wu
Garrett	Miller, George	Young (AK)

NOES—285

Ackerman	Barrow	Bonner
Aderholt	Bartlett	Bono Mack
Akin	Bass (CA)	Boren
Alexander	Becerra	Boswell
Altmire	Berkley	Boustany
Andrews	Biggart	Brady (PA)
Austria	Bilbray	Brady (TX)
Baca	Bilirakis	Brown (FL)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Barletta	Blackburn	Butterfield

Calvert	Holt	Pitts
Camp	Hoyer	Platts
Canseco	Huelskamp	Polis
Cantor	Hunter	Pompeo
Carnahan	Inslee	Price (NC)
Carney	Israel	Quayle
Carson (IN)	Issa	Quigley
Carter	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Cassidy	(TX)	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Jenkins	Reed
Chabot	Johnson (GA)	Rehberg
Chandler	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Chu	Kelly	Reyes
Ciilline	Kildee	Ribble
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Richardson
Cleaver	King (IA)	Rivera
Clyburn	King (NY)	Roby
Coffman (CO)	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kissell	Rogers (MI)
Connolly (VA)	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Lamborn	Roskam
Courtney	Lance	Ross (AR)
Cravaack	Langevin	Ross (FL)
Crawford	Lankford	Rothman (NJ)
Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Critz	Larson (CT)	Runyan
Crowley	Latham	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Latta	Rush
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	T.
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Denham	Long	Scalise
Dent	Lowe	Schakowsky
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Schiff
Dicks	Luetkemeyer	Schmidt
Dingell	Luján	Schock
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Schrader
Donnelly (IN)	E.	Schwartz
Doyle	Mack	Schweikert
Dreier	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Manzullo	Scott, Austin
Ellison	Marchant	Scott, David
Ellmers	Marino	Sessions
Engel	Matheson	Sewell
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Fattah	McCollum	Shimkus
Flake	McCotter	Shuler
Fleischmann	McDermott	Simpson
Fleming	McGovern	Simpson
Flores	McHenry	Sires
Forbes	McIntyre	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Stearns
Fudge	Meehan	Sullivan
Galegally	Meeks	Terry
Garamendi	Miller (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Gibbs	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Gonzalez	Moore	Towns
Gosar	Murphy (CT)	Tsongas
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Graves (MO)	Myrick	Upton
Green, Al	Nadler	Van Hollen
Griffin (AR)	Neal	Walberg
Grimm	Neugebauer	Walden
Guinta	Noem	Walz (MN)
Guthrie	Nunes	Wasserman
Gutierrez	Nunnelee	Schultz
Hanabusa	Olson	Watt
Hanna	Oliver	Waxman
Harper	Owens	Webster
Hartzer	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Whitfield
Hastings (WA)	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Hayworth	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (SC)
Hensarling	Paulsen	Wittman
Herger	Payne	Wolf
Himes	Pelosi	Womack
Hinchee	Pence	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Yoder
Hirono	Peters	Young (FL)
Holden	Peterson	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson	Keating	Smith (NJ)
Giffords	Markey	Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1422

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 226, noes 201, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

AYES—226

Ackerman	Ellmers	Lowey
Altmire	Emerson	Luján
Amash	Eshoo	Lummis
Bachmann	Farr	Mack
Baldwin	Fattah	Maloney
Barrow	Filner	Manzullo
Bass (CA)	Flake	Matsui
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Berg	Fudge	McCollum
Berman	Gallely	McDermott
Biggart	Garamendi	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Gardner	McKeon
Blumenauer	Gibbs	McNerney
Bono Mack	Gibson	Meehan
Boren	Gingrey (GA)	Meeks
Boswell	Goodlatte	Mica
Brady (PA)	Gosar	Michaud
Bralley (IA)	Gowdy	Miller, Gary
Brooks	Graves (GA)	Miller, George
Butterfield	Green, Al	Moran
Campbell	Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney
Cantor	Grijalva	Murphy (CT)
Capuano	Guinta	Nadler
Cardoza	Guthrie	Napolitano
Carnahan	Hanabusa	Neal
Carney	Hanna	Noem
Cassidy	Harper	Oliver
Castor (FL)	Hartzler	Paul
Chabot	Heck	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Heinrich	Payne
Chandler	Herrera Beutler	Pelosi
Chu	Higgins	Peters
Ciilline	Himes	Petri
Clarke (MI)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Clarke (NY)	Hirono	Polis
Clay	Hochul	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Holden	Quayle
Coble	Holt	Rangel
Coffman (CO)	Honda	Reed
Cohen	Hoyer	Renacci
Connolly (VA)	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Conyers	Hurt	Richardson
Cooper	Inslee	Roby
Costa	Israel	Roe (TN)
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Rokita
Critz	Johnson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Cuellar	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Ryoder
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Kind	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Kingston	Sánchez, Linda
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	T.
DesJarlais	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Dicks	Labrador	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lance	Schakowsky
Doggett	Langevin	Schiff
Dold	Larsen (WA)	Schmidt
Donnelly (IN)	Latham	Schrader
Doyle	LaTourette	Schwartz
Duffy	Lee (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Levin	Serrano
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Sessions
Edwards	Loeb sack	Sherman
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (NJ)
	Long	

Smith (WA)	Tonko	Welch
Speier	Tsongas	West
Stark	Van Hollen	Westmoreland
Stearns	Velazquez	Woodall
Sutton	Visclosky	Woolsey
Terry	Walden	Wu
Thompson (PA)	Walsh (IL)	Yarmuth
Tierney	Waters	Young (IN)
Tipton	Waxman	

NOES—201

Adams	Gutierrez	Pitts
Aderholt	Hall	Platts
Akin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Alexander	Hastings (FL)	Pompeo
Andrews	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Austria	Hayworth	Price (GA)
Baca	Hensarling	Rahall
Bachus	Herger	Rehberg
Barletta	Hinchee	Reichert
Bartlett	Huelskamp	Reyes
Barton (TX)	Hultgren	Richmond
Berkley	Hunter	Rigell
Bilbray	Issa	Rivera
Bilirakis	Jackson Lee	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (GA)	(TX)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Black	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Blackburn	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonner	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Boustany	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Brady (TX)	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Broun (GA)	King (IA)	Runyan
Brown (FL)	King (NY)	Rush
Buchanan	Kissell	Ryan (WI)
Buchon	Kline	Scalise
Buerkle	Lamborn	Schilling
Burgess	Landry	Schock
Burton (IN)	Lankford	Schweikert
Calvert	Larson (CT)	Scott (SC)
Camp	Latta	Scott (VA)
Canseco	Lewis (CA)	Scott, Austin
Capito	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Capps	Lipinski	Sewell
Carson (IN)	Lucas	Shimkus
Carter	Luetkemeyer	Shuler
Clyburn	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Cole	E.	Simpson
Conaway	Lynch	Sires
Cravaack	Marchant	Slaughter
Crawford	Marino	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Crowley	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Cummings	McCaul	Stivers
Davis (KY)	McCotter	Stutzman
DeFazio	McHenry	Sullivan
Denham	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	McKinley	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	McMorris	Thornberry
Dreier	Rodgers	Tiberi
Engel	Miller (FL)	Towns
Farenthold	Miller (MI)	Turner
Fincher	Miller (NC)	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Walberg
Fleischmann	Murphy (PA)	Walz (MN)
Fleming	Myrick	Wasserman
Flores	Neugebauer	Schultz
Forbes	Nugent	Watt
Fortenberry	Nunes	Webster
Fox	Nunnelee	Welch
Frelinghuysen	Olson	West
Garrett	Owens	Westmoreland
Gerlach	Palazzo	Whitfield
Gohmert	Pallone	Wilson (SC)
Gonzalez	Pascrell	Wittman
Granger	Pastor (AZ)	Wolf
Graves (MO)	Pearce	Womack
Green, Gene	Pence	Yoder
Griffin (AR)	Perlmutter	Young (AK)
Grimm	Peterson	Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson	Keating
Giffords	Markey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1427

Messrs. MCCARTHY of California and BURGESS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 167, noes 260, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

AYES—167

Ackerman	Filner	Neal
Akin	Fudge	Noem
Alexander	Garamendi	Olver
Baldwin	Gardner	Owens
Barrow	Garrett	Pallone
Bass (CA)	Gingrey (GA)	Pascrell
Becerra	Gonzalez	Paul
Berman	Gosar	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Peters
Bono Mack	Gutierrez	Petri
Braley (IA)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Broun (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Burgess	Higgins	Price (NC)
Camp	Himes	Quigley
Capps	Hinchee	Rangel
Capuano	Hinojosa	Reichert
Cardoza	Hirono	Richmond
Carnahan	Hochul	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Holt	Roybal-Allard
Cassidy	Honda	Royce
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Rush
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Ryan (WI)
Chandler	Israel	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Jackson (IL)	T.
Cicilline	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kingston	Schiff
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schmidt
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Schrader
Cohen	Langevin	Schwartz
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costello	Lee (CA)	Slaughter
Courtney	Levin	Speier
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Crowley	Lowey	Stearns
Cummings	Lujan	Stivers
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Tiberi
DeFazio	Markey	Tierney
DeGette	Matheson	Tonko
DeLauro	Matsui	Towns
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dicks	McCollum	Van Hollen
Dingell	McDermott	Velazquez
Doggett	McGovern	Walden
Doyle	McMorris	Waters
Edwards	Rodgers	Waxman
Ellison	McNerney	Wilson (FL)
Engel	Meeks	Woolsey
Eshoo	Michaud	Wu
Farr	Miller, George	
Fattah	Moran	

NOES—260

Adams	Barton (TX)	Bonner
Aderholt	Bass (NH)	Boren
Altmire	Benishek	Boswell
Amash	Berg	Boustany
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Austria	Biggert	Brady (TX)
Baca	Bilbray	Brooks
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brown (FL)
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Barletta	Black	Buchon
Bartlett	Blackburn	Buerkle

Burton (IN)	Inslee	Rahall
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Reed
Calvert	(TX)	Rehberg
Campbell	Jenkins	Renacci
Canseco	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Ribble
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Richardson
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rigell
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rivera
Chaffetz	Jordan	Roby
Clyburn	Kelly	Roe (TN)
Coble	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Cooper	Kissell	Rohrabacher
Cravaack	Kline	Rokita
Crawford	Labrador	Rooney
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Landry	Roskam
Davis (KY)	Lankford	Ross (AR)
Denham	Latham	Ross (FL)
Dent	LaTourette	Runyan
DesJarlais	Latta	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Dold	Lewis (GA)	Scalise
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Schilling
Dreier	LoBiondo	Schock
Duffy	Loeback	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Long	Scott (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Emerson	Lummis	Serrano
Farenthold	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Fincher	E.	Sewell
Fitzpatrick	Mack	Shimkus
Flake	Manzullo	Shuler
Fleischmann	Marchant	Shuster
Fleming	Marino	Simpson
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Sires
Forbes	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Fox	McCotter	Smith (TX)
Frank (MA)	McHenry	Smith (WA)
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Southerland
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Stutzman
Gallegly	McKinley	Sullivan
Gerlach	Meehan	Terry
Gibbs	Mica	Thompson (CA)
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Goodlatte	Miller (NC)	Thornberry
Gowdy	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Granger	Moore	Turner
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney	Upton
Graves (MO)	Murphy (CT)	Visclosky
Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Griffin (AR)	Myrick	Walsh (IL)
Grimm	Nadler	Walz (MN)
	Napolitano	Wasserman
	Neugebauer	Schultz
	Nugent	Watt
	Nunes	Webster
	Nunnelee	Welch
	Olson	West
	Palazzo	Westmoreland
	Pastor (AZ)	Whitfield
	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)
	Pearce	Wittman
	Pence	Wolf
	Peterson	Womack
	Pitts	Woodall
	Herger	Yarmuth
	Holden	Yoder
	Huelskamp	Young (AK)
	Hultgren	Young (FL)
	Hunter	Young (IN)
	Hurt	

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson	Issa
Giffords	Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1432

Messrs. LOBIONDO and MACK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. SUTTON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

AYES—225

Adams	Gerlach	Michaud
Aderholt	Gibbs	Miller (FL)
Akin	Gibson	Miller (MI)
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
Amash	Gohmert	Moore
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Baldwin	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barton (TX)	Gowdy	Napolitano
Bass (NH)	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer
Becerra	Graves (MO)	Noem
Benishkek	Griffin (AR)	Nugent
Berg	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Bilbray	Grijalva	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Guinta	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Paul
Black	Hall	Paulsen
Bonner	Hanabusa	Pearce
Boustany	Hanna	Peterson
Bralley (IA)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brooks	Heck	Pingree (ME)
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Pitts
Buchanan	Herger	Platts
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Buerkle	Himes	Pompeo
Burton (IN)	Hinchesy	Posey
Calvert	Honda	Price (GA)
Camp	Huelskamp	Reed
Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Rehberg
Capito	Hultgren	Renacci
Capuano	Hurt	Ribble
Carson (IN)	Issa	Richardson
Cassidy	Jackson (IL)	Rigell
Chabot	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Cicilline	Jones	Rohrabacher
Clarke (MI)	Jordan	Rokita
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rooney
Clay	Kingston	Roskam
Cleaver	Kline	Ross (FL)
Coble	Kucinich	Royce
Cole	Labrador	Ryunyan
Conyers	Landry	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Lankford	Sanclise
Cravaack	Latham	Schilling
Crawford	LaTourette	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Latta	Schrader
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Schweikert
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Scott (SC)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Scott, Austin
Denham	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Long	Serrano
Doggett	Lucas	Sessions
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Mack	Southerland
Farenthold	Maloney	Stark
Fincher	Manzullo	Stearns
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Stivers
Flake	Markey	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCaul	Sullivan
Fleming	McClintock	Terry
Flores	McCotter	Thompson (PA)
Foxx	McGovern	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Tierney
Fudge	McMorris	Tipton
Gallely	Rodgers	Turner
Gardner	Meehan	Upton
Garrett	Mica	Van Hollen

Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walters
Webster
Welch

West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Woolsey
Wu
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 513, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 229, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

AYES—199

NOES—201

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Burgess
Butterfield
Canseco
Cantor
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Elmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson
Giffords

Keating
McHenry

Nunes
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
King
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meeke
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal

Scott, David

Adams	Gonzalez	Nadler
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Napolitano
Akin	Gosar	Neugebauer
Alexander	Gowdy	Noem
Amash	Graves (GA)	Nugent
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Griffin (AR)	Paul
Bass (NH)	Grijalva	Paulsen
Becerra	Guinta	Payne
Benishkek	Gutierrez	Pearce
Berg	Hall	Peterson
Bilbray	Hanabusa	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hanna	Pingree (ME)
Boustany	Harris	Pitts
Bralley (IA)	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Brooks	Hastings (FL)	Pompeo
Broun (GA)	Heck	Posey
Buchanan	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Quigley
Buerkle	Himes	Rangel
Burgess	Hinchesy	Reed
Burton (IN)	Honda	Renacci
Campbell	Huelskamp	Ribble
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Richardson
Capuano	Hultgren	Rigell
Carson (IN)	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Cicilline	Jones	Rooney
Clarke (MI)	Jordan	Roskam
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Royce
Clay	Kingston	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kline	Schilling
Coble	Kucinich	Schmidt
Cole	Labrador	Schwartz
Conyers	Landry	Schweikert
Cooper	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cravaack	Latham	Scott (VA)
Crawford	LaTourette	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Denham	LoBiondo	Simpson
DesJarlais	Long	Slaughter
Duffy	Lujan	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Speier
Edwards	Mack	Stearns
Eshoo	Maloney	Stutzman
Farenthold	Manzullo	Terry
Farr	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Fincher	Markey	Tierney
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Tipton
Flake	McClintock	Towns
Fleming	McGovern	Tsongas
Flores	McHenry	Upton
Foxx	McIntyre	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	McMorris	Visclosky
Fudge	Rodgers	Walberg
Gardner	Michaud	Walsh (IL)
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Walters
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	West
Gibson	Miller, George	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Moore	
Gohmert	Mulvaney	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1439

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Wilson (SC) Woodall
Wolf Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—229

Ackerman	Gallegly	Olver
Altmire	Garamendi	Owens
Andrews	Gerlach	Palazzo
Austria	Granger	Pallone
Baca	Green, Al	Pascrell
Bachus	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Barrow	Grimm	Perlmutter
Bartlett	Guthrie	Peters
Barton (TX)	Harper	Platts
Bass (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Polis
Berkley	Hayworth	Price (NC)
Berman	Heinrich	Quayle
Biggert	Herger	Rahall
Billrakis	Higgins	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Rehberg
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Reichert
Black	Hochul	Reyes
Blackburn	Holden	Richmond
Blumenauer	Holt	Rivera
Bonner	Hoyer	Roby
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Boren	Inslie	Rogers (KY)
Boswell	Israel	Rogers (MI)
Brady (PA)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Jackson Lee	Ross (AR)
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Jenkins	Roybal-Allard
Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Runyan
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ruppersberger
Canseco	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Cardoza	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Kind	T.
Carney	King (IA)	Sarbanes
Carter	King (NY)	Scalise
Castor (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schakowsky
Chabot	Kissell	Schiff
Chandler	Kline	Schock
Chu	Lamborn	Schrader
Clyburn	Lance	Schwartz
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Conaway	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	LaTourette	Shimkus
Cooper	Levin	Shuler
Costa	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Courtney	Lipinski	Sires
Cravaack	Loeb sack	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Lowe y	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Smith (WA)
Critz	Luetkemeyer	Stark
Crowley	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Cuellar	E.	Sullivan
Davis (CA)	Marino	Sutton
DeGette	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Tonko
Dicks	McCotter	Turner
Dingell	McDermott	Van Hollen
Doggett	McKeon	Walden
Dold	McKinley	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	McNerney	Wasserman
Doyle	Meehan	Schultz
Dreier	Meeks	Watt
Ellison	Mica	Waxman
Ellmers	Miller (NC)	Webster
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Welch
Engel	Moran	Whitfield
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Fleischmann	Myrick	Womack
Forbes	Neal	Yarmuth
Fortenberry	Nunes	Yoder
Franks (AZ)	Nunnelee	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Olson	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Culberson Giffords Keating

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1446

Mr. WESTMORELAND 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. RIGELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector.

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Chairman, each Member of this body has the duty to protect the separation of powers that was so wisely woven into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers and which forms the very foundation of how we govern this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, an egregious ongoing breach of the separation of powers is taking place at this very hour; specifically, the usurpation of a power given only to Congress, that found in article I, section 8 of the Constitution: only Congress can declare war.

Known initially as Operation Odyssey Dawn and now as Operation Unified Protector, military intervention easily rising to the definition of war is being carried out in Libya. It is being carried out with the bravery, exceptional professionalism and commitment to victory that define our fellow Americans who serve in our Armed Forces. And before I address the mission itself, I first applaud their willingness to sacrifice so much for their fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, a careful review of the President's case for support of his actions in Libya leads me to this sobering but firm conclusion. The President's use of force in Libya is unwise and it is unconstitutional. The level of military resources being employed both in personnel and equipment, the amount of ordnance delivered, and the damage inflicted constitute acts of war. At the very minimum, they meet the definition of “hostilities” under the War Powers Resolution. Yet not one of the three criteria delineated in the War Powers Resolution that would justify his action has been met.

There has been no declaration of war. There has been no statutory authority issued. There has been no evidence that an attack on American forces was imminent or had occurred.

Now if a Tomahawk missile was launched into any American city, whether Los Angeles, Chicago, or even my home city of Virginia Beach, would that not meet our definition of hostilities? Absolutely, it would.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the pivotal issue: The military force being directed toward Libya easily triggers the definition of hostilities. The legal opinion upon which the administration stakes the legitimacy of its actions in Libya is thinner than the paper on which it is written. It is not based on

law but something that he refers to as the “national interest,” a term that the President, in his wisdom, believes he can solely define himself. His Office of Legal Counsel concluded that: “President Obama could rely on his constitutional power to safeguard the national interest by directing the anticipated military operations in Libya which were limited in their nature, scope, and duration”—listen carefully here—“without prior congressional authorization.”

□ 1450

Disregarding the legal opinions of the Pentagon's general counsel and the acting head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, both of whom told the White House they believed that the military's operations in Libya amounted to “hostilities,” the President plowed ahead.

Mr. Chairman, a President's opinion of the War Powers Resolution does not negate its authority.

Though required by law, there was no check; there was no balance. Even the broadest interpretation of article I, section 8 cannot corral the interpretation held by the President of his unilateral right to engage U.S. forces in combat. It is irreconcilable with our Constitution. The President has taken America into a war in the midst of a financial crisis, in yet another Muslim nation, in pursuit of a military objective that is ambiguous and constantly morphing.

Though I disagree with the President's actions in Libya, I stand here today not motivated by partisanship. Now, if I woke up tomorrow morning and learned that the President had taken action to defend this great country from imminent danger and attack, I would be the first to stand next to him and affirm his action. If America should go to war, it must be done so in a very careful, deliberative manner and as a last measure.

It must be done so in a way that is fully consistent with our Constitution. That is not the case here.

My amendment is necessary because only by using the power of the purse can we end an unwise war and meet our duty, our high duty, to preserve the separation of powers. Now is the time to act.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. On March 19, 2011, coalition forces launched Operation Odyssey Dawn to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 to protect the Libyan people from the brutal regime of Muammar al Qadhafi. Operation Odyssey Dawn ended on March 31, 2011, and transitioned to the NATO-led Operation Unified Protector, which continues today.

Operation Odyssey Dawn has ceased operations; therefore part of this amendment is no longer relevant. However, the NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and to protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed resolutions adopted in the United Nations Security Council, authorizing “all necessary measures.”

This amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with NATO allies from whom we will undoubtedly require support in the future and who have been our partners since 1949. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can defeat Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for “Operation and Maintenance—Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites” is hereby reduced and increased by \$1,000,000.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, more than 25 years ago, the Congress charged the Defense Department to identify and then to clean up and remediate properties which the department had owned or leased in order to test chemical munitions. Congress did so because these munitions had left hazardous substances related to the work of the department. There are more than 2,000 such sites in nearly every State, all the Territories and in the District of Columbia.

My concern is with those sites in congested residential parts of our country where there may be dense populations located by formerly used defense sites. A classic case and perhaps the most important—but I’m sure not the only one—was the World War I chemical weapons site for the United States of America. It happened to have been right here in Northwest Washington, DC, in a portion of what is now American University and its surrounding neighborhood known as Spring Valley.

The Army is making good on its duty to clean up these formerly used defense sites (FUDS), including the site in the District of Columbia, but we have no information on the health effects of these leftover chemical munitions. They have been found in people’s back and front yards. They have been found, at least here, in people’s gardens. Entire houses and garages, as it turns out, unknowingly were built on this debris. The site here in the District of Columbia was found by accident by a utility contractor digging into a trench. The neighborhood had no knowledge. The city had no knowledge of these leftover munitions. Again, I stress that there are surely other sites around the United States, and I cite this case as an example.

This land, in the District of Columbia at least, was used for the research and development and testing of chemical explosives, and it was able to be done in this city because there wasn’t any local government, and there wasn’t any home rule. I guess, since the city was administered by the Federal Government, they could simply make a munitions testing site in this city. Hundreds of pounds of chemical agents and explosives were developed and released throughout the environment. We have found in the Spring Valley section of the city arsine projectiles, mustard gas projectiles, lewisite projectiles, and other kinds of chemical toxic waste left over from undetonated ordnances.

When World War I was over, the Army simply used the site where they’d been doing the testing as a dumpsite. They buried these munitions right where they were testing. Now, that was the way in which you disposed of these munitions at the time. In the Spring Valley area that is a classic case, there are 1,200 private homes, 30 Embassies and foreign properties, Sibley Hospital, Wesley Seminary. There may be other metropolitan areas that have formerly used defense sites as well. Spring Valley may be the prime target because it is such a well-established neighborhood where chemical agents and munitions were once used.

□ 1500

The amendment requires the Secretary to allocate \$1 million to study the human health effects of left-over munitions in congested residential areas. Just as the Department of Defense and the Army have acknowledged their obligation to clean up and remove

hazardous substances, especially munitions that have been left behind through their testing, they also have the obligation to investigate whether there are any remaining health effects. That is all we are asking; that there be a study as to whether there are any remaining health effects at this former munitions site from World War I and other sites like it in congested residential areas.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to acknowledge the gentleman’s hard work to clean up this part of the District of Columbia.

Our bill provides \$276.5 million in the Environment Restoration Account, formerly the Used Defense Site Account. The Department has the authority to provide funding to those projects that it deems of the highest priority and that pose the greatest risk to environmental and human health.

If the Department believes that funding such a study as the gentleman from the District of Columbia suggests is important, the Department has the ability to do so. For these reasons, we do oppose the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I also appreciate the gentleman’s amendment, and I will work with you on seeing if we can talk to the military to use environmental restoration funds if your amendment doesn’t succeed.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, to engage in a colloquy on the need for traumatic brain injury funding for post-acute guidelines for our returning troops.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that medical treatment guidelines for post-acute rehabilitation of moderate and severe TBI do not exist today. Recognizing this, Mr. PLATTS from Pennsylvania and Ms. GIFFORDS from Arizona included an amendment in the National Defense Authorization for fiscal year 2012 that would require the Department of Defense to implement post-acute treatment guidelines for traumatic brain injury. This provision was supported by

the cochairs of the Brain Injury Task Force—myself, Mr. PLATTS, bipartisan. It is my hope that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences be able to begin the project as soon as possible. Over the years, the TBI Task Force has addressed many gaps for our servicemembers.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As cochair of the Traumatic Brain Injury Task Force, I am honored to join with the gentleman from New Jersey in support of implementing post-acute treatment guidelines.

Before 2007, there were no funds in the budget for traumatic brain injury treatments, but with the dedicated efforts of Chairman YOUNG and other members of the Appropriations Committee, through their efforts we were not only able to provide funding, but more importantly, to sustain a significant level of funding over the past number of years.

As we continue to address new gaps for our servicemembers suffering TBIs, in this 2012 authorization bill that was passed in the committee and moving forward through the process we requested \$1 million to fund these post-acute guidelines that the gentleman from New Jersey has referenced. It is our understanding that while TBI funding in the Defense appropriations bill is not separated by purpose, it is our understanding that the Department uses the overall funding for traumatic brain injury research for authorized purposes.

Is our understanding correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman is correct. In this bill, the committee has provided an additional \$125 million for TBI research. It's above the fully funded budget request of \$415 million. And it has been our long-standing policy that this increased funding is provided at the discretion of the Department. Historically, this subcommittee has provided increased funding for TBI research but refrained from directing how that money should be spent, allowing the Department to prioritize how best to use that funding for authorized purposes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, may I also clarify that should the authorization bill pass with this provision on post-acute guidelines that the Department then has the needed amount of \$1 million to really accomplish this objective which we have.

Mr. Chairman, I would request, as usual, your deepest cooperation. And no one has done more for our troops than you.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that he is correct; should the provision be carried on the final authorization bill, then the Department would have sufficient resources to fund the provisions should they decide to based on this appropriations bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to my brother, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to add my words of great thanks to Chairman YOUNG, who has been a great leader in doing right by our men and women in uniform in all fashion, and especially those who have suffered traumatic brain injury. As a Nation, we are indebted to you and your staff for your great leadership.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7 of title 1, United States Code (the Defense of Marriage Act).

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, what sets the United States apart from many other countries that have lots of resources are our values, and that we are a Nation of laws. We may not agree with all of our laws, but they are the laws of our land, and not even the President can decide which laws to enforce and which not to enforce. Yet this administration has said it will not enforce the Defense of Marriage Act.

The Department of Defense maintains that the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell does not directly challenge the Defense of Marriage Act, which protects the right of individual States to define marriage as the union between a man and a woman. In February, 2011, Attorney General Eric Holder announced that the Department of Justice would no longer defend the Defense of Marriage Act in Federal court. However, the House of Representatives has expressed its intent to continue legal defense of the statute along with other laws of our country.

My proposed amendment would reaffirm Congress' assertion that funds may not be used in contravention of section 7 of title I, United States Code, the Defense of Marriage Act. The Department of the Navy has already demonstrated how pressures to accommodate same-sex couples can quickly lead to policy changes that are ultimately contrary to previous assurances given

with regard to the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell and in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act.

On April 13, 2011, the Office of the Chief of Navy Chaplains, in a memo titled "Revision of Chaplain Corps Tier 1 Training," directed that training be revised to accommodate same-sex marriages on military bases that are located in States where same-sex marriage is legal. The memo stated, "This is a change to previous training that stated same-sex marriages are not authorized on Federal property." The memo further authorized the participation of a military chaplain in a same-sex civil marriage "if it is conducted in accordance with the laws of a State which permits same-sex marriages or unions," and if the chaplain is otherwise certified to officiate. This calls into question the intent of the Department of Defense with regard to compliance with existing Federal law under the Defense of Marriage Act.

Congress should establish policy guidance on this issue that will cover numerous contingencies and unexpected situations in the future. It is irresponsible for the Department of Defense to dismiss all concerns about issues involving marriage status by pointing to the existence of the Defense of Marriage Act.

□ 1510

There's no contingency plan to address this issue should the Federal courts invalidate the Defense of Marriage Act. In fact, the administration is inviting that very policy. Federal court orders could suddenly overturn current policies of the Department of Defense, which is not likely to resist or oppose new directives that disregard the intent of the Defense of Marriage Act. Congress can and should enact a policy making it clear that Defense Department funds should not be used in ways that violate Federal laws, including the Defense of Marriage Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Issues such as the Defense of Marriage Act represent policy questions that are not suited to appropriation bills. Indeed, this amendment does not address any specific program funding matter addressed in the bill now before the House.

To the extent that this amendment has any connection to the Department of Defense, I believe that such a policy issue is appropriately addressed within the domain of the House Armed Services Committee. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I won't be redundant. I'll just follow up on what my colleague Representative FOXX said in proposing this amendment for the two of us.

This is merely a move to make sure that legislation that has already passed, the Defense of Marriage Act and in the authorization bill dealing with the Department of Defense, coincides with the appropriation bill that we're talking about today.

There's been some confusion in the Department of Defense, in the facilities at these military bases, that there could be marriages between two men or two women. The Defense of Marriage Act and the authorization bill clearly state that that cannot happen and will not happen because it would be a violation of the Defense of Marriage Act which has passed this body.

And even though the administration has chosen not to be involved in this issue, I believe it's incumbent on the Congress to make this issue very clear so that we don't have confusion on these military bases when we talk about same sex marriages.

I think it is imperative that we make absolutely clear in both the appropriation bill and the authorization bill, as well as the Defense of Marriage Act, what the law is, what it's intended to do, so that it's very clear to the military so they don't have any difficulty in making decisions on this particular issue.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague, Representative VIRGINIA FOXX for introducing this amendment on behalf of the both of us.

She and her staff, especially Javier Sanchez, have thoroughly examined the confusing messages and conflicting protocols within the Department of Defense related to the implementation of the Defense of Marriage Act.

Why is this Amendment Needed?

(1) This amendment reinforces language that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 that passed the House on May 26, 2011.

Section 534 of the FY 2012 National Defense Authorization Act reaffirms the policy of the Defense of Marriage Act by stating that the word "marriage" included in any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the Department of Defense (DoD) applicable to a service member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense shall mean only a legal union between one man and one woman.

And, Section 535 establishes that marriages performed on DoD installations or marriages involving the participation of DoD military or civilian personnel in an official capacity, to include chaplains, must comply with the Defense of Marriage Act.

This amendment does not impose a new restriction on the Department of Defense.

It is a straightforward in its purpose and text. It simply aligns the Department of Defense appropriations bill we are considering today with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 that passed the House May 26, 2011.

The amendment ensures that defense dollars are not used to implement policy changes that violate the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA).

I believe that appropriations and authorization bills should be compatible, where possible, and by adopting the Foxx-Burton amendment, we will do just that for the Defense of Marriage Act.

This is the only opportunity we have to synchronize DoD funding to the DOMA policy provisions contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

(2) The amendment settles—once and for all—any confusion and/or misinformation within the DoD about the abilities of its personnel to perform same-sex marriages as well as the use of its facilities.

It is important that we pass this amendment, which is a straightforward statement reaffirming Congress' assertion that funds may not be used in contravention of section 7 of title 1, United States Code (Defense of Marriage Act).

The law ensures the States would not have to recognize same-sex marriages from other States, and that the Federal Government would recognize only the union of one man and one woman as marriage.

Offering up Federal facilities and Federal employees for the use in same-sex marriages violates DOMA, which is still the law of the land and binds our military.

(3) President Obama's Administration is on record that it will no longer defend DOMA thus leaving it up to Congress to defend against challenges to DOMA.

I am confident that activist lawyers and judges will begin challenging inconsistencies in marriage status for military personnel. For example, a same-sex couple who was married in a State where same-sex marriage is recognized sues because they are denied military family housing. The resolution of this kind of litigation would propel the courts into policy matters that Congress should decide.

Bottom line.

This amendment—in conjunction with the Sections 534 and 535 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012—will allow Congress to speak with one voice on the Defense of Marriage Act.

If Congress fails to speak clearly on this issue, we are certain to see more conflicting and confusing DOMA protocols emerging in the Department of Defense. And, it will be with the blessing of the White House.

Let's keep our Department of Defense focused on the missions at hand.

Congress can and should make it clear that Defense Department funds should not be used in ways that violate Federal laws, including the Defense of Marriage Act.

Support the Foxx-Burton Amendment. Let's leave the guesswork out of it.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, last year, Congress voted to repeal the counterproductive and unjust policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

But despite overwhelming evidence that repeal will strengthen our military, despite strong support for repeal among our troops and the American people, despite support for repeal from military leaders like the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and despite a Federal court order that the Government stop enforcing DADT immediately, Republicans are still pushing to keep this shameful policy in place.

Under DADT, 13,500 gay men and women were discharged simply because of who they were. These were troops who had served our country honorably and bravely; 1,000 of them filled what the military calls "critical occupations," such as engineering and interpretation of languages like Arabic and Farsi.

Our closest allies—countries like Britain, Canada, and Israel—know better than to throw that kind of service and expertise away.

Yet the amendment offered by Mr. HUELSKAMP would force our military to stop training its Chaplain Corps to prepare for the repeal of DADT. This amendment would substitute Congress's micromanagement for the judgment of our military leaders on training issues, and it is a transparent attempt to interfere with the repeal of DADT in any way possible.

The amendment offered by Ms. Foxx is in a similar vein. It would prohibit defense appropriations in contravention of the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA.

DOMA is discriminatory and should be ruled unconstitutional—but as long as it is law, it clearly applies to all Federal agencies, including the Defense Department.

That makes this amendment entirely unnecessary. Let's see it for what it is: Republicans' effort to change the subject from open service—an argument they've lost—to marriage equality—an argument they're still in the process of losing.

I urge my colleagues to oppose both amendments which put partisan belief in the exclusion of gays above the strength of our military.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. I rise to engage Mr. DICKS in a colloquy regarding an important area of funding for the Department of Defense.

For more than a decade, the Department of Defense has funded programs to support established university programs that promote region-wide informal conferences and task forces on arms control, regional security, and related topics to the Middle East for Arab, Israeli, and other officials and experts.

These programs serve an important national security objective—fostering an alternative means of dialogue and engagement in an area of unparalleled significance to the United States. I know of one such program in Los Angeles, and I urge the Department to continue funding such programs.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member, for his thoughts on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. First of all, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

And I thank you, Mr. BERMAN, for your comments and agree that such programs that support university programs promoting Middle East conferences and task forces on arms control, regional security, and other issues

for Arab, Israeli, and other officials are important and beneficial. I hope the Department of Defense funds such programs accordingly, and I will work with the gentleman to ensure that that happens.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code (popularly known as the "Berry Amendment").

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlemen from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. I rise today to offer an amendment with Mr. KISSELL to ensure that no funds in this bill are spent in violation of the Berry Amendment.

The Berry Amendment requires DOD to procure certain categories of products from American manufacturers including food, clothing, fabrics, stainless steel, and certain tools. It was enacted to ensure that the United States troops wore military uniforms made in the U.S.A. and to ensure that U.S. troops were fed American-made food.

The Berry Amendment has been on the books for 70 years. Yet, in recent years, some in Congress have tried to weaken it. At a time of 9 percent unemployment and when employment in the U.S. manufacturing sector is on the decline, it is more important than ever for Congress to reiterate its support for existing law that promotes domestic procurement.

I urge my colleagues to support American manufacturing and to promote American food and uniforms for our troops by voting for the Michaud-Kissell Amendment.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

Mr. KISSELL. I would like to thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, for 70 years, as my colleague pointed out, the Berry Amendment has served this Nation well. It has given our fine military forces the best of American-made equipment and has guaranteed the American people the opportunity to make that equipment. It is a matter of national security. And it should not be a matter, as the intent of Congress has been clear for 70 years, it shouldn't be a matter of us standing up to reaffirm this amendment.

But as my colleague said, there have been efforts made to weaken the Berry Amendment, to get around the Berry Amendment, and we simply want to remind all folks involved that the Berry Amendment is the intent of Congress. It has been the law for 70 years. And we

need to continue with the Berry Amendment that any funds that are being spent should be spent in total compliance with the Berry Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to advise him that we're prepared to accept this amendment.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank the chairman very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KISSELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any United States commercial air carrier if that contract, memorandum of understanding, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee allows the air carrier to charge baggage fees to any member of the Armed Forces who is traveling on official military orders and is being deployed overseas or is returning from an overseas deployment.

□ 1520

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

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple, to-the-point amendment.

We have heard recently about members of our armed services traveling on official military business being charged excess baggage fees by our commercial airlines here in the United States. This amendment would not make any funds available for entering into any contracts, memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, loans or loan guarantees with any United States commercial airlines where those contracts, memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, loans or loan guarantees would allow for excess baggage fees for any member of the armed services traveling on official military business.

Our folks, when they're traveling and protecting our Nation, shouldn't have to worry about this, and we as a Nation shouldn't have to pay extra fees beyond the millions upon millions of dollars that we already pay to these airlines. This just should be business as usual, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Our troops and their families are being asked to make sacrifice after sacrifice after sacrifice. We should be at a point of trying to make things better for them, make things easier for them; and I would say that one of the things that we can do is to adopt the gentleman's amendment to at least give them some relief when they're coming back from the war that we sent them to without charging them extra money to get back home with their belongings.

I applaud the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I rise in strong support.

Mr. DICKS. Will the chairman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I, too, agree with the chairman. This is one of those situations where I think we have to step in and take action for our troops. This is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a corporation or other business entity that does not disclose its political expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

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

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the third time this year to call for transparency and disclosure in our system and throughout our government. This appropriations bill will spend hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars next year; and a huge portion of it, a portion that's impossible to quantify, will go to contractors. Some are small, others rank among the world's largest companies. As we meet today, the workforce of contractors in Afghanistan is the same size as the workforce of the uniformed personnel there; and since 2005, we've spent approximately \$12 billion on contractors in Afghanistan. Today, there are more private contractors than uniformed personnel in Iraq, and we've spent \$112 billion on contractors in Iraq since 2005.

The Federal Government does business with thousands of contractors who receive billions of dollars in taxpayer

money. They should be required to disclose their political spending, and that's what my amendment will accomplish.

In 2002 when we voted to pass the historic McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill, most Republicans voted "no," saying we needed disclosure, not soft money restrictions. They said we needed to put spending out in the open and let the voters assess it. Today, when the President proposes requiring contractors to simply disclose their spending, not to limit it, Republicans are up in arms. They say it will politicize the contracting process; but when contractors can spend money in elections, the contracting process is already politicized.

My amendment is modest and it's simple: It will bring this information out into the open and let the public decide for themselves. The public deserves to know what happens with their tax money.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a revolutionary idea. For the last 17 years, the SEC requires bond dealers to limit their campaign contributions to the officials in the cities that issue bonds. It requires them to disclose their contributions, providing the public with transparency. The rule was challenged and upheld in court, and my amendment really adheres to the same principle. To quote Senator MITCH MCCONNELL from 2003: "Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?"

I agree with Senator MCCONNELL. With public dollars come public responsibilities. Disclosure would fulfill this responsibility. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." This amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to speak on the point of order? Seeing none, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of whether certain political contributions were disclosed. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$17,192,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available by title IX.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

By way of brief summary, this amendment would freeze the base Department of Defense funding at 2011 levels. It is roughly a \$17 billion reduction, or a 3 percent reduction over the bill that's currently before us. Again, it takes it back to the 2011 levels that we passed just recently in H.R. 1 during the continuing resolution debate.

This is not, Mr. Chairman, a new idea. It's not even my idea. The Domenici-Rivlin bipartisan deficit reduction plan also proposed exactly this—freezing base defense spending at 2011 levels.

□ 1530

During the budget debate, the one substantive bipartisan amendment that passed was an amendment that was a sense of the Committee that said that defense spending needed to be on the table as we look at spending reductions for 2012. And most importantly, the President's fiscal commission, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, also recommended exactly what this amendment does today, keeping defense spending at 2011 levels.

I happen to believe that at least, especially in this area, the Simpson-Bowles Commission is correct. And I want to read from the commission's report: "Every aspect of the discretionary budget must be scrutinized. No agency can be off limits, and no program that spends too much or achieves too little can be spared. Any serious attempt," and I will say that again, "any serious attempt to reduce the deficit will require deliberate, planned reductions in both domestic and defense spending."

Personally, I like to think that I am serious about cutting our deficits. I hope that I am not alone. Many of us have gone around back home and told people how serious we are. But how can we look them in the eye and tell them that we are serious about cutting this deficit and about cutting spending and then come in and plus-up the base defense budget?

Admiral Mullen himself said that with the increasing defense budget, which is almost double over the last 10 years, it has not forced us, that's the Defense Department, to make the hard trades. It hasn't forced us to prioritize. It hasn't forced us to do the analysis.

We just received a Budget Committee memo today that said of the 92 major defense acquisition programs, 69 percent of them are over-budget. One in every five of them is over-budget by at least 50 percent. That is simply not right. It's not what our families are having to do. It's not what our States

are having to do. It's not even what we have chosen to do in other areas of the budget. We have made hard decisions. We have made hard choices. The Defense Department needs to do exactly the same.

This amendment will not in any way limit our national defense capabilities. It will not put a single soldier at more risk. It simply holds defense spending exactly where we were 3 months ago when we approved the CR.

Having been here about 6 months, there is one thing that I have learned being a freshman. And for the folks who are here for the first time, the message is this: talk is cheap. Talk is especially cheap. It's very easy for us to go home and tell folks how important it is to cut spending, how serious we are about cutting spending. But nothing sends the message that we are really serious about it like cutting spending on something that is important to us. It's easy to cut things that we don't like. It is hard to cut things that are important to us. And defense spending is critically important to me and to the folks of this Nation and to the folks of South Carolina.

But if we're going to send a message that we are really serious about cutting spending, then everything needs to be on the table. And holding defense spending simply at 2011 levels and passing this amendment would help show everybody that we are really serious about fixing this difficulty.

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

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

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

Mr. DICKS. This amendment follows the Lee amendment and the Garamendi amendment in cutting about \$17.1 billion from the Overseas Contingency Operation Fund. I myself feel that we could be reducing our troop levels faster, but I don't think we should take the money out at this point until we have a better understanding of the pace of the withdrawal.

Now, we know the President's plan is 10,000 this year and another 23,000 next year. And so there will be some savings in the overseas contingency account as those troops come home. But I think it's too early to make a decision on that. Better left to do it in conference, where we can make a reasoned judgment and talk to the Pentagon and the Congressional Research Service so that we have a better idea of how much savings this will be. I feel that this is premature at this point. The other two amendments were soundly defeated, and I think the same fate will be here.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Just for clarification, the amendment only makes the change to the base spending. It does not change anything in title 9. It does not change overseas contingencies in any way. It is simply the base portion

of the DOD budget. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. DICKS. That's even worse. I would doubly oppose the gentleman's amendment on that part of it. So let's defeat this amendment, as we defeated the others.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I rise in opposition to this amendment. I am one of the original budget cutters in this Congress. But I will not cut a defense budget to the point that it adversely affects our troops or adversely affects our country's readiness. And we could be getting close to that.

This year, Secretary Gates made his recommendation, which resulted in the President's budget request being \$13 billion less than we had anticipated for national defense. In addition to that, this committee recommended, and this Congress will pass sometime today or tomorrow, a bill that is \$9 billion less than the President requested. So we have cut and saved money everywhere we could without affecting readiness and without having an adverse effect on our troops.

If we start cutting too deep—and we were careful with this \$9 billion reduction, very careful—we don't want to see that we have to cancel training for returning troops. We don't want to have to cancel Navy training exercises. We don't want to have to slow down or reduce Air Force flight training. We don't want to delay or cancel maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles. We don't want to delay important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and to military barracks. If we do those things, we are affecting our readiness. Training relates to readiness.

Training is a large part of the money in the base bill, not the overseas contingency operations account, but the base bill, which is what this amendment reduces. This amendment could be getting us very close to a dangerous situation where troops and readiness are affected. And there is just no way that I can even appear to support this amendment. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. BASS OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1590 or 1591 of title 18, United States Code, or in contravention of the requirements of section 106(g) or (h) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104(g) or (h)).

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is simple. It prohibits the Defense Department from being used to engage in or facilitate human trafficking. Thousands of private contracting defense firms, including some of the industry's biggest names, such as DynCorp International and Halliburton subsidiary KBR, have been linked to trafficking-related incidents. Thousands of nationals from impoverished countries are lured by the promise of good jobs, but sometimes end up victims of scams that leave them virtual slaves, with no way to return home or seek legal recourse.

Despite this, allegations against Federal contractors engaged in illegal labor practices ranging from contract-worker smuggling to human trafficking in Iraq and Afghanistan continue to surface in the media.

A recent New Yorker article illustrates the urgent need for this amendment. The article tells the story of two women from Fiji who thought they were going to lucrative jobs in Dubai, but ended up, quoting the article, unwitting recruits for the Pentagon's invisible army of more than 70,000 cooks, cleaners, construction workers, beauticians, et cetera, from the world's poorest countries who service U.S. military contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These two women were asked to deliver resumes, hand over passports, submit to medical tests, and they had to pay \$500 to a recruiting firm. They were lured to Iraq under false pretenses and then told they would be making \$700 a month. That was after they believed they were going to be making \$3,800 a month, 10 times the normal salary in their home country.

□ 1540

What they didn't realize was that they were contracted to work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. They were also victims of sexual harassment and assault.

After complaining, they were sent off base for making trouble and held for a month while their passports and ID badges were confiscated by the subcontracting company. The company that hired them was initially reprimanded but still operates in Fiji and still has a contract with the U.S. military.

Meanwhile, allegations against Federal contractors engaged in commer-

cial sex and labor exploitation continue.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I rise in strong support of this amendment, which will prevent U.S. taxpayer dollars from being used to facilitate human trafficking and labor abuses on U.S. military bases.

As cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Human Trafficking, I am particularly concerned that workers from South Asia and Africa are being trafficked to work on U.S. military bases and that U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent to unlawfully lure and transport them to work in extreme conditions.

It is Army policy to oppose all activities associated with human trafficking. This must include the supply chain that provides services to our servicemembers defending our country.

We must have strong oversight over our contracting system to ensure that it is free from human rights abuses, and this amendment works toward that end.

I urge my colleagues to join us in fighting human trafficking and support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would just like to advise the gentlewoman that I consider this an extremely important amendment and I am happy to accept it.

Ms. BASS of California. Thank you.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We will be glad to accept the amendment. We appreciate your hard work in this effort.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to thank the gentlemen for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Bass-Maloney Amendment, which cuts funding to subcontractors in the U.S. Defense Department. This amendment would prevent funding from being used by subcontractors hired by the Defense Department who engage in unlawful activities of human trafficking and labor abuses on military bases.

At a time where we are going across the board looking for all the budget cuts we can find to help reduce the national debt, it only makes sense to eliminate funding to these nefarious individuals who are performing atrocious acts on our military soil and are not representing what this great country stands for. We as Americans cannot fund human trafficking nor can we allow labor abuse; these abuses are not what this country stands for and it's our job as lawmakers to do everything in our power to put an end to such crimes.

We can send a loud message with this amendment that the United States does not stand for such horrible crimes. So I join my

colleagues in support of the Bass-Maloney Amendment to H.R. 2219.

Ms. BASS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds in this Act may be used to procure air transportation from a commercial air carrier for a member of the Armed Forces who is traveling under orders to deploy to or return from an overseas contingency operation under terms that allow the carrier to charge the member fees for checked baggage other than for bags weighing more than 80 pounds or bags in excess of four per individual.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. GRIMM) for his support on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Runyan-Grimm amendment which seeks excess baggage fees being charged to servicemembers deploying or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

This issue was brought to light early in June when a group of Army Reservists traveling back from Afghanistan were charged \$200 each for checking a fourth bag, some of which contained U.S. Government equipment like an M4 rifle, a grenade launcher, and a 9-millimeter pistol. The soldiers posted a YouTube video, titled, "Delta Airlines Welcomes Soldiers Home," expressing their frustrations for what they had experienced.

After serving our country in theater and enduring an 18-hour layover on their trip home, the warm welcome this group received was a \$2,800 out-of-pocket expense. This is an unacceptable slap in the face, whether it was intentional or not. Applying these charges to those headed to or returning from the fight is an insult to them and their service to our Nation.

My amendment would make none of the funds available by this act to be used to pay any commercial air carrier if that airline charges excess baggage fees for the first four pieces of checked luggage that are 80 pounds or less per servicemember. This amendment is a reasonable compromise, whose primary purpose is taking care of our warfighters while not allowing the system to be abused.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines risk their lives to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. They take great personal sacrifices to defend our country. There is no doubt they should be provided with any reasonable accommodations while traveling on orders to or from theater of operations. Most im-

portantly, they should not have to endure personal financial hardship as a result of traveling to and from overseas contingency operations. \$200 is a large amount of money to pay out of pocket, especially for those who are enlisted.

It shouldn't take a YouTube video and bad publicity to convince any of us to do the right thing. With this amendment, we are sending a very strong message that our warfighters are individuals who are serving our country and not for an addition to a profit margin.

The amendment is endorsed by the VFW and the National Guard Association of the United States. I hope all my colleagues will stand with me in support of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines by voting in favor of this amendment.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Washington, DC., July 7, 2011.

Hon. JOHN RUNYAN,
House of Representatives, Longworth Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RUNYAN: We are writing to express our strong support for your recently proposed amendment to H.R. 2219, the FY12 Defense Appropriations bill to target and deny funds to commercial airlines who would charge excess baggage fees to servicemembers deploying and returning from overseas contingency operations. The National Guard Association of the United States represents over 45,000 members of the National Guard, their families and employees.

NGAUS believes in the fair treatment of our servicemembers, including our Guard and Reserve, when they deploy and return from overseas operations. The incident this past June where soldiers were charged excess baggage fees for equipment by an airline was outrageous. This amendment would appropriately target the program airlines participate in for supporting additional airlift capability for troops/baggage and equipment while denying funds made available in the bill to those airlines who violate tile program and charge baggage fees for the first four pieces of baggage (not exceeding 80 lbs and not including any carry-on baggage).

The National Guard Association of the United States strongly supports your efforts to correct unfair treatment by airlines in regards to our members of the National Guard and our Armed Forces deploying or coming home from overseas contingency operations.

Sincerely,

GUS HARGETT,
Major General, USA (Ret),
President, NGAUS.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman for the hard work that he has done on this amendment. I associate myself with his comments because I strongly agree with everything that he said, and I am happy to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I had the Clerk read the amendment to show how short and how simple it is. It simply says that none of the money appropriated in this bill can be used to violate the War Powers Resolution, which is the law of the land found in title 50.

The War Powers Resolution simply states that a President may not deploy our troops into hostilities or our military forces into hostilities for more than 60 days if the President does not have congressional authorization. In the absence of such authorization, the President has 30 days to withdraw.

This is the exact same amendment that we considered 3 weeks ago on the MilCon appropriations bill. At that time it got the support of 60 percent of the Republicans and 61 percent of the Democrats, and I hope that those who voted for the bill or the amendment 3 weeks ago would vote the same way today. I hope to be able to persuade a few who voted the other way last time.

This amendment is important, even if we weren't engaged in Libya at all, because for the last several administrations, Presidents have been captured by the siren song of extremist lawyers who are part of the permanent executive branch. They tell the President that the President of the United States, acting alone, can deploy our troops into hostilities for unlimited duration, for any purpose, and, in any quantity, any assets can be deployed.

□ 1550

We are told that there are no limits on the President's power as Commander in Chief. Well, the War Powers Act says otherwise, and it is the law of the land. Now these extremist attorneys in the executive branch have gone a little further. They have added insult to injury by floating the idea that a resolution by NATO, the Arab League, or the United Nations can substitute for an authorization from both Houses of Congress, or they have said that briefing the leadership of Congress is a substitute for enacting an authorization. But even the most extremist attorneys in the executive branch admit we have the power of the purse, and we can prevent the funds provided by this appropriations bill from being used to violate the War Powers Act.

If we were to do otherwise, we would be abdicating our own responsibility, for if Congress habitually appropriates funds knowing that they will be used to violate the law of the land, then we would be complicit in undermining democracy and the rule of law here in the United States.

Now we on this side admire the President of the United States. But even if you would grant this President unlimited power to deploy unlimited forces for unlimited duration, if you ignore the War Powers Act today, you are granting that power to the next President. And those of us who are in good health will all live to see a President that we disagree with. And even if you agree with exactly what's happening in Libya, it is important that we draw a line and say that the conduct of our foreign policy must be consistent with U.S. law.

Now as a practical matter, this President has taken the extreme position that we are not engaged in hostilities in Libya. So what will be the practical effect of this amendment? First, I think he will reconsider that decision, because I think the lawyers behind it took refuge in the belief that the War Powers Act was somehow not binding on the administration. With this amendment, the War Powers Act is binding because we do have the constitutional right to limit the use of funds.

Furthermore, at a minimum, this amendment would prevent the President from deploying regular ground forces to Libya. Now I realize he doesn't intend to do that at this time. But, clearly, this President could not claim that armored divisions deployed in a war zone were not engaged in hostilities. So the minimum practical effect of this amendment is to limit Presidential power to what is going on now and not to introducing major combat operations.

Now, I support a limited effort to bring democracy and the rule of law to the people of Libya. That's not what this amendment is about. This amendment is about democracy and the rule of law here in the United States. I think that if we pass this amendment, and if we can get the Senate to do likewise, that the President will come to Congress and seek an authorization for what is going on in Libya. And at that time, Congress will be able to influence our policy. I think we would insist on a legal limitation to limit our efforts to just air forces and perhaps ground rescue operations. I believe that we would insist that we have the right to review that policy every 3 or 6 months. I believe that we would insist that the \$33 billion of Qadhafi assets which have been frozen by the U.S. Treasury be used to finance this operation, instead of American taxpayer dollars. And I believe that we would insist that the rebels in Benghazi disassociate themselves from the al Qaeda operatives in their midst and from the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group.

But we can't insist on anything if we accept the view of extremist attorneys in the executive branch who view Congress as merely an advisory body. A review of the law and a review of the Constitution indicates that Congress has and should not be derelict in exercising a role in forming American foreign policy.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The amendment prohibits the use of funds in this bill to breach the War Powers Act. However, the proponents hope this language will compel the administration to change our response to the crisis in Libya.

I oppose the amendment on two different grounds. First, the language of the amendment cannot possibly deliver what the proponents claim. Second, what the proponents hope to accomplish would harm the efforts of our allies, working against our national interests and benefiting Qadhafi.

The language can't deliver on the proponents' promises for two reasons. First, the amendment restricts the use of funds in this bill, but none of the \$118.7 billion in the overseas contingency portion of the bill are designated for Libya. Second, the language merely requires compliance with the War Powers Act, but the heart of the proponents' difference with the President is a matter of interpretation about what constitutes compliance. The amendment takes us no closer to a resolution of that difference.

I would oppose the amendment even if the language could accomplish what the proponents hope for. To further restrict our role in Libya puts us on the wrong side of history and on the wrong side of the Arab Spring. It would hinder the efforts of our allies, if not making NATO's mission impossible and prolonging Qadhafi's tenuous hold on power.

To address the matter of Libya, I believe that language—similar to the language introduced in the other body by Senators KERRY and MCCAIN, is the appropriate course of action at this time—this language preserves the understanding between the administration and Congress that U.S. ground forces are not appropriate at this time, and it requires regular and detailed reports from the administration to the Congress.

Now I must say that I, too, agree that the President would always be better served, as President Bush did and President Clinton, to come to Congress to get approval of the authorization. But to unilaterally overturn an effort that includes NATO, the Arab League, and the United Nations saying that this horrific act would take place against the people of Libya, is just, I think, a big mistake, and it would undermine U.S. foreign policy that's been

consistent since 1949 when NATO was established. So I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to Pakistan.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which states, as you have just heard, no funds in this bill may go to Pakistan.

Pakistan is a country on which we have spent billions and billions of dollars. We've given them \$18 billion just since 9/11—not to mention the many billions of dollars we gave to them during the Cold War. What has all that spending achieved for the people of the United States? Pakistan is now the best friend to America's worst enemies: radical Islam and, yes, an emerging and belligerent China. Wake up, America.

Was anyone really surprised to find Osama bin Laden was living in a luxurious mansion in plain view in a military-dominated Pakistani city? Let me admit that even I was surprised that the Pakistani Government was so bold, so open in its contempt of the people of the United States, as to arrest five of its citizens for helping us bring to justice Osama bin Laden, that terrorist radical fiend whose leadership led to the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

The Pakistan Intelligence Service, the ISI, is today, as it always has been, a friend of radical Islam and an enemy of Western democracy. With American acquiescence and Saudi financing, the Pakistani Government—read that the ISI—the Pakistani Government created the Taliban as Islamabad's vanguard for the conquest of Afghanistan. In the process, they set in place a fundamentalist anti-Western radical Islamic terrorist state.

Let's note that even after 9/11, after 3,000 of our citizens had been slaughtered, the ISI continued to covertly support radical Islamic terrorists, and they are still engaged in such hostile

acts, even as American lives are being lost even today.

□ 1600

In 2010, the London School of Economics published a report that found agents of the ISI—this is 2010, long after 9/11—were “funding and training the Afghan Taliban.” And to top things off, there is substantial reporting that has been done that suggests that Pakistani diplomats are lobbying the Afghan Government leaders, suggesting that they dump the United States and turn to China for a partnership and reconstruction.

This isn't shame on them; this is shame on us. Washington may be able to coerce and bribe Islamabad into doing us a favor now and then, but it is time to face reality. The goals and values of the United States and Pakistan are fundamentally at odds. Wake up, America. This bill would provide for another \$1 billion to Pakistan. The Pakistani Government and Pakistan, they are not our friends. Why are we borrowing money from China to give to a government that has betrayed us time and time again?

Therefore, I urge adoption of my amendment to eliminate any funding in this appropriations bill from going to Pakistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. The bill includes approximately \$2.4 billion to support the Pakistani military. Of this amount, \$1.1 billion is for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, and approximately \$1.3 billion is provided through Coalition Support Funds.

The Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund provides for the training and equipping of Pakistani forces specifically to aid U.S. counterterrorism objectives. Coalition Support Funds are used to reimburse the Pakistani military for operations which generally support U.S. counterterrorism objectives.

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's killing by U.S. Special Forces, serious questions have arisen about Pakistan's reliability as a strategic partner, and I agree with the gentleman from California that this has raised serious questions here in the United States about the reliability of one of our partners. And also, there are questions about President Karzai in Afghanistan as well.

Now, the relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult. It reminds me a great deal, during World War II, of our relationship with the Soviet Union, Russia. That was a difficult relationship, but it was essential at that time. And it is essential at this point. This relationship has helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism, and the Pakistanis have allocated a significant

part of their forces within their own borders to this mission, which we need to do more of on the federally administered tribal areas and in Quetta, where the Afghan Taliban leadership exists. And we need them to let us bring our Special Forces into Pakistan.

Now, a complete withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts within their military and their government generally. Aggravating this divide would be counterproductive to U.S. objectives in the region.

In addition to the counterterrorism activity, the fact of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capabilities provides ample reason for the United States to continue positive engagement, so I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is any of the money that we have in this bill going to end up financing the ISI? Will any of that money end up in the hands of the ISI?

Mr. DICKS. I cannot say for certain. I don't think there is anything in this bill that I know of, any provision that provides funding directly to the ISI. Now, there may be. As the gentleman knows, there are other avenues in the intelligence world. But I don't know of anything specifically in this bill. And the ISI, I have just as much trouble with them as you do. But I don't think that we have anything specifically in the bill that funds them.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is there any language in the bill that would prevent the money in this bill from going to the ISI?

Mr. DICKS. No, I don't think there is any prohibition in this bill.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the voice vote by which amendment No. 61 offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) was adopted be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

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

If not, the earlier voice vote is vacated.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would ask the subcommittee chairman, Mr. YOUNG, if he would enter into a colloquy regarding the Minuteman III Warm Line Solid Rocket Motor Sustainment program.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, I would be very happy to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As the chairman is aware, the Air Force has proposed to terminate the Minuteman III Warm Line Solid Rocket Motor Sustainment program beginning in FY 2012. The Air Force has not presented this committee a viable plan to sustain this strategic weapon system beyond the year 2020 as these motors age out, and the program of record now requires the system to be deployed until 2030, which does leave a 10-year gap of vulnerability with no Minuteman III-specific industrial base to support this weapon system.

Would the chairman agree that it is vitally important that the Air Force undertake what is called a smart closeout of this program to include taking definite steps to preserve the essential tools, the uniquely skilled workforce, suppliers, equipment, and production facilities needed to continue to produce and support the readiness of Minuteman III motors through their current operational life cycle through at least 2030?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Utah for bringing this matter to our attention, and we do share his concern for the solid rocket motor industrial base.

We understand that the Air Force is considering their options, and we certainly intend that they use closeout funding from the Minuteman III mod line in a wise manner. We believe that they should seriously consider a smart closeout, as the gentleman from Utah described, and should also consider incorporating the essential elements from the Minuteman III production line into existing production lines for other defense solid rocket booster programs in order to preserve both military capabilities and to ensure the best use of taxpayer funds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, do you also agree that all funds provided for Minuteman III modification in this bill may only be used to support the current Minuteman III system and that no funds have been either requested in the President's budget request or provided by this committee to begin a new start program for a future, currently unauthorized Minuteman III follow-on capability?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would respond that the purpose of the funding that we have provided for the Missile Modifications program is to support the operational capability of the Minuteman through 2030. This includes \$34 million, as requested, for closeout of the warm line program. Development of any follow-on capability is still years away. And the gentleman is correct, a new start system would require authorization and appropriation by the Congress, which the Air Force has not requested and we have not provided. We intend that warm line funds be used in a manner that preserves the industrial base and does not diminish our future strategic capabilities.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area and look forward to working with him further on this issue.

□ 1610

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his kindness and his answers.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated, expended, or used in any manner to support military operations, including NATO or United Nations operations, in Libya or in Libya's airspace.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, we have had a couple of amendments we've already voted on. In reviewing whether or not to withdraw my amendment, my concern comes on the review of Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, my dear friend, and the amendment that passed that he provided. His amendment says that none of the funds in the act may be used for supporting military activities of any group or individual not part of a country's Armed Forces. So it still could be used to supplement another country's Armed Forces through NATO or through the U.N.

We have here a case where people on both sides recognize that the President

moved forward and put our military in harm's way to go after a man who until March 1 was recognized by the United Nations as being a leader in human rights. In fact, it had elected him in 2003 to be the chairman of the Human Rights Commission of the U.N. We also know from our office's inquiry of our own military that we comprise 65 percent of NATO's military. So it is not comforting to think that this President has already gone beyond seizing on loopholes and is just ignoring laws in order to do what he wants because the Arab League asked him—not Congress, not the population of the United States, but the Arab League and some in NATO.

It has not been established—and there are no indications it will be established—that the people who are going to replace Qadhafi will be better for us, for our national security or for our allies like Israel. So, if it's not good for this country's national security and if it's true as to what the gentleman Secretary Gates said, to whom the President recently awarded a Medal of Honor, that we have no national security interests in Libya, then we should not be committing our military in that direction.

Even though the U.N. may support action in Libya and even though they may buy into this Arab Spring, we are already seeing that Iran is excited because it looks like they're going to get additional puppets. We found out this week that the leader of Iraq, Maliki, is giving in to the request of the leader of Iran and is going against his promise to us and to the people of Camp Ashraf that they'll be safe and secure. Now he's saying he's going to disband the camp.

It is time to put America's national security and national interests first and not some whim of some President because someone outside the U.S. asked him. We know the Muslim Brotherhood, despite what some say, has been supporting terrorism. The evidence was clear in the Holy Land Foundation trial. We know that this administration has bent over backwards to appease such folks, so it is time for an amendment to make very clear, which this one does:

Mr. President, it doesn't matter whether you're going to try to use our military through NATO, our military through the U.N., our military head-up for a reconnaissance rescue. It doesn't matter. You're not going to use them.

For those who argue the War Powers is constitutional or is unconstitutional, I would humbly submit it does not matter. Even though the War Powers Act was passed as a curb against the President at the time, it is actually a gift to a President. This body has the power of the purse to cut off funding at any time it so desires, and the War Powers gave him a gift that said, Look, we'll give you days and days and days to come make your case before we cut you off.

That's a gift.

This President has shoved it back down our throats, and has said, I don't care what you think.

It is time to use the constitutional powers of this body and say, "Enough."

In the hopes that people will vote for this amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I find it a little difficult to listen to the arguments about the War Powers Act, because I agree with those arguments.

First of all, in 1973, I think the Congress did give Presidents a gift of power not intended by the Constitution. The Constitution is very clear. It intends that war-making decisions would be made in conjunction with the Commander-in-Chief and the Congress, not the Commander-in-Chief by himself or herself and not the Congress alone, but while working together. That's not the way it has been happening lately. There hasn't been a real declaration of war under the Constitution since World War II, but we have fought in a lot of wars, and we have killed and wounded a lot of our kids.

That's not the argument, though. I agree with all of those points. I think that Congress has a serious responsibility to review the War Powers Act and to make it what we think it ought to be, and that is a partner relationship between the Congress and the executive branch.

Yet, while we hear these strong arguments about the War Powers Act and the separation of powers, these amendments don't really get the job done. If you want to cut off all funding for any activities in and around Libya, you would have to introduce a separate resolution that would simply say: No funds appropriated here or anywhere else can be used in the Libya operation.

In this particular bill, there is no money for Libya, and the President has made it very clear that he is not going to use any funds from the fiscal year 2012 appropriation for Libya. We'll see if that changes, but we have that in writing. We're already there. We're already in the area. We're already flying missions. If this amendment should be agreed to, here is what we would not be able to do:

We could not fly search and rescue missions for a downed pilot. We could not do ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance. We could not do aerial refueling for our coalition partners. We could not even be part of operational planning under this amendment.

As much as I agree with what the gentleman is trying to accomplish, I can't support this amendment, because of the effect that it really has. If it could amend the War Powers Act and make the President be a partner with Congress, I'd say, Amen. Let's do it quickly. I think the Congress ought to do that, and I think we ought to be serious about doing that; but on this particular amendment, I've got to oppose

it because this is what we're dealing with, not the emotional discussions about the War Powers Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The brutal regime of Muammar al Qadhafi has caused an international outcry, and the people of Libya have asked for our help. The NATO-led mission to defeat Qadhafi and protect the people of Libya was undertaken in concert with a broad coalition of nations, including the Arab League, and it followed resolutions adopted in the United Nations Security Council, authorizing "all necessary measures."

□ 1620

The amendment would end our involvement unilaterally. I believe this could materially harm our relationship with our NATO allies from whom we will undoubtedly require support in the future, and our NATO alliance has been a vital and successful part of U.S. foreign policy dating back to its formation in 1949.

I do support a wider debate and greater oversight of the use and the cost of U.S. military forces engaged in the Libya operation, but I would point out that the administration did send up a detailed document that shows the money that has been spent thus far and what will be spent through the end of this fiscal year. We should let the mission with our NATO allies continue so we can replace Qadhafi and protect the Libyan people.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. And I would just remind everyone that in 1986 President Reagan authorized a military strike following the bombings in Berlin and definitive proof of Qadhafi's involvement in other terrorist activities. At the time, President Reagan publicly denounced Qadhafi, the "Mad Dog of the Middle East who espoused the goal of world revolution."

Mr. Chairman, I can only wonder what Ronald Reagan would say today about those who would propose immediate withdrawal of U.S. assistance to the broad coalition of nations attempting to finish the job that President Ronald Reagan started.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, President Obama issued a Memorandum on Federal Fleet Performance, which requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015. My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Defense Appropriations bill from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum. I have introduced similar amendments to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill and the Agriculture Appropriations bill and intend to do it with other appropriations bills. Both were accepted by the majority and passed by voice vote.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with almost 197,000 being used by the Department of Defense. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, coal, agricultural waste, hydrogen and renewable electricity. Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment as both sides of the aisle have done in previous bills; and I want to mention on a similar note, I have worked in a bipartisan fashion with my

colleagues, JOHN SHIMKUS, ROSCOE BARTLETT and STEVE ISRAEL, to open the bipartisan Open Fuel Standard Act, H.R. 1687.

Our bill would require 50 percent of new automobiles in 2014, 80 percent in 2016, and 95 percent in 2017 to be warranted to operate on nonpetroleum fuels in addition to or instead of petroleum-based fuels. Compliance possibilities include the full array of existing technologies, including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive and fuel cell, and a catch-all for new technologies. I mention it because it's similar to this, and I really believe that our energy policies obviously can only be done on a bipartisan basis.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, again as we've done on all the other bills where I have introduced it, and the Open Fuel Standard as we work toward breaking our dependence on foreign oil.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment. I think we've seen this on other bills, and I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to accept the amendment, and I too think it's a good amendment and a good idea.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of B-1 aircraft of the Armed Forces.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the B-1 bomber.

This is a very simple amendment. Basically, it just says it prevents any funds in this bill from being used to retire the B-1 bombers during the coming fiscal year.

Currently, as you know, about 163 planes are in our bomber fleet, which is about 3 percent of our total fleet. Currently, we are going through an analysis of what our bomber fleet is going

to look like in the future, and part of that is from the START Treaty. What we feel is appropriate is for us to not look at reductions in the bomber fleet on a piecemeal basis, but to look at it as a total picture once we have done the analysis and seen how many of the planes will not be needed for nuclear capability moving forward.

The B-1 is kind of an interesting plane. It doesn't get a lot of attention, but what it does is it works 24-7 and has in the theaters that we're involved in for a number of years. In fact, it has been our number one bomber of choice for a number of years and until recently was the only bomber seen in active duty.

I am pleased to be supported in this effort by Congressman THORNBERRY, who is vice chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as well as my colleague, Mr. CONAWAY.

At this time, I would like to yield to one of the cosponsors of this amendment, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The B-1 bomber is the workhorse of our long-range bomber fleet and has been flying missions over Iraq and Afghanistan for nearly a decade. More importantly, the B-1 bomber from the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base in my home State of South Dakota just carried out air strike operations in Libya. In just under 2 days, Ellsworth generated aircraft loaded with conventional weapons that were able to strike targets halfway across the world.

Regardless of what one thinks about our involvement in Libya, one thing that one cannot dispute is the B-1's capability to respond globally and its vital importance to our bomber fleet. Mr. Chairman, with the next generation bomber development still a decade or more away, the administration's proposal to retire six B-1s is short sighted and it's premature. What's more, it can't be reversed. Retired planes aren't mothballed and put away for a period of time. They are sent to the bone yard and they are used for parts. Mr. Chairman, we propose that no B-1s be irreversibly retired this year because of questions regarding the future of our bomber force structure and the B-1's proven track record in theater as our workhorse.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a strong bomber fleet, a strong national defense, and I ask them to support this amendment.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentlelady from South Dakota just made a speech that I was about to make, so I would just simply say it's a good amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman, and I urge our colleagues to

support a strong national defense and making sure that we have the appropriate number of bombers, and to vote in favor of the Neugebauer amendment.

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

□ 1630

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

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

Mr. DICKS. I would just say to the gentleman that the B-2 bomber has been used also on several of these military operations that we've used, and the B-2 is a stealthy airplane. We only have 20. As a member of the committee, I offered the multiyear purchase agreement so we could buy the B-1s. And we had a unanimous vote, I think, in our committee on that. It was very bipartisan.

I agree with the gentleman that we don't have enough bombers. That's why I'm so strongly committed to the next-generation bomber. But as has been pointed out, that's going to be several years away. We tried to add some money this year to accelerate that because we do need a follow-on bomber.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I agree with the gentleman. And I think that our bomber fleet is extremely important, the B-1, the B-2, and obviously the B-52s. And as the gentleman knows, as we do not have a replacement bomber in the works at this particular point in time and until such time as we develop that, I think it's extremely important that we be strategic about what level we maintain our current fleet until we know what the replacement is going to be. And I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, we only have 20 stealthy bombers. That's what some people don't understand. And the ability to penetrate China or the Soviet Union or wherever we might have to penetrate at some point, North Korea, we would be vulnerable with the B-52s and the B-1s to surface-to-air missiles.

So making sure that we get a high-quality stealthy airplane to follow the B-2 is a matter of national importance. I support the amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of the B-1 bomber fleet. To echo what my colleague, Mr. NEUGEBAUER has said, I too believe that we should carefully examine the way we modify our bomber fleet for the future.

As part of the New Start Treaty, the U.S. and Russia will limit their nuclear capable delivery vehicles to a total of 700 deployed assets, including heavy bombers. At this time, we do not yet know what those cuts will look like. Preserving the size of our non-nuclear bomber fleet until we know the results of the New Start Treaty analysis is simply good policy.

My colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and I are very concerned that if we go

down this path and prematurely reduce a portion of the fleet, that we will regret that decision.

Mr. Chair, I recognize that cuts need to be made. Every aspect of the budget needs to be thoroughly reviewed, but let's not make bad budgetary decisions without considering our mission capabilities first.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to address the ranking member of the House Appropriation's Committee on Defense, Mr. DICKS, and also the chair in a colloquy on the critical need to improve the recruitment, retention, and competitive compensation of the mental health professionals who can work with our Iraq and Afghanistan military servicemen and -women.

Since 2001, 2,103 military members have died by suicide. And one in five servicemembers currently suffer from post-traumatic stress and/or major depression. We must ensure that an adequate number of mental health professionals are available to treat our soldiers.

Mental health professionals must be retained by providing adequate pay and competitive benefits that are also available in the private sector. It is our duty and responsibility to our wounded warriors that we ensure their mental health services are secure and available when and where needed.

I am submitting for the RECORD an article from the Army Times dated April 7, 2011, regarding the Senate Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee meeting of April 6 and quoting Army Surgeon General Lieutenant General Schoomaker, who stressed the severe lack of mental health professionals in the military, and his concern about retention, especially in the rural areas. The article states, "Congress has been pressing the military health system to add more psychiatric doctors, nurses and social workers for several years. That has prompted the services to add about 1,500 full-time mental health professionals since 2006—a 70 percent increase."

The article further says, "But demand has continued to outpace that growth. Active-duty troops and their families were referred to off-base civilian mental health care professionals nearly 4 million times in 2009, roughly double the number of off-base referrals in 2006, military data show."

"The dramatic increase in military suicides during the past several years has added urgency to congressional concerns. At the April 6 hearing, all three military surgeons general told lawmakers about efforts to improve training, recruiting and retention of mental health professionals."

Senator MIKULSKI has suggested military training may be uniquely important because some civilian doctors and social workers have trouble understanding the troops' problems and mindset.

I am also submitting for the RECORD a witness statement of July 14, 2011, from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, where the Deputy Director of Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Division, Jacob Gadd, expressed the challenges of hiring and retaining quality mental health specialists. Our servicemembers should not have to wait one more day for the help they deserve.

As cochair of the Congressional Mental Health Care Caucus, I have met with many key military leaders to learn what the most critical issues are in addressing mental health services for our military men and women. I've repeatedly been informed that there have been woefully inadequate numbers of mental health professionals available to care for our men and women.

Congress has a responsibility to see that our soldiers and veterans have the resources for quality care. Because this quality of care is dependent on the quantity of behavioral health specialists trained in war, PTS, we must successfully recruit and retain to work with our men and women who fight to ensure our precious daily freedoms.

The legislation before you today provides \$32.3 billion for the defense health program and military family programs, with \$125 million of this going towards research of traumatic brain injury and psychological health treatment, hopefully to also include hyperbaric treatment research.

We must insist on accountability that adequately trained behavioral health professionals are on hand when and where needed. I would like to work with the ranking member to obtain from the Department of Defense a detailed outline on their efforts for each military service—Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, et cetera—to recruit, retain, and formulate the competitive salaries and benefits that will keep behavioral health specialists serving our men and women who have given so much to protect our freedoms.

We place them in harm's way. It is our duty and obligation to ensure the best care is given to them.

I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I will work with the gentlelady on the Defense Department's plan to ensure adequate mental health services for our servicemembers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. NAPOLITANO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentlelady continue to yield?

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. I would point out that the chairman of this committee, Mr. YOUNG, and his wife, Beverly, have been some of the strongest advocates for our Wounded Warriors and he has led the fight in our committee to increase the funding for traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder. So our committee has been very committed to this. It is one of our highest priorities.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank Mr. DICKS, the ranking member, for working with me on this critical issue and look forward to working soon enough on this.

[Apr. 7, 2011]

PANEL QUESTIONS ADEQUACY OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE

(By Andrew Tilghman)

The military's top doctors faced heated questions on Capitol Hill about whether there are enough mental health professionals to meet the soaring demand from troubled troops.

"Do you feel you have adequate mental health personnel?" asked Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., at an April 6 hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee's defense panel.

Lt. Gen. Eric Schoomaker, the Army surgeon general, acknowledged that the military would prefer to have more, but cited an overall lack of mental health professionals nationwide as a key challenge. "I think the nation is facing problems. As a microcosm of the nation, we have problems," Schoomaker said.

Congress has been pressing the military health system to add more psychiatric doctors, nurses and social workers for several years. That has prompted the services to add about 1,500 full-time mental health professionals since 2006—a 70 percent increase.

But demand has continued to outpace that growth. Active-duty troops and their families were referred to off-base civilian mental health care professionals nearly 4 million times in 2009, roughly double the number of off-base referrals in 2006, military data show.

The dramatic increase in military suicides during the past several years has added urgency to congressional concerns. At the April 6 hearing, all three military surgeons general told lawmakers about efforts to improve training, recruiting and retention of mental health professionals.

Mikulski suggested military training may be uniquely important because some civilian doctors and social workers have trouble understanding troops' problems and mindset.

"From what I understand . . . often in the first hour of the first treatment, the military [patients] facing this problem walk out and tell the counselor, essentially, to go to hell because they don't feel they get it," she said.

Schoomaker downplayed issues with non-military professionals.

"Frankly, I think . . . this warrior culture issue might be present in some cases but not universally. Our people do a good job with that," he said.

Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., was concerned about reservists who may not live near a military treatment facility and may have problems finding mental health care. Schoomaker agreed that reservists can face a significant challenge.

"We have residual problems . . . in reserve communities. You go home to a community where access to care is a problem for all care, but especially behavioral health," Schoomaker said.

That's also a problem for some active-duty posts in rural areas. "In the desert of Cali-

fornia, for example, it's hard to recruit and retain high-quality people," he said.

STATEMENT OF JACOB B. GADD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, VETERANS AFFAIRS AND REHABILITATION DIVISION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON "EXAMINING THE PROGRESS OF SUICIDE PREVENTION OUTREACH EFFORTS AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS", JULY 14, 2010

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for this opportunity to submit The American Legion's views on progress of the Suicide Prevention efforts at the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to the Subcommittee today. The American Legion commends the Subcommittee for holding a hearing today to discuss this timely and important issue.

Suicide among service members and veterans has always been a concern; it is the position of The American Legion that one suicide is one too many. However, since the war in Iraq and Afghanistan began, the numbers of service members and veterans who have committed suicide have steadily increased. As our service members are deployed across the world to protect and defend our freedoms, we as a nation cannot allow them to not receive the care and treatment they need when they return home. The tragic and ultimate result of failing to take care of our nation's heroes' mental health illnesses is suicide.

Turning first to VA's efforts in recent years with Mental Health Care, The American Legion has consistently lobbied for budgetary increases and program improvements to VA's Mental Health Programs. Despite recent unprecedented increases in the VA budget, demand for VA Mental Health services is still outpacing the resources and staff available as the number of service members and veterans afflicted with Post Traumatic Stress (PTS) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) continues to grow, this naturally leads to VA's increase in mental health patients.

In 2008, RAND's Center for Military Health Policy Research, an independent, nonprofit group, released a report on the psychological and cognitive needs of all servicemembers deployed in the past six years, titled, "Invisible Wounds of War: Psychological and Cognitive Injuries, Their Consequences, and Services to Assist Recovery," which estimated that more than 300,000 (20 percent of the 1.6 million) Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are suffering from PTS or major depression and about 320,000 may have experienced TBI during deployment.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates 30,000-32,000 U.S. deaths from suicide per year among the population. VA's Office of Patient Care and Mental Health Services reported in April 2010 that approximately 20 percent of national suicides are veterans. The National Violent Death Reporting System reports 18 deaths per day by veterans and VA's Serious Mental Illness Treatment, Research and Evaluation Center reported about five deaths occur each day among VA patients. In a recent AP article, it was cited that there have been more suicides than service members killed in Afghanistan.

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) has made improvements in recent years for Mental Health and transition between DoD and VA such as the Federal Recovery Coordinators, Polytrauma Rehabilitation System of Care, Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom

(OIF) case management teams, integrating mental health care providers into primary care within VA Medical Center Facilities and Community Based Outpatient Clinics (CBOCs), VA Readjustment (Vet) Centers hiring of Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) Counselors, establishing directives for TBI screening, clinical reminders and a new symptom and diagnostic code for TBI.

Regarding suicide prevention outreach efforts, VA founded the National Suicide Prevention Hotline, 1-800-273-TALK (8255) by collaborating with the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline where veterans are assisted by a dedicated call center at Canandaigua VA Medical Center in New York. The call center is staffed with trained VA crisis health care professionals to respond to calls on a 24/7 basis and facilitate appropriate treatment. VA reported in 2010 a total of 245,665 calls, 128,302 of which were identified as veterans. Of these veterans, 7,720 were rescued.

VA hired Local Suicide Prevention Coordinators at all of the 153 VA Medical Centers nationwide in an effort to provide local and immediate assistance during a crisis, compile local data for the national database and train hospital and local community on how to provide assistance. One of the primary responsibilities of the Local Suicide Prevention Coordinators is to track and monitor veterans who are placed on high risk of suicide (HRS). A safety plan for that individual veteran is created to ensure they are not allowed to fall through the cracks.

In 2009, VA instituted an online chat center for veterans to further reach those veterans who utilize online communications. The total number of VeteransChat contacts reported since September 2009 was 3,859 with 1471 mentioning suicide. VA has also had targeted outreach campaigns which included billboards, signage on buses and PSA's with actor Gary Sinise to encourage veterans to contact VA for assistance.

THE AMERICAN LEGION SUICIDE PREVENTION AND REFERRAL PROGRAMS

The American Legion has been at the forefront of helping to prevent military and veteran suicides in the community. The American Legion approved Resolution 51, The American Legion Develop a Suicide Prevention and Outreach Referral Program, at the 2009 National Convention. In addition, VA's National Suicide Prevention Coordinator Dr. Janet Kemp facilitated an Operation S.A.V.E. Training for our Veterans Affairs and Rehabilitation Commission members. VA&R Commission members and volunteers subsequently developed American Legion state, district and post training programs to provide referrals for veterans in distress with VA's National Suicide Prevention Hotline. The American Legion currently has over 60 posts with active Suicide Prevention and Referral Programs.

In December 2009, The American Legion took the lead in creating a Suicide Prevention Assistant Volunteer Coordinator position, under the auspices of VA's Voluntary Service Office. Each local suicide prevention office is encouraged to work with veteran service organizations and community organizations to connect veterans with VA's programs in their time of transition and need. The Suicide Prevention offices can increase their training of volunteers to distribute literature and facilitate training in order to further reach veterans in the community.

This year, The American Legion entered into a partnership with the Defense Centers of Excellence's Real Warrior Campaign to educate and encourage our members to help transitioning service members and veterans receive the mental health treatment they need. Additionally, during our 2010 National

Convention we will have a panel to discuss prevention, screening, diagnosis and treatment of TBI with representatives from DoD, VA and the private sector.

CHALLENGES

Despite recent suicide prevention efforts, yet more needs to be done as the number of suicides continues to grow. The American Legion's System Worth Saving (SWS) program, which conducts site visits to VA Medical Center facilities annually, has found several challenges with the delivery of mental health care. VA has the goal to recruit psychologists from their current nationwide level of 3,000 to 10,000 to meet the demand for mental health services. However, VA Medical Center Facilities have expressed concerns with hiring and retaining quality mental health specialists and have had to rely on fee basis programs to manage their workload.

The American Legion applauds last year's action by Congress in passing Advance Appropriations for mandatory spending. However, problems exist in VA itself in allocating the funds from VA Central Office to the Veteran Integrated Service Networks (VISNs) and to the local facilities. This delay in funding creates challenges for the VA Medical Center Facility in receiving its budget to increase patient care services, hiring or to begin facility construction projects to expand mental health services. VA's 2011 budget provides approximately \$5.2 billion for mental health programs which is an 8.5 percent, or \$410 million, increase over FY 2010 budget authorization. The American Legion continues to be concerned about mental health funds being specifically used for their intent and that Congress continue to provide the additional funding needed to meet the growing demand for treatment.

Challenges in preventing suicide include maintaining confidentiality and overcoming the stigma attached to a service member or veteran receiving care. Additionally, the issue of a lack of interoperable medical records between DoD and VA, while being addressed by Virtual Lifetime Electronic Records (VLER), still exists. The American Legion has supported the VLER initiative and the timely and unfettered exchange of health records between DoD and VA. Unfortunately, DoD and VA still have not finalized both agencies ALTA and VISTA architecture systems since the project began in 2007, which limits DoD and VA's ability to track and monitor high risk suicide patients during their transition from military to civilian life. The American Legion recommends VA take the lead in developing a joint database with the DoD, the National Center for Health Statistics and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to track suicide national trends and statistics of military and veteran suicides.

The American Legion continues to be concerned about the delivery of health care to rural veterans. As mentioned, a nationwide shortage of behavioral health specialists, especially in remote areas where veterans have settled, reduces the effectiveness of VA's outreach. No matter where a veteran chooses to live, VA must continue to expand and bring needed medical services to the highly rural veteran population through telehealth and Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy (VRET). DoD and VA have piloted VRET at bases at Camp Pendleton, Camp Lejeune and the Iowa City VA Medical Center. VRET is an emerging treatment that exposes a patient to different computer simulations to help them overcome their phobias or stress. The younger generation of veterans identifies with computer technology and may be more apt to self-identify online rather than at a VA Medical Center or CBOC.

Both DoD and VA have acknowledged the lack of research on brain injuries and the difficulties diagnosing PTS and TBI because of the comorbidity of symptoms between the two. The Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center (DVBIC) developed and continues to use a 4-question screening test for TB today. At the same time, Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York developed the Brain Injury Screening Questionnaire (BISQ), the only validated instrument by the Centers for Disease Control to assess the history of TBI, which has over 100 questions with 25 strong indicators for detecting TB. Mount Sinai has published data that suggest some of the symptoms, particularly those categorized as "cognitive," when found in large numbers (i.e. 9 or greater), indicate the person is experiencing complaints similar to those of individuals with brain injuries. The American Legion wants to ensure that DoD and VA are working with the private sector to share best practices and improve on evidence-based research, screening, diagnosis and treatment protocols of the "signature wounds" of Iraq and Afghanistan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The American Legion has seven recommendations to improve Mental Health and Suicide Prevention efforts for VA and DoD:

(1) Congress should exercise oversight on VA and DoD programs to insure maximum efficiency and compliance with Congressional concerns for this important issue.

(2) Congress should appropriate additional funding for mental health research and to standardize DoD and VA screening, diagnosis and treatment programs.

(3) DoD and VA should expedite development of a Virtual Lifetime Medical Record for a single interoperable medical record to better track and flag veterans with mental health illnesses.

(4) Congress should allocate separate Mental Health funding for VA's Recruitment and Retention incentives for behavioral health specialists.

(5) Establish a Suicide Prevention Coordinator at each military installation and encourage DoD and VA to share best practices in research, screening and treatment protocols between agencies.

(6) Congress should provide additional funding for telehealth and virtual behavior health programs and providers and ensure access to these services are available on VA's web pages for MyHealthyVet, Mental Health and Suicide Prevention as well as new technologies such as Skype, Apple i-Phone Applications, Facebook and Twitter.

(7) DoD and VA should develop joint online suicide prevention service member and veteran training courses/modules on family, budget, pre, during and post deployment, financial, TBI, PTSD, Depression information.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, although VA has increased its efforts and support for suicide prevention programs, it must continue to reach into the community by working with Veteran Service Organizations such as The American Legion to improve outreach and increase awareness of these suicide prevention programs and services for our nation's veterans. The American Legion is committed to working with DoD and VA in providing assistance to those struggling with the wounds of war so that no more veterans need lose the fight and succumb to so tragic a self-inflicted end.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, this concludes my testimony.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the following entities:

- (1) The Government of Iran.
- (2) Hamas.
- (3) Hizbullah.
- (4) The Muslim Brotherhood.

□ 1640

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

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I ask for your support of my limiting amendment that would prohibit any military expenditure that would assist any entity that has a policy calling for the destruction of the State of Israel.

My amendment is specific and would prohibit this type of expenditure to any entity that has a policy calling for the destruction of the State of Israel. Most prominent, of course, is Iran. Just last month, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad reiterated his nation's policy calling for the complete elimination of Israel.

It is not just formally recognized states, however, we need to be concerned about. History has shown that entities we consider terrorist fringe groups sometimes, through force, manipulation and popular vote, take over the state apparatus. This happened in the Gaza Strip when Hamas, the Islamic Resistance Movement, won a plurality of legislative seats, 44 percent, in the 2006 election. The United States and Israel classify Hamas as a terrorist organization, but the United Nations, for example, does not. The Hamas Charter of 1988, never withdrawn or amended, states that "Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it has obliterated others before it." This mirrors the Iranian policy, as that "the reason for the Zionist regime's existence is questioned, and this regime is on its way to annihilation."

In the last budget, according to the State Department, U.S. military aid to Egypt totals over \$1.3 billion annually in funding referred to as Foreign Military Financing. Currently, questions exist about the Muslim Brotherhood, now a key player in Egypt and potentially in Libya with the rebel opposition, and its hostility to Jews and the State of Israel. It is quite possible that extremist groups who seek the destruction of Israel are taking over the state operations in Egypt and part of Libya. Time will tell.

My amendment would ensure that we do not use our money and military assistance to help any entity that will not recognize the right of Israel to exist and to exist peacefully. That includes the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. No other nation on Earth except Israel has had to face systematic, ideological and persistent existential threats.

My amendment would prohibit military aid, assistance or funding to any nation, state or entity that espouses a policy that refuses to recognize Israel's right to peacefully exist. With the prospect of not receiving our money and assistance, the new Egyptian regime may take a more respectful approach to Israel. In this sense, my amendment takes a carrots approach.

I appreciate your support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment. I also want to support his reasons for offering this amendment. I think they are very well taken. The amendment is a good amendment, and I strongly support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . Not more than \$200,000,000 of the funds provided by title IX under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army" may be available for the Commander's Emergency Response Program, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by \$200,000,000.

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

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the major decisions that this Congress has to make and for which we need a recommendation from the Appropriations Committee for the Defense Subcommittee is whether nation-building is a wise strategy, a sustainable strategy, an affordable strategy, and an effective strategy in Afghanistan. We had a debate on that policy. There was a bipartisan vote, with 204 Members suggesting it was time to call into question the wisdom, sustainability and effectiveness of nation-building.

One of the things that we have provided to our commanders in order for them to be able to do hearts-and-minds civic projects, roads, bridges, schools is a \$400 million fund that they can use completely at their discretion. Now, this sounds like a good idea. If you're going to ask the military to win the hearts and minds, not just use military power to fight battles, then a discretionary fund can seemingly make some sense. The question, though, is, upon review, it turns out that these roads, these bridges, these canals, almost the moment they're turned over to the Af-

ghan authorities, fall into disrepair, disuse and neglect. It's not surprising.

Number one, there is very little local government infrastructure in Afghanistan, and the fact that we build a road or a school doesn't necessarily mean there's a government or an authority there to be able to maintain it. So we build something, and the moment we turn the keys over, it falls into disuse and disrepair.

Second, the expenses of doing this are enormous. It may make sense to do these civic projects, to create some goodwill, but do you do them, Mr. Chairman, in the middle of a shooting war? Or is it better to do that before or after the war, when you have a chance for this implementation to occur?

Then, third, there's an immense amount of ripping off of this money from the American taxpayer. It gets lost. It gets picked up in graft that we all know about is too rampant in Afghanistan. According to a report in *The Washington Post*, half of this money, a minimum of \$400 million, is gone missing, it's wasted, and it is coming out of our taxpayer pockets.

My amendment would cut in half the \$400 million, reduce it to \$200 million, basically taking away that \$200 million that is being utterly wasted. This is a commonsense, practical way to save money by stopping a policy that may be good in theory but in practice is a failure.

[From the *Washington Post*, Jan. 4, 2011]

U.S.-FUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE DETERIORATES ONCE UNDER AFGHAN CONTROL, REPORT SAYS
(By Josh Boak)

Roads, canals and schools built in Afghanistan as part of a special U.S. military program are crumbling under Afghan stewardship, despite steps imposed over the past year to ensure that reconstruction money is not being wasted, according to government reports and interviews with military and civilian personnel.

U.S. troops in Afghanistan have spent \$2 billion over six years on 16,000 humanitarian projects through the Commander's Emergency Response Program, which gives a battalion-level commander the power to treat aid dollars as ammunition.

A report slated for release this month reveals that CERP projects can quickly slide into neglect after being transferred to Afghan control. The Afghans had problems maintaining about half of the 69 projects reviewed in eastern Laghman province, according to an audit by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

The spending in Afghanistan is part of the \$5 billion provided to U.S. military commanders for projects in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2004. The new report is the latest to identify shortcomings and missteps in the program, whose ventures have included the Jadriyah Lake park in Iraq, planned as a water park but now barren two years after a U.S. military inauguration ceremony.

The dilapidated projects in Afghanistan could present a challenge to the U.S. strategy of shifting more responsibility to Afghans. Investing in infrastructure, notes President Obama's December review of the war, "will give the Afghan government and people the tools to build and sustain a future of stability."

"Sustainment is one of the biggest issues with our whole strategy," said a civilian official who shared details from a draft of the

report. "The Afghans don't have the money or capacity to sustain much." The official spoke on the condition of anonymity because the Defense Department is preparing a response to the audit.

Photos in the report show washed-out roads, with cracks and potholes where improvised explosive devices can be hidden. Among the projects profiled is a re-dredged canal that filled with silt a month after opening.

Multiple reports by the Government Accountability Office have noted a lack of monitoring by the Pentagon. And because formal U.S. oversight stops after a project is turned over to Afghans, it is difficult to gauge how projects are maintained country-wide.

When asked whether the Afghans have trouble sustaining projects, the U.S. military issued a statement saying it does not have the information to provide an immediate answer.

Gen. David H. Petraeus, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, said in Senate testimony last year that CERP is "the most responsive and effective means to address a local community's needs." He previously relied on the discretionary fund as the commanding general in Iraq, where \$3.5 billion has been spent through the program. Over the past two years, Petraeus has pushed for stricter controls to stop any fraud and waste.

In response to "insufficient management," CERP guidance for Afghanistan was revised in December 2009, according to a statement by the military. The new guidance emphasizes the need to meet with Afghan leaders when choosing what to fund. It does not, however, require U.S. troops to continue inspecting projects after they are placed under Afghan control.

Under the guidance, an Afghan governor, mayor or bureaucrat must sign a letter promising to fund maintenance and operations. But an October SIGAR audit of projects in Nangahar province found that only two of the 15 files examined contained a signed letter. Nor is there formal reporting to the national or provincial Afghan governments of what was spent and built, the audit said. That makes it difficult for Afghans to know what they are supposed to maintain.

The provincial and district governments that take over the projects do not have the money to sustain them because they cannot collect taxes and they depend on the national government for funding, said Army Maj. David Kaczmarek, the civil affairs officer for Task Force Bastogne in eastern Afghanistan.

To teach the local governments how to request additional funds from Kabul, Kaczmarek helped launch a program in the summer that uses CERP dollars for the operation and maintenance of some projects.

The U.S. military tracks CERP projects with poorly maintained computer databases. Before October 2009, the database did not consistently record the villages or districts where projects were undertaken, according to military and civilian personnel who spoke on the condition of anonymity because the master database is classified.

A civilian official who examined the contents of the database for a government assessment said the military cannot account for the spending without knowing the villages and districts that were project recipients.

"Let's say the project is not working," the official said. "Why would we want to fund that project again the next year? Very little evaluation was done to decide what we fund next."

The organizational problems have also frustrated attempts to study the effectiveness of the \$2 billion spent on CERP. A paper

co-written by Princeton University professor Jacob Shapiro found that CERP funding helped reduce violence in Iraq. Shapiro and his colleagues have struggled over the past nine months to conduct a similar study for Afghanistan because of the database.

"There's not a sense of how the program may or may not be working in Afghanistan," Shapiro said.

Army Lt. Col. Brian Stoll tried to clean up the database while serving in Kandahar last year. He champions CERP as a way to build confidence in the Afghan government, despite the mess he found.

Projects dating to 2006 had never been closed out, said Stoll, who updated the files while working 12-hour days to audit ongoing projects in southern Afghanistan.

We never got it all cleaned up," Stoll said. "It was like a Hydra. You get part of it cleaned up and you find some more along the way."

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment for a number of reasons, although I think he's made some good points, and certainly we want accountability to apply to this program as much as we want it to apply to anything. However, this is the same funding level as last year. The request was \$425 million, and our commanders in the theater are telling us that that is even not high enough. So what we're doing with this amendment is actually cutting a level funding item from last year, cutting it in half.

Now, what does the CERP money do, the Commander's Emergency Response Program money? Let's say an IED explodes, or maybe there is a bomb that blows up a storefront in the middle of the street. A commander can go in there and hire local labor to clear out the entrance to that small business or whatever it is and get it done quickly without having to put U.S. Army personnel in danger to do it and can do it quickly and effectively and therefore leave our soldiers in the field, leave our soldiers where they can be most effective with their time and their training, and it does promote some goodwill on the streets with the people.

It has been said, well, all you're doing is renting a friend, and we're not going to be the first army that's fighting a war that rents friends, if you will. It really doesn't just rent a friend. It does create some long-term goodwill and does have an economic benefit of it. But the idea is to give the commander on the street some flexibility so that they can get the jobs done as the jobs arise and get them done quickly and turn them around.

CERP money actually has been an effective tool, and it's enormously popular with our commanders who are on the ground. I believe one of the problems we have in Afghanistan, one of the problems we've always had, is that too many decisions are being made down the street at the Pentagon and

not in Baghdad, not in Kabul, not in Kandahar, where the commanders are closest to the war front.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1650

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment, which would address another misguided Federal regulation. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of alternative fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gases emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. Simply stated, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on the Department of Defense.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquid jet fuels. This was based on the opinion of environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel produces more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum. I recently offered my similar amendment to both the MILCON VA and Ag appropriations bills, and they passed the House by voice vote each time.

My friend Mr. CONAWAY of Texas also had similar language added to the Defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation. We must ensure that our military becomes more energy independent and that it can effectively and efficiently rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

Our Nation's military should not be burdened with wasting its time studying fuel emissions when there is a simple fix, not restricting their fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, policies, and regulations

like section 526. In light of increasing competition with other countries for energy and fuel resources, and continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is more important than ever for our country to become more energy independent and to further develop and produce our domestic energy resources. Placing limits on Federal agencies', particularly the Defense Department, fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy policy and independence.

On July 9, 2008, the Pentagon, in a letter to Senator JAMES INHOFE stated: "Such a decision would cause significant harm to the readiness of the Armed Forces because these fuels may be widely used and particularly important in certain geographic areas."

In summary, not only have extreme environmental views and policies created and burdened American families and businesses, but they also cause "significant harm in readiness to the Armed Forces."

Mr. Chairman, section 526 makes our Nation more dependent on Middle Eastern oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 would help us promote American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs.

To everyone watching these proceedings today, I would say this: following my remarks, you will hear speakers from the other side of the aisle make several claims regarding the merits of section 526. When you hear these claims, please remember the following facts about section 526: it increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. It hurts our military readiness and our national security. It prevents the use of safe, clean, and efficient North American oil and gas. It increases the cost of American food and energy. It hurts American jobs and the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The Department of Defense alone is the largest single energy consumer in the world. Its leadership in this arena is critical to any credible approach to dealing with energy independence issues. Section 526 provides an opportunity for the Federal Government to play a substantial role in spurring the innovation needed to produce alternative fuels which will not further exacerbate global climate change.

This provision has spurred development of advanced biofuels. These fuels are being successfully tested and proven today on U.S. Navy jets at supersonic speeds. It's a testament to American ingenuity. Unfortunately, section 526 is under assault by those who disagree with advanced biofuels production. They'd like us to continue our dependence on the fuels of the past.

That's the wrong path to take. It's unsustainable and won't lead to the energy security we need.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague in asking to exempt the Department of Defense from section 526; 526 was added to the energy bill in a wrongheaded move to placate some notion that it would have some impact on global warming. It's wrong to require the Department of Defense in these times, where every single dollar is scarce and every single dollar should have a home, to require them to spend extra money beyond what they would normally spend for fuel for their planes.

This amendment would also allow the continued development of coal-to-liquid jet fuel, which would make this country much less dependent on foreign oil in terms of powering our jets and other engines. So 526, maybe it belongs in the Department of Energy bill, maybe it belongs somewhere else, but it does not belong in the Department of Defense spending bill because those dollars are scarce. They are going to get scarcer. And to require the Department of Defense to spend more money than they would have otherwise have spent on energy under this wrongheaded notion, in my view, is just simply bad policy.

So I rise in support of my colleague's amendment, and I urge the adoption of his amendment when it comes to a vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I support the gentleman's amendment, but I do want to understand one thing in terms of what it does to the military's options of purchasing domestic or even North American fuel. And the reason why I say that is, as I understand, the Department of Defense has three strategies in terms of energy, or using less energy. Number one is to increase the fight, decrease the fuel. Number three is increase the capacity. And then number two—and I am going in this order for a reason—is to increase the fuel options, the choices, to diversify the fuel sources. And it appears to me that 526 has inadvertently eliminated some of the options.

I would like to yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES) to explain that a little bit further, particularly with respect to domestic energy sources.

Mr. FLORES. Thank you for the chance to provide further weight to this amendment.

It's important to know that much of the oil that we import from the oil

sands in Canada winds up being blended in several refined fuels throughout the United States. So if you took a literal reading of section 526, theoretically the military would not be able to use any of those fuels since the oil sands as a source is considered to be banned by section 526.

The oil from Canada from the oil sands is stable North American oil and gas. And it is in large part produced by Americans and creating American jobs. Section 526 would cut off this safe, friendly, stable source of fuel to this country. And my amendment does nothing to restrict the military from looking at all alternative sources of fuel. It allows them to go with biofuels, whatever alternative energy sources they need. It just takes away burdensome restrictions that are based on environmental views that aren't proven.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned about, with 84 million barrels of fuel produced every day, and America only having control of about 3 percent of that, yet consuming 25 percent, wherever we can use a friendly source of fuel is something that we need to keep open as an option.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for tax collection purposes by the Afghan Ministry of Finance.

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

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

The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the American taxpayer is spending \$2 billion a week in Afghanistan. Among the expenditures are payment for projects that are rebuilding infrastructure in Afghanistan—roads, bridges, schools, in some cases hospitals.

The Washington Post recently reported that the Afghan Government is taxing American aid. We send the money there to build a road. We have to hire contractors in order to do that, and the Afghan Government is trying to tax that money for their own coffers.

So it's not enough that our taxpayers are spending billions of dollars on projects to rebuild their infrastructure. The Afghan Government is literally trying to reach into the pocket and

double dip and tax our taxpayers for our taxpayers' generosity in giving them money. Now, how does that make any sense at all?

Among the things that the Afghan officials are doing, after this was reported, is stepping up their efforts to grab that cash. They are doing things like threatening to detain contractors. If they don't pay up, take money that's assigned to build that road and put that money in the Afghan coffers, they, the Afghan officials, are threatening, Mr. Chairman, to detain our contractors. They are denying licenses to our contractors, again, in an effort to do what I could only call a shakedown.

Third, they are revoking visas for unpaid tax bills. We are spending a substantial amount of our money rebuilding their infrastructure. We should not be taxed, nor should we allow our taxpayers, essentially, to be stuck up by the Afghan officials.

This amendment, offered by my colleague from Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, would end that practice.

So we believe this is overdue. There should be no tolerance for this double-dipping by the Afghan Government, and our amendment is an effort to crack down on that process.

I thank my colleague from Washington for joining me in the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

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

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination about the use of funds by a foreign government entity. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

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

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

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. We are working on making this amendment something that can be passed as a part of this bill, but I just want to speak in support of it and share part of the reason I am very honored to be working with the gentleman from Vermont on this.

Basically, we are in Afghanistan right now helping to rebuild, or in many cases build from scratch, infrastructure. And when we leave that country—and I do hope it will be soon—we will leave that infrastructure behind. Power grids, water systems, trained law enforcement are the building blocks of a functioning society.

We will spend or have spent hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars on improvements meant to better the lives of the people in Afghanistan.

The reason I supported this amendment is we don't need to also be paying taxes to the Afghan Government for the privilege of rebuilding that country, and that's why I cosponsored the amendment.

The Department of Defense funding should be focused on providing soldiers training in the field and on the front lines with the tools they need to protect themselves and defend our country. This amendment would uphold or, as it was offered, as we attempted, would uphold existing law and clarify existing agreements between the U.S. and Afghanistan, prohibiting Afghanistan from taxing U.S. subcontractors doing work in Afghanistan. So this ban on levying taxes would also apply to all subcontractors that may not have direct contracts with Afghanistan.

In other words, if a company is working on a project funded by the U.S. Department of Defense, whether that company is a prime contractor or a subcontractor, that company should not be subject to taxes from the Afghan Government.

It seems pretty simple. These are the contractors doing the work of rebuilding in Afghanistan, helping rebuild the infrastructure and hopefully allowing them to one day thrive independently.

So common sense and financial prudence says the U.S. should not be subject to taxation for the rebuilding efforts it is paying for. That was what we were getting at with this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think that the point you have raised is a very valid point and something that is very good discussion matter.

Unfortunately, we believe that it is authorizing on an appropriation, as the Chair has confirmed, but that's probably the concern far more than the philosophical concern.

So I think that if you and the gentleman can work on some other language, make another run at it, I cannot speak for the real chairman of the committee, but I think that there are going to be a number of people who would have sympathies with you because I think you have raised a very valid point.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Very good. We will continue to work on this issue, and I thank you for hearing my point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any rule, regulation, or executive order regarding the disclosure of political contributions that takes effect on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, in April a draft executive order was circulated that would require all companies bidding on Federal contracts to disclose all Federal campaign contributions.

If enacted, this executive order would effectively politicize the Federal procurement process, in my opinion. Companies wouldn't merely be judged by the merits of their past performance, by the capability to do the job, but would also be obviously considered on the basis of who they gave money to or against.

This would clearly chill the constitutionally protected right to donate to political parties, candidates and causes of one's choice; and, I think, frankly, that's exactly what the executive order, proposed executive order, is intended to do.

My amendment would simply prohibit funds from this act being used to implement such an executive order.

It doesn't change existing Federal campaign contribution law in any way. It doesn't prevent the disclosure of campaign contributions. It simply says we won't spend money from this bill to require campaign contribution information to be submitted along with bids for Federal contracts.

This House has agreed to this concept on three previous occasions: once in the bill, once in an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, and once in an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act.

Finally, it's worth noting that Congress has rejected an effort to do exactly what this proposed executive order intends to do when it failed to pass the DISCLOSE Act in 2010.

Mr. Chairman, pay-to-play has no place in the Federal procurement contract, and we should try to keep politics out of the selection of vendors and businesses and contractors to go about doing Federal works. So I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Our system has been improved by having public disclosure of political contributions. The more the public knows about where the money is coming from, the better off the citizenry is.

The amendment is a legislative attempt to circumvent a draft executive order, which would provide for increased disclosure of the political contributions of government contractors, especially contributions given to third-party entities.

Opposition exists for this effort because some believe this additional information could be used nefariously to create some kind of enemies list, like during the Nixon administration.

□ 1710

They argue that companies should not disclose more information because people in power could misuse that information to retaliate against them. Using the opposition's logic, all campaign disclosures would be bad. Government contractors already disclose contributions and expenditures by their PACs and those who contribute to them. Contributions by the officers and directors of government contractors are also required to be disclosed.

These provisions are fine as they are written. The information is required to be provided already in law. And the executive order that the amendment would circumvent certainly enhances the quality of that information.

Disclosure is good because disclosure of campaign contributions to candidates is good. Disclosure of companies making these disclosures is good. And I just worry that we have a situation here where companies or major entities could make enormous contributions secretly, and that's what we are trying to avoid. And the President's executive order is an attempt to do that. We already know that the Boeings, the Lockheeds, the General Dynamics and the Northrop Grummans all make campaign contributions, and they are all disclosed. What's wrong with disclosure?

I urge a "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I accept the amendment because I believe that the things that Mr. DICKS is talking about in this amendment actually do move us in that direction.

I would like to yield to Mr. COLE and ask him to clarify that because I want it confirmed.

Mr. COLE. I would simply say to my good friend from Washington, who I respect frankly as much I do anybody in this Congress, the intent here is to make sure we never link political contributions with the awarding of government contracts. If we want to require additional disclosure, the Congress has it within its ability to do that, and indeed we considered something like this in 2010 and decided it was inappropriate. And that was a time when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in control of both Houses as well the Presidency.

So I understand the concerns, but I think this is an inappropriate way to address them. Number one, the executive order, frankly, is legislating through the back door. If we want to change the campaign contribution laws in the United States, that needs to be done here, not by executive fiat.

And, secondly, to link it with the contracting process is inevitably going to raise questions, create fears and doubt and I think without question chill political speech. So let's just simply keep contracting and the awarding of the contract by the Government of the United States separate from partisan political considerations and contributions. I think we would be better off.

I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I just listened with great curiosity to the comments that were made about the so-called intent of the legislation. I don't see my colleagues on the other side bringing forward legislation that you have the power to pass given the number of votes that you have for full disclosure.

So if you're opposed to a draft executive order, if you're opposed to my coming to the floor and blocking every time I offer an amendment for disclosure in transparency, change it. You were for it before you went against it, the Republicans were. That's what the record is. So I rise in opposition to Representative COLE's amendment which blocks disclosure of contractor political spending.

Now, this is not to create any kind of list. You can come up with all kinds of things about why you're against something and then try to label it. This is about disclosure. This is about sunshine. This is about disinfectant, and you're against it. I think that's a bad place to be. In fact, I think it's the wrong side of history.

The draft of the President's order would require disclosure requirements for contractors who do business with the Federal Government. Now, any business that does business with the Federal Government is paid with taxpayer dollars. Why shouldn't there be transparency, accountability, and disclosure relative to those dollars? This amendment, your amendment, would prohibit disclosure, which I think is the exact wrong thing to do.

We should oppose any amendment—we should oppose any amendment, Republican or Democrat—that's designed to keep the public less informed about what happens to their tax dollars. We know who supports this amendment. It's the American League of Lobbyists, the lobbyists for the lobbyists. Surprise, surprise.

They're trumpeting their opposition to the President's draft order. We should be fighting for the taxpayers, not for the uber-, superlobbyists. What are we here for? We are here for the public interest, for the people. And yet there is an amendment on the floor that would destroy any attempt at disclosure.

Again, I remember when the Republicans supported disclosure. When we wanted contribution limits, Republicans said, no, we need disclosure instead. Now that we are asking for disclosure, you're opposed to it. As I said, you were for it, now you're against it.

The American people were very clear on this late last year when there was a CBS/New York Times poll, and that poll found that 92 percent of Americans support requiring outside groups to disclose how much money they have raised, where it came from and how it was used.

Now we are going directly to taxpayer dollars, those that do business with the Federal Government. It's very simple to disclose. We should be listening to the American people, and I would ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

This is a bad amendment. It's not good for the country. It's not good for our system. I don't believe it's why the people sent us here. And of all things to be stomping on and trying to snuff out, disclosure should not be one of them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$8,500,000,000, not to be derived from amounts of appropriations made available—

- (1) by title I ("Military Personnel");
- (2) under the heading "Defense Health Program" in title VI ("Other Department of Defense Programs"); or
- (3) by title IX ("Overseas Contingency Operations").

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment. It's kind of a test of whether or not Members of this body believe what they say. Fortunately, I think for all concerned, the oath we take at the beginning of the session does not carry over to specific statements. So the fact that I believe this will probably, unfortunately, show a great gap between what people say and what they vote will have no consequences other than the public knowing it.

We are at a time of austerity. We are at a time when the important programs, valid programs, are being cut back. And we were told by some, everything is on the table, there are no sacred cows, all those metaphors that are supposed to suggest that we will deal with everything. And then we get this appropriation from the Appropriations Committee for the military budget. At a time when we are cutting police officers on the streets of our cities, we are cutting back firefighters, we're cutting back maintenance of highways, of the construction of bridges to replace old bridges, when we are cutting in almost every capacity, the military budget gets a \$17 billion increase for this fiscal year to the next.

A \$17 billion increase for the military budget simply does not fit with this argument that we are putting everything on the table. Yes, they say they're putting everything on the table, but there is a little bit of a problem with the preposition here—not the proposition, the preposition.

□ 1720

The military budget is not on the table. The military is at the table, and it is eating everybody else's lunch. We are cutting area after area. For example, we have been told by some on the Republican side that we cannot afford to go to the aid of those of our fellow citizens who have been the victims of natural disasters who have suffered enormous physical and, therefore, also psychological damage from tornadoes and floods unless we find the cuts elsewhere. But if we were not increasing the military budget by \$17 billion over this year, then there would be no need to do that and you would not have to worry about that aid.

Now, my colleagues, this is co-authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). We are being very moderate here. We are not saying don't give the Pentagon any more money. This amendment reduces by 50 percent the increase for the Pentagon. We are accepting \$8.5 billion more.

By the way, this, of course, does not affect the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It just occurred to me, maybe this was said earlier, the budget for Afghanistan, which we refuse to cut, reluctantly, regrettably, was voted out by the committee before the President announced a 10,000 troop reduction. So we are overfunding Afghanistan unless you think the President was kidding when he said we are going to bring down 10,000 troops. We funded 10,000 troops for next year that won't be there in Afghanistan. And that is the problem.

We are saying to the Pentagon, You find it. Don't cut military personnel. Don't cut health, but perhaps some of the bases we maintain overseas, some

of the subsidies we give to NATO. Lip service is paid here to an alliance in which they participate.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I have to say it is true of the Obama administration and the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, they are the enablers of one of the great welfare dependencies in the history of the world: the ability of wealthy European nations, 61 years after the foundation of NATO, to get subsidized by America so their military budgets can be a small percentage of ours as percentage of the GDP so they can provide more services, better rail, better health care, and earlier retirement for their own people.

This says to the Pentagon not that we are going to cut you. This gives them a greater than 1 percent increase at a time when everybody else is being cut. And it leaves it up to the Pentagon. Let's look at the bases that we have all over the world. Let's look at efficient procedures. Yes, there is inefficiency.

You cannot mandate efficiency from the outside when you simultaneously give the entity in question the ability to spend without limit. You will never get efficiency, Mr. Chairman, at the Pentagon if we don't begin to subject them to the same kind of fiscal discipline that everybody else gets. And it is undeniable that the Pentagon is a great exception here.

We are going to be telling American cities to continue to lay off cops, to continue to ignore important reconstruction projects that help with transportation. We are going to continue to cut back on firefighters. We are going to continue to quibble over financial disaster relief, but we will give the Pentagon, unless this amendment passes, an additional \$17 billion that we cannot afford.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a somewhat different perspective than my friend from Massachusetts does on the trend line of defense spending.

Looking at the long term, defense spending has actually, over time, come down pretty dramatically as a percent of our gross national product. In 1960, at the height of the Cold War, we spent about 9 percent of the GDP on defense. In 1980 in the great Reagan defense buildup, it was about 6 percent. It fell as low as 3.5 percent on the eve of 9/11. It is barely 5 percent, or in that range, today. So by historical standards, particularly since 1940, we do not spend a large percentage of the national wealth on defense.

By the way, the same thing is true of the Federal budget. In 1960, about 50 percent of the Federal budget was defense spending. It was about 33 percent in 1980. It is about 18 or 19 percent

today. Certainly a lot of money, and that is certainly not the only way in which to judge military spending, but if looked at in terms of the size of the Federal budget or the wealth of the country, defense has been, comparatively speaking, a bargain compared to other parts of the budget.

I would also like to point out that, frankly, this Defense Subcommittee and the administration have worked to find additional economies. Secretary Gates made \$78 billion in reductions over the next 5 years, and this budget itself is below what the President of the United States asked us to appropriate by \$9 billion. In addition, the Secretary has laid out a path for an additional \$400 billion worth of savings.

I think most Americans would be shocked to find out we are engaged in two or three wars, depending on how you want to count, with an Army that is almost 40 percent smaller than it was in 1982.

So I yield to no one in terms of trying to find savings in defense, but I think the record ought to be clear: As a percentage of our national wealth, as a percentage of the Federal budget, what we spend on defense has come down. And, frankly, we ought to remember that we are at war; we are in a dangerous situation. This is not the first place to cut, although cut we have. In my opinion, I think it is the last place that we ought to cut.

And the consequences of what my friend proposes, I think, would be terrific. We would be reducing and canceling training for returning troops, canceling Navy training exercises, reducing Air Force flight training, delaying or canceling maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles, and delaying important safety and quality-of-life repairs.

This is not the time for us to embark on additional cuts on top of the restraints in spending that we have already done as a House. I would urge the rejection of my friend's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite numbers of words.

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

Mr. HOLT. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

You know, all of Washington inside the Beltway is abuzz about how much we can save by cutting Federal spending. As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) said, to us, this amendment is a test. Will we put every Federal agency's budget on the table in our quest to control spending and reduce debt, or are there privileged categories? Will we continue down the path of trying to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, the disabled, schoolchildren, and seniors?

The Pentagon spending bill before us, some \$650 billion, nearly two-thirds of a trillion dollars, is about equal to all military spending of all the rest of the

world—all of our allies, all of our potential adversaries, and all of those countries that Americans rarely think about all put together.

The amendment that Mr. FRANK and I and some of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are offering today is truly a modest proposal. It would simply cut the rate of increase in Pentagon spending. Instead of allowing a \$17 billion increase over this year's level, it would cut that increase in half just to see if we are willing to do that.

Now, my colleague, Mr. COLE, puts this, I think, in the wrong context. I mean, we should talk about, sure, in 1960 it was a larger part of the budget. That is before we had Medicare, before we had a lot of programs. But when you ask yourself if our military structured to deal with the problems this country faces and to expect from other countries in the world their share of what must be done, the answer surely is this is an unsustainable size.

This amendment was born out of a series of discussions among Mr. FRANK and Mr. PAUL and Mr. JONES and some other Members and I have had over several months. Recently, we sent a joint letter that outlined our concerns about the state of our spending on national security. We point out not only the excessive, unquestioned overall size of military spending, but also that this is a result of the military that is indeed a remnant of the Cold War, to go back to Mr. COLE's comments. And it bears far more than our share of keeping the peace and is still structured to overwhelm the Soviet Union more than to deal with today's actual threats to our security.

To take one example that the cosponsors of this amendment may or may not agree with me on but we might ask: Why do we need a replacement for the B-2 bomber?

□ 1730

It was not the B-2 bomber or any bomber that killed Osama bin Laden. It was U.S. Special Operations. Buying new nuclear bombers would simply be a form, I think, of defense sector corporate welfare to protect against a threat that went away decades ago. I could cite multiple additional disconnects between our defense spending priorities and the actual threats we face.

One that comes to mind is Libya. As we note in our letter, it has been widely reported in the press that England and France have been pressing the United States to resume its earlier role in Libya because they've been unable to assume it themselves. The explanation is that only America has the capacity to respond.

Our point precisely.

We have allowed other nations in the world to grow into an overdependence on America's military and America's tax dollars and the expenditure of American money and lives far beyond what's appropriate for our share of world peacekeeping. All of us who sup-

port this amendment want to protect our country. That's precisely why we've offered our proposal and this amendment: To put ourselves on track for a better structured military.

Spending money on cold war-era weapons to wage undeclared wars of choice is clear evidence of misguided, needlessly expensive priorities. If the House cannot even pass an amendment that simply cuts the rate of increase in Pentagon spending, it will never pass amendments that actually make the kinds of cuts that are truly necessary to restructure our defense in order to meet the real threats we face and to achieve the budget savings that we must secure for our financial future.

I urge my colleagues to support this modest first step to rein in our out-of-control defense budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I rise in support of the Frank-Holt amendment.

This is a modest amendment. Quite frankly, I wish the cut were greater than the cut being proposed here, because I think everybody in this Chamber knows that there is a great deal of waste and abuse that exists within our military spending. We have no-bid defense contracts. We go right down that road of all the contracts that we've divvied out and how wasteful they've been, and we're still building and preserving weapons systems that are remnants of the cold war that even our Joint Chiefs of Staff don't want. So there is savings to be had within the military.

The other point I want to make is that, when we talk about national security and national strength, we ought to be talking about making sure that the people in this country can earn a decent living. National security should mean jobs. It should mean the strength of our infrastructure, the quality of our education system, which we are neglecting. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to balance the budget by cutting those very programs that, I think, provide our economic strength. When you go home to your districts, the first thing that people want to talk about is jobs. It is economic security.

Why aren't we doing more to create jobs? Why aren't we talking more about jobs here in the Capitol?

So I make those two points because I think this amendment is a modest amendment that moves us in the right direction and that moves this discussion in a better direction.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First of all, what we are saying is they get an increase. So, if you vote against this amendment, apparently you believe that they are 101½ percent efficient at

the current level, because you're giving them, we would say, a 101½ percent increase. You must believe it's a 103 percent increase, those who vote against this. People pay lip service where there are some inefficiencies, but you will not get at them unless there is some limit to the spending.

I particularly want to address the very odd notion that we should decide what we need to spend on the military today by using as a standard what the situation was 51 years ago. That's the problem. Fifty-one years ago, Germany was divided. The Communists controlled Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary and East Germany. Our Western allies were poor, and they were still recovering from 1945. The Soviet Union was very strong. That's precisely the problem. This budget out of the Appropriations Committee and from the administration, which is also incorrect on this, acts as if it were still 1960. The fact is that it is no longer appropriate for the rest of the world to expect us to put out so much of the burden. That's what the issue is.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said, oh, well, we'll have to cut this here and that there.

Why? Why don't we cut some of the money we spend in Europe, in Japan and in other wealthy and secure nations?

This amendment tells the Pentagon, You're only going to get half of the \$17 billion increase on top of the \$500 billion-plus you already get. You decide where to stop spending.

Well, are they able to stop spending overseas?

Foreign aid is very unpopular, I think unduly unpopular. I like to help poor children and to fight disease, but the biggest foreign aid program in the history of the world is the American military budget and its foreign aid for the un-needy, its foreign aid for the wealthy. You want to talk about percentages of the GDP that are in the budget. What about Germany? What about England? What about France? What about Italy? What about Denmark? What about the Netherlands? All are our great allies, and none spend as much as half a percentage as we do.

So what we now have here, apparently, the House is going to decide. When Members have said that the Pentagon should be subjected to fiscal discipline and that other needs will be taken into account and that the deficit is the greatest threat to national security—people have quoted Mike Mullen as saying that and Robert Gates as saying that—do the Members understand what it means? It means that you don't even cut the Pentagon, that you don't even level fund them, but you don't give them \$17 billion additional. You give them \$8.5 billion at a time when you are requiring cuts in very important programs.

I will reemphasize that this is a House which says we can't afford to go to the aid of our fellow citizens who have been devastated by disasters in

the southeastern part of the country and elsewhere unless we make offsetting cuts. Well, to the extent that you give the Pentagon an additional \$17 billion, you exacerbate that dilemma, and you make it harder to find the funds necessary to go to the aid of the people in this area.

Yes, we want to keep the American people safe. I want to keep them safe from unsound bridges, from fires that can't be effectively combated, from food that isn't adequately tested, and from diseases. People are unsafe because we are cutting back on health research.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The notion that the only danger to the American people is a Soviet Union which collapsed 20 years ago or whatever it is we are protecting people from in Germany and other bases such as that ignores the need for better public safety here, better public health here, research on disease, protection against disaster. It's one thing to go to the aid of people after a disaster, but let's do a better job of building those structures that can help diminish it.

This is a central question: Are the Members of the House going to say, "No, we didn't really mean it? No, the Pentagon is not subject to fiscal discipline"?

My friend from Oklahoma said, oh, no, there were cuts; there's \$78 billion in cuts coming over the next 5 years. This is a \$17 billion increase. How can that be a cut? It may be a cut from a \$30 billion increase, and that \$30 billion increase is a cut from a \$200 billion increase, but it ain't a cut. It's a \$17 billion increase, and we say let it only be an \$8.5 billion increase.

So the question is not are we going to treat the Pentagon more generously with less discipline than any other entity. We've conceded that. We're only asking that you cut in half the extent to which you are going to tell American cities to lay off cops, that you're going to say that we don't have enough to provide disaster relief without making cuts elsewhere, that you're going to cut health research, that you're going to cut food inspection, that you're going to cut fire service, that you're going to cut the reconstruction of bridges in America.

Tens and tens of billions will be spent in Western Europe and on our allies that needed our help 61 years ago and 51 years ago but who don't need it today—in Japan and in other parts of the world where we're subsidizing their military budgets so they can spend more elsewhere.

By the way, let me close with this: We talk about competition and things that count—our ability to spend money on community colleges, to provide aid so that people can become scientists and engineers, our ability to develop technology. All of those things are hampered by the drain on resources we get from spending military dollars in precisely those countries with which we are competing. England and Germany and France and the Netherlands and Denmark and Japan can all spend more on their education and on their technology—on those areas where we are competitive in a friendly way because we allow them to keep their military budgets to a much lower percentage of GDP than ours, and that is the relevant measure.

□ 1740

So we again have a test: Are Members so caught up in the history—and again, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for helping make the point; 1960 is his reference point. Well, stay with the concerns of 1960 and use that as a reference point and things are not going to look very good in 2011.

I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'm having a hard time believing what I'm hearing in this Chamber when it comes to national defense. You don't get a bookkeeper or an accountant to make some sleight-of-hand number to come up with a defense number. That's not how you do it. The way you do it is decide what is the threat; what is threatening America, what is threatening our allies overseas, what is threatening our troops or our businesses around the world? Decide what that threat is, and then decide how we're going to meet that threat. That's how you come up with a defense number.

Just imagine we are going back to the good old days of just slashing defense, gutting the victory fund, and the hangars were full of hangar queens—hangar queens being airplanes that can't fly because they don't have engines or they don't have parts. And in order to make one airplane fly, they had to cannibalize two or three others to get enough parts to make one airplane fly. Well, if you need three or four airplanes in the air but only one flies, somebody is in trouble. We don't want to go back to the days of a hangar queen, the "hollow force" so-called.

And what about the troops out in combat facing a vicious enemy, and they get to the point where they haven't really experienced what they are about to experience because we didn't get that far in our training because the training was curtailed? When you start cutting back the money, you

start cutting back the training, you start cutting back the flying hours, you start cutting back the ability of that soldier to reach out and say, hey, I know exactly how to do this because I was trained properly. Don't cut the training, don't do it. Don't cut our readiness by cutting training. Don't cut our readiness by having hangars full of hangar queens that can't fly or by having garages full of vehicles that can't run because of a lack of spare parts.

This is just not good defense. You don't make your defense decisions based on some magical scheme or some solution that an accountant might come up with. You had better be very careful about what the threat is. We don't want any more Pearl Harbors; we don't want any more U.S. World Trades on 9/11; we don't want any more attacks on the Pentagon. We were not well enough prepared there with our intelligence. We need to make sure that we invest enough in intelligence to make sure that we stop those things before they happen.

Defense is not something to play games with. Defense is not something to stand up and say, hey, I'm a cost-cutter. All of us are cost-cutters in our own way; some of us just have different priorities for what costs ought to be cut.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. This subcommittee did a very good job in reducing and saving over \$9 billion on this bill alone. This is a terrible amendment. I hope that we overwhelmingly defeat this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. II. None of the funds made available by this Act for international military education and training, foreign military financing, excess defense articles, assistance under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law (109-163; 119 Stat. 3456), issuance for direct commercial sales of military equipment, or peacekeeping operations for the countries of Chad, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Burma may be used to support any military training or operations that include child soldiers, as defined by the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in 2008, this body declared that the United States would not provide military assistance to countries found guilty of using child soldiers. With broad bipartisan support, we declared that this is an affront to human dignity and an affront to civilization itself, and we reaffirmed this policy earlier this year in the continuing resolution.

It is the policy of our Nation that children—all children, no matter where they are—belong on playgrounds and not battlegrounds, Mr. Chairman. But that policy is at risk, and this body has an important decision to make. Six governments were found guilty of using child soldiers in 2010—Burma, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. As the law we passed provided, four were granted national security interest waivers last year in the hopes, Mr. Chairman, that they would take serious and aggressive strides toward ending this serious human rights violation. Somalia was also permitted to continue receiving peacekeeping assistance, effectively sanctioning only Burma, a country to which we provided no military assistance anyway.

Mr. Chairman, this administration has been heavily criticized for this decision. And it is no surprise that in the newly released 2011 child soldiers report, the same six countries were listed as violators once again. Mr. Chairman, we must ask, where is the progress? The 2011 report needs to stand as a challenge to President Obama, the administration, and this Congress as well. We are operating inconsistently, obligated by law and civilized order itself to combat this most serious human rights violation—especially prevalent in the world's ungoverned spaces—but we continue with military assistance, with inattentiveness to stopping the pernicious use of child soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment reaffirms current U.S. policy, lest we forget it. In the 2011 continuing resolution, we extended the Child Soldiers Prevention Act to cover peacekeeping operations, and my amendment is consistent with this. It also clarifies a point of law not mentioned in the Child Soldiers Prevention Act. Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006 provides the Department of Defense the authority to

train and equip foreign military forces. But according to its own terms and the State Department, section 1206 authorities may not be used to provide any type of equipment, supplies, or training that is otherwise prohibited by any other provision of law.

Mr. Chairman, children in these countries are being preyed upon, innocent lives are being lost, children are being thrown into psychological hell. Girl soldiers and some boys are being subjected to grotesque sexual slavery and violence. They are property. Their lives are not their own. They are battered, beaten, victimized, stripped of dignity, hope, and a future, made to do unfathomable things by the world's worst criminals.

Mr. Chairman, these criminals just aren't faceless rebels in the bush either. While there are plenty of those, we are talking now about governments that are guilty of this pernicious practice. And we need to make it clear: Are we going to tolerate this or not? William Wilberforce, the British statesman and unyielding abolitionist for whom our anti-human trafficking law is named, once said this: "You may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you did not know."

□ 1750

We must make it clear to these governments that we do now know and that we cannot look the other way, Mr. Chairman. With that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to express support for this good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 61 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. SHERMAN of California.

An amendment by Mr. ROHRBACHER of California.

An amendment by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 249, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

AYES—176

Adams	Gowdy	Pastor (AZ)
Akin	Graves (GA)	Paul
Amash	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Baldwin	Grijalva	Peterson
Bass (NH)	Guinta	Petri
Benishek	Hall	Pingree (ME)
Berg	Hanabusa	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pompeo
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Braley (IA)	Heck	Price (GA)
Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Quigley
Broun (GA)	Himes	Reed
Buchanan	Hinchee	Reichert
Bucshon	Honda	Renacci
Buerkle	Huelskamp	Ribble
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Richardson
Burton (IN)	Hultgren	Rigell
Campbell	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Capito	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Chaffetz	Jones	Rooney
Cicilline	Jordan	Roskam
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Ross (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Kingston	Royce
Clay	Kucinich	Rush
Cleaver	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Coble	Landry	Schilling
Cole	Lankford	Schmidt
Conyers	Latham	Schweikert
Costello	Latta	Scott (SC)
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Davis (KY)	Long	Sensenbrenner
DeFazio	Lummis	Serrano
Denham	Lynch	Sessions
DesJarlais	Mack	Sherman
Duffy	Maloney	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	Markey	Stearns
Emerson	McClintock	Stutzman
Farenthold	McGovern	Sullivan
Fincher	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Tiberi
Flake	McMorris	Tipton
Fleming	Rodgers	Upton
Flores	Mica	Visclosky
Foxx	Michaud	Walberg
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Walsh (IL)
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Waters
Garrett	Moore	West
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gibson	Nadler	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano	Woodall
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Noem	Wu
Goodlatte	Nugent	Yoder
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (AK)

NOES—249

Ackerman	Bartlett	Black
Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Blackburn
Alexander	Bass (CA)	Blumenauer
Altmire	Becerra	Bonner
Andrews	Berkley	Bono Mack
Austria	Berman	Boren
Baca	Biggart	Boswell
Bachus	Bilbray	Brady (PA)
Barletta	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Barrow	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)

Butterfield Hirono
 Calvert Hochul
 Camp Holden
 Canseco Holt
 Cantor Hoyer
 Capps Hunter
 Cardoza Inslee
 Carnahan Israel
 Carney Issa
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee
 Carter (TX)
 Cassidy Jenkins
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Chabot Johnson (OH)
 Chandler Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Johnson, Sam
 Clyburn Kaptur
 Coffman (CO) Kelly
 Cohen Kildee
 Conaway Kind
 Connolly (VA) King (IA)
 Cooper King (NY)
 Costa Kinzinger (IL)
 Courtney Kissell
 Cravaack Kline
 Crawford Lamborn
 Crenshaw Lance
 Critz Langevin
 Crowley Larsen (WA)
 Cuellar Larson (CT)
 Davis (CA) LaTourette
 DeGette Levin
 DeLauro Lewis (CA)
 Dent Lewis (GA)
 Deutch Lipinski
 Diaz-Balart Loebstack
 Dicks Lofgren, Zoe
 Dingell Lowey
 Doggett Lucas
 Dold Luetkemeyer
 Donnelly (IN) Lujan
 Doyle Lungren, Daniel
 Dreier E.
 Edwards Marchant
 Ellison Marino
 Ellmers Matheson
 Engel Matsui
 Eshoo McCarthy (CA)
 Farr McCarthy (NY)
 Fattah McCaul
 Filner McCollum
 Fleischmann McCotter
 Forbes McDermott
 Fortenberry McIntyre
 Franks (AZ) McKeon
 Frelinghuysen McNerney
 Fudge Meehan
 Gallegly Meeks
 Garamendi Miller (NC)
 Gerlach Miller, Gary
 Granger Miller, George
 Green, Al Moran
 Green, Gene Murphy (CT)
 Griffith (VA) Murphy (PA)
 Grimm Myrick
 Guthrie Neal
 Gutierrez Nunes
 Harper Nunnelee
 Hartzler Olson
 Hastings (FL) Olver
 Hayworth Owens
 Heinrich Pallone
 Hensarling Pascrell
 Herger Pelosi
 Higgins Pence

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson Hinojosa
 Giffords Payne

□ 1818

Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Messrs. CRAVAACK, NEAL, AL GREEN of Texas, TIERNEY, CROWLEY, and BARLETTA changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MOORE, and Messrs. GARRETT of New Jersey, GONZALEZ, SHERMAN, GRIJALVA, HARRIS, GRAVES of Missouri, CONYERS, MILLER of Florida, SULLIVAN, and BILIRAKIS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 515, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MACK). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 175, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—248

Adams Duncan (SC)
 Aderholt Duncan (TN)
 Akin Ellmers
 Alexander Emerson
 Altmire Farenthold
 Amash Fincher
 Austria Fitzpatrick
 Bachmann Flake
 Bachus Fleischmann
 Barletta Fleming
 Barrow Flores
 Bartlett Forbes
 Barton (TX) Fortenberry
 Bass (NH) Foxx
 Benishek Franks (AZ)
 Berg Frelinghuysen
 Bilbray Gallegly
 Bilirakis Gardner
 Bishop (GA) Garrett
 Bishop (UT) Gerlach
 Black Walden
 Blackburn Gingrey (GA)
 Bonner Gohmert
 Boren Goodlatte
 Boustany Gosar
 Brady (TX) Gowdy
 Brooks Granger
 Broun (GA) Graves (GA)
 Buchanan Graves (MO)
 Bucshon Green, Gene
 Buerkle Griffin (AR)
 Burgess Griffin (VA)
 Burton (IN) Grimm
 Calvert Guinta
 Camp Guthrie
 Campbell Hall
 Harper Harper
 Harris Harris
 Carter Hartzler
 Cassidy Hastings (WA)
 Chabot Heck
 Chaffetz Hensarling
 Chandler Herger
 Coble Herrera Beutler
 Coffman (CO) Holden
 Cole Huelskamp
 Conaway Huizenga (MI)
 Costello Hultgren
 Cravaack Hunter
 Crawford Hurt
 Crenshaw Issa
 Critz Jenkins
 Cuellar Johnson (IL)
 Davis (KY) Johnson (OH)
 Denham Johnson, Sam
 Dent Jones
 DesJarlais Jordan
 Dold Kelly
 Donnelly (IN) King (IA)
 Dreier King (NY)
 Duffy Kingston

Price (GA)
 Quayle
 Rahall
 Reed
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Rivera
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Roskam
 Ross (AR)
 Ross (FL)
 Royce
 Runyan

NOES—175

Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Bass (CA)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Biggert
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenuaer
 Bono Mack
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly (VA)
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Frank (MA)
 Fudge
 Garamendi
 Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor
 Cardoza
 Culberson

□ 1822

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Hastings (FL)
 Hayworth
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Insee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kildee
 Kind
 Kucinich
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Loebstack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lujan
 Lynch
 Maloney
 Markey
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (CT)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Olver
 Owens

Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree (ME)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Richard
 Richmond
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stark
 Sutton
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 135, noes 290, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—135

Amash	Gowdy	Pallone
Baldwin	Graves (GA)	Paul
Barton (TX)	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bass (NH)	Griffith (VA)	Peters
Benishkek	Gutierrez	Pitts
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Blumenauer	Hensarling	Quigley
Boswell	Herrera Beutler	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Himes	Rangel
Brady (TX)	Hinchee	Reed
Braley (IA)	Holt	Renacci
Brown (GA)	Honda	Ribble
Buerkle	Huelskamp	Richardson
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Hurt	Rokita
Capuano	Inslee	Ross (FL)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Royce
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Chu	Jordan	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schwartz
Clay	Kucinich	Schweikert
Coble	Labrador	Scott (SC)
Costello	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Crowley	LaTourette	Serrano
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Sessions
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
DeGette	Mack	Southerland
Doyle	Maloney	Stark
Duffy	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	McGovern	Stutzman
Emerson	McHenry	Sutton
Farr	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Tierney
Filner	Miller, George	Tonko
Flake	Mulvaney	Van Hollen
Foxx	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Murphy (PA)	Walsh (IL)
Fudge	Myrick	Welch
Garrett	Nadler	Woodall
Gibson	Napolitano	Woolsey
Goodlatte	Neal	Wu
Gosar	Oliver	Yoder

NOES—290

Ackerman	Blackburn	Cleaver
Adams	Bonner	Clyburn
Aderholt	Bono Mack	Coffman (CO)
Akin	Boren	Cohen
Alexander	Boustany	Cole
Altmire	Brooks	Conaway
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Connolly (VA)
Austria	Buchanan	Cooper
Baca	Bucshon	Costa
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Courtney
Bachus	Butterfield	Cravaack
Barletta	Calvert	Crawford
Barrow	Camp	Crenshaw
Bartlett	Canseco	Critz
Bass (CA)	Cantor	Cuellar
Becerra	Capito	Davis (CA)
Berg	Capps	Davis (IL)
Berkley	Carnahan	Davis (KY)
Berman	Carney	DeLauro
Biggart	Carson (IN)	Denham
Billray	Carter	Dent
Bilirakis	Cassidy	DesJarlais
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Deutch
Bishop (UT)	Chandler	Diaz-Balart
Black	Ciilline	Dicks

Dingell	Langevin	Rigell
Doggett	Lankford	Rivera
Dold	Larsen (WA)	Roby
Donnelly (IN)	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Dreier	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Edwards	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Ellison	Levin	Rogers (MI)
Ellmers	Lewis (CA)	Rooney
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Lipinski	Roskam
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ross (AR)
Fincher	Loeb sack	Rothman (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Long	Roybal-Allard
Fleischmann	Lowey	Runyan
Fleming	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Rush
Forbes	Luján	Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry	Lummis	Sánchez, Linda
Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel	T.
Frelinghuysen	E.	Sanchez, Loretta
Gallely	Lynch	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Marchant	Schiff
Gardner	Marino	Schilling
Gerlach	Markey	Schmidt
Gibbs	Matheson	Schock
Gingrey (GA)	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Granger	McCaul	Sewell
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Sherman
Green, Al	McCotter	Shimkus
Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Shuler
Grijalva	McIntyre	Shuster
Grimm	McKeon	Simpson
Guinta	McKinley	Sires
Guthrie	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Hall	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Hanabusa	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Hanna	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Harris	Meeke	Speier
Harper	Mica	Sullivan
Hartzer	Miller (FL)	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Hayworth	Miller (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Heck	Moore	Thornberry
Heinrich	Moran	Tiberi
Heger	Neugebauer	Tipton
Higgins	Noem	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Nugent	Turner
Hirono	Nunes	Upton
Hochul	Nunnelee	Visclosky
Holden	Olson	Walberg
Hoyer	Owens	Walden
Hultgren	Palazzo	Walz (MN)
Hunter	Pascarell	Wasserman
Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Paulsen	Waters
(TX)	Pearce	Watt
Jenkins	Pelosi	Waxman
Johnson (GA)	Pence	Webster
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson	West
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Westmoreland
Jones	Pingree (ME)	Whitfield
Kaptur	Platts	Wilson (FL)
Kelly	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Kildee	Pompeo	Wittman
King (IA)	Posey	Wolf
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Womack
Kingston	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Kinzinger (IL)	Quayle	Young (AK)
Kissell	Rehberg	Young (FL)
Kline	Reichert	Young (IN)
Lamborn	Reyes	
Lance	Richmond	

NOT VOTING—6

Conyers	Giffords	Payne
Culberson	Issa	Towns

□ 1827

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 316, noes 111, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—316

Adams	Ellmers	Larson (CT)
Akin	Emerson	Latham
Alexander	Farenthold	LaTourette
Amash	Farr	Latta
Andrews	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Austria	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Bachmann	Fincher	Lewis (GA)
Bachus	Fitzpatrick	Lipinski
Baldwin	Flake	LoBiondo
Barletta	Fleischmann	Loeb sack
Bartlett	Fleming	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass (CA)	Flores	Lucas
Bass (NH)	Forbes	Luján
Becerra	Fortenberry	Lummis
Benishkek	Foxx	Lynch
Berg	Frank (MA)	Mack
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Maloney
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Manzullo
Bishop (NY)	Gallely	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Markey
Bonner	Garrett	McCarthy (CA)
Bono Mack	Gerlach	McClintock
Boswell	Gibbs	McGovern
Boustany	Gibson	McHenry
Brady (PA)	Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre
Brady (TX)	Gonzalez	McKeon
Braley (IA)	Goodlatte	McMorris
Brooks	Gosar	Rodgers
Brown (GA)	Gowdy	Mica
Brown (FL)	Graves (GA)	Michaud
Buchanan	Green, Gene	Miller (FL)
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Buerkle	Griffith (VA)	Miller (NC)
Burgess	Grijalva	Miller, Gary
Burton (IN)	Grimm	Miller, George
Butterfield	Guinta	Moore
Calvert	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Camp	Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)
Campbell	Hall	Myrick
Capito	Hanabusa	Nadler
Capps	Hanna	Napolitano
Capuano	Harper	Neal
Carnahan	Harris	Neugebauer
Carney	Hartzler	Nugent
Cassidy	Hastings (FL)	Nunnelee
Castor (FL)	Heck	Palazzo
Chabot	Heinrich	Pallone
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Pascarell
Chu	Herrera Beutler	Pastor (AZ)
Ciilline	Himes	Paul
Clarke (MI)	Hinchee	Paulsen
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Pearce
Clay	Hirono	Pelosi
Cleaver	Holden	Pence
Coble	Holt	Peters
Coffman (CO)	Honda	Petri
Cohen	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Conaway	Hultgren	Platts
Connolly (VA)	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Conyers	Hurt	Pompeo
Costello	Inslee	Posey
Cravaack	Jackson (IL)	Price (GA)
Crawford	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Crenshaw	(TX)	Rangel
Critz	Jenkins	Reed
Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Davis (KY)	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Renacci
DeGette	Jones	Ribble
Denham	Jordan	Richardson
Dent	Kaptur	Rigell
DesJarlais	Keating	Roe (TN)
Deutch	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Doggett	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Dold	Kline	Rokita
Doyle	Kucinich	Rooney
Duffy	Labrador	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Landry	Ross (AR)
Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Ross (FL)
Edwards	Lankford	Rothman (NJ)
Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard

Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schilling
Schmidt
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speler
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—111

Ackerman
Aderholt
Altmire
Baca
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boren
Canseco
Cantor
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carter
Chandler
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Engel
Eshoo
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi

Gohmert
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Higgins
Hochul
Hoyer
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Lamborn
Lance
Levin
Long
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCormack
McCotter
McDermott
McKinley
McNerney

Meehan
Meeks
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Perlmutter
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rahall
Reyes
Richmond
Rivera
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Schiff
Schock
Scott, David
Shuler
Sires
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords

Payne
Towns

□ 1832

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 338, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—89

Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Barletta
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Black
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Campbell
Cardoza
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cohen
Conyers
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emerson
Farenthold
Finler
Fincher

Fox
Frank (MA)
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Guinta
Harris
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Honda
Hultgren
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keating
Kucinich
Landry
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
McClintock
Michaud
Mulvaney
Napolitano

Nugent
Pallone
Paul
Pearce
Petri
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Schilling
Schradler
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Southernland
Stark
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Walsh (IL)
West
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOES—338

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrow
Bartlett
Shuler
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)

Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar

Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Ellison
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCormack
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes

Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Lucas
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Rahall
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (SC)

Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Olver
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speler
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
Giffords

Payne
Towns

□ 1836

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 265, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—162

Adams Griffin (AR) Peterson
Akin Grijalva Petri
Amash Guinta Pitts
Bachmann Gutierrez Poe (TX)
Baldwin Hall Pompeo
Barton (TX) Hanna Posey
Bass (NH) Harris Price (GA)
Benishek Hastings (WA) Reed
Bilbray Heck Reichert
Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler Renacci
Boustany Himes Ribble
Braley (IA) Honda Richardson
Brooks Huizenga (MI) Rigell
Broun (GA) Hultgren Roe (TN)
Buchanan Hurt Rohrabacher
Bucshon Issa Rokita
Buerkle Jackson (IL) Rooney
Burgess Johnson (IL) Ross (FL)
Burton (IN) Jones Royce
Campbell Jordan Schilling
Capito Kingston Schmidt
Chaffetz Kucinich Schweikert
Clarke (MI) Labrador Scott (SC)
Clarke (NY) Landry Scott, Austin
Clay Lankford Sensenbrenner
Cleaver Larson (CT) Serrano
Coble Latham Sessions
Cole LaTourrette Sherman
Conyers Latta Lee (CA) Simpson
Davis (KY) DeFazio Lewis (GA) Smith (NJ)
Denham LoBiondo Southerland
DesJarlais Long Stark
Duffy Lummis Stearns
Duncan (SC) Lynch Stutzman
Duncan (TN) Mack Sullivan
Emerson Maloney Terry
Farenthold Marchant Thompson (PA)
Fincher Tiberi
Fitzpatrick McClintock
Flake McHenry
Fleming McMorris
Flores Rodgers
Foxy Michaud
Gardner Miller (FL)
Garrett Miller (MI)
Gibbs Mulvaney
Gibson Nadler
Gingrey (GA) Napolitano
Gohmert Noem
Gonzalez Nugent
Goodlatte Pastor (AZ)
Gosar Paul
Gowdy Paulsen
Graves (GA) Pearce

NOES—265

Ackerman Carney Edwards
Aderholt Carson (IN) Ellison
Alexander Carter Ellmers
Altmire Cassidy Engel
Andrews Castor (FL) Eshoo
Austria Chabot Farr
Baca Chandler Fattah
Bachus Chu Finer
Barletta Cicilline Fleischmann
Barrow Clyburn Forbes
Bartlett Coffman (CO) Fortenberry
Bass (CA) Cohen Frank (MA)
Becerra Conaway Franks (AZ)
Berg Connolly (VA) Frelinghuysen
Berkley Cooper Fudge
Berman Costa Gallegly
Biggert Costello Garamendi
Bilirakis Courtney Gerlach
Bishop (GA) Cravaack Granger
Bishop (NY) Crawford Graves (MO)
Black Crenshaw Green, Al
Blackburn Critz Green, Gene
Blumenauer Crowley Griffith (VA)
Bonner Cuellar Grimm
Bono Mack Cummings Guthrie
Boren Davis (CA) Hanabusa
Boswell Davis (IL) Harper
Brady (PA) DeGette Hartzler
Brady (TX) DeLauro Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL) Dent Hayworth
Butterfield Deutch Heinrich
Calvert Diaz-Balart Hensarling
Camp Dicks Herger
Canseco Dingell Higgins
Cantor Doggett Hinchey
Capps Dold Hinojosa
Capuano Donnelly (IN) Hirono
Cardoza Doyle Hochul
Carnahan Dreier Holden

Holt McKinley Ryan (OH)
Hoyer McNeerney Ryan (WI)
Huelskamp Meehan Sanchez, Linda
Hunter Meeks T.
Inslee Mica Sanchez, Loretta
Israel Miller (NC) Sarbanes
Jackson Lee Miller, Gary Scalise
(TX) Miller, George Schakowsky
Hall Moore Schiff
Jenkins Johnson (GA) Moran Schock
Kissell Johnson (OH) Murphy (CT) Schrader
Johnson, E. B. Murphy (PA) Schwartz
Johnson, Sam Myrick Scott (VA)
Kaptur Neal Scott, David
Keating Neugebauer Scott, David
Kelly Nunes Sewell
Kildee Nunnelee Shimkus
Kind Olson Shuler
King (IA) Olver Shuster
King (NY) Owens Sires
Kinzinger (IL) Palazzo Slaughter
Kissell Pallone Smith (NE)
Kline Pascrell Smith (TX)
Lamborn Pelosi Smith (VA)
Lance Pence Speier
Langevin Perlmutter Stivers
Larsen (WA) Peters Sutton
Levin Pingree (ME) Thompson (CA)
Lewis (CA) Platts Thompson (MS)
Lipinski Polis Thornberry
Loeb sack Tierney
Lofgren, Zoe Quayle Tonko
Lowey Quigley Tsongas
Lucas Rahall Turner
Luetkemeyer Rangel Van Hollen
Lujan Rehberg Walden
Lungren, Daniel Reyes Walz (MN)
E. Richmond Wasserman
Marino Rivera Schultz
Markey Roby Watt
Matheson Rogers (AL) Waxman
Matsui Rogers (KY) Welch
McCarthy (CA) Rogers (MI) Whitfield
McCarthy (NY) Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (FL)
McCaul Roskam Wittman
McCollum Ross (AR) Womack
McCotter Rothman (NJ) Wu
McDermott Roybal-Allard Yarmuth
McGovern Runyan Yoder
McIntyre Ruppensberger Young (FL)
McKeon Rush Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Culberson
GiffordsPayne
Towns

□ 1840

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 257, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—169

Ackerman Baldwin Bishop (GA)
Altmire Bass (CA) Bishop (NY)
Amash Becerra Blumenauer
Baca Benishek Boswell

Braley (IA) Green, Gene
Broun (GA) Griffith (VA)
Buerkle Grijalva
Butterfield Gutierrez
Campbell Hanabusa
Capps Hastings (FL)
Capuano Heinrich
Cardoza Higgins
Carnahan Himes
Carney Hinchey
Chaffetz Hirono
Chandler Chaffetz Hochul
Chu Holt
Cicilline Hoyer
Clarke (MI) Hurt
Clarke (NY) Inslee
Clay Israel
Cleaver Issa
Clyburn Jackson (IL)
Cohen Johnson (IL)
Connolly (VA) Johnson, E. B.
Conyers Jones
Costa Keating
Costello Kildee
Courtney Kind
Crowley Kucinich
Cummings Langevin
Davis (CA) Larsen (WA)
Davis (IL) Larson (CT)
DeFazio Lee (CA)
DeGette Lewis (GA)
DeLauro Lipinski
Delauro Lofgren, Zoe
Dicks Lowey
Doggett Lujan
Doyle Maloney
Duffy Markey
Duncan (TN) Matsui
Edwards McCollum
Ellison McDermott
Engel McGovern
Eshoo Meeks
Farr Michaud
Filner Miller (MI)
Fitzpatrick Miller (NC)
Flake Miller, George
Frank (MA) Moore
Fudge Moran
Garamendi Murphy (CT)
Garrett Nadler
Gingrey (GA) Napolitano
Goodlatte Neal

NOES—257

Adams Coffman (CO)
Aderholt Cole
Akin Conaway
Alexander Cooper
Andrews Cravaack
Austria Crawford
Bachmann Crenshaw
Bachus Critz
Barletta Cuellar
Barrow Davis (KY)
Bartlett Denham
Barton (TX) Dent
Bass (NH) DesJarlais
Berg Diaz-Balart
Berkley Dingell
Berman Dold
Biggert Donnelly (IN)
Bilbray Dreier
Bilirakis Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT) Ellmers
Black Emerson
Blackburn Farenthold
Bonner Bonner
Bono Mack Fincher
Boren Fleischmann
Boustany Fleming
Brady (PA) Flores
Brady (TX) Forbes
Brooks Fortenberry
Brown (FL) Foxx
Buchanan Franks (AZ)
Bucshon Frelinghuysen
Burgess Gallegly
Burton (IN) Gardner
Calvert Gerlach
Camp Gibbs
Canseco Gibson
Cantor Gohmert
Capito Gonzalez
Carson (IN) Gosar
Carter Gowdy
Cassidy Granger
Chabot Graves (GA)
Coble Graves (MO)

Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Lewis (CA) Pearce
 LoBiondo Pence
 Loeback Perlmutter
 Long Peterson
 Lucas Petri
 Luetkemeyer Pitts
 Lummis Platts
 Lungren, Daniel Poe (TX)
 E. Pompeo
 Lynch Posey
 Mack Price (GA)
 Manzullo Quayle
 Marchant Reed
 Marino Rehberg
 Matheson Reichert
 McCarthy (CA) Renacci
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes
 McCaul Ribble
 McClintock Richardson
 McCotter Rigell
 McHenry Rivera
 McIntyre Roby
 McKeon Roe (TN)
 McKinley Rogers (AL)
 McMorris Rogers (KY)
 Rodgers Rogers (MI)
 Mc Nerney Rohrabacher
 Meehan Rokita
 Mica Rooney
 Miller (FL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Miller, Gary Roskam
 Mulvaney Ross (AR)
 Murphy (PA) Ross (FL)
 Myrick Rothman (NJ)
 Neugebauer Royce
 Noem Runyan
 Nugent Ruppertsberger
 Nunes Ryan (WI)
 Nunnelee Sanchez, Loretta
 Olson Scalise
 Owens Schiff
 Palazzo Schilling
 Paulsen Schmidt

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson Jackson Lee Payne
 Giffords (TX) Towns

□ 1843

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 170, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—256

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

Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Walberg
 Walz (MN)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Jackson Lee Payne
 Towns

Chandler
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly (VA)
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Cuellar
 DeFazio
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Eilmers
 Emerson
 Farnsworth
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Holden
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)

NOT VOTING—5

Jackson Lee Payne
 Towns

□ 1843

Chandler
 Coble
 Coffman (CO)
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly (VA)
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Cravaack
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Critz
 Cuellar
 DeFazio
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Dreier
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Eilmers
 Emerson
 Farnsworth
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Flake
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayworth
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herrera Beutler
 Holden
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)

NOES—170

Ackerman
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Bass (CA)
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Castor (FL)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)

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
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schilling
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott (SC)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (NJ)
 Southerland
 Stearns
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Sullivan
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walsh (IL)
 Webster
 West
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson Jackson Lee Payne
 Giffords (TX) Towns

□ 1847

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—181

Ackerman
 Amash
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baldwin
 Barton (TX)
 Bass (CA)
 Bass (NH)
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Berman
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boswell
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Campbell
 Capuano
 Castor (FL)
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Clarke (MI)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costello
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Deutch
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duffy
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Frank (MA)
 Frank (MI)
 Frank (NY)
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heinrich
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hochul
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Ellison
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Frank (MA)
 Frank (MI)
 Frank (NY)
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Himes
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono

Holt
Honda
Huizenga (MI)
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lujan
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pelosi
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Renacci
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schroeder
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (IL)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—244

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Berg
Berkley
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chandler
Cicilline
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar

Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hochul

Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCotter
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo

Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson
Giffords
Jackson Lee (TX)
Payne
Tiberi
Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1851

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense 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. 1309, FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2011

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-138) on the resolution (H. Res. 340) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to extend the authorization of the national flood insurance program, to achieve reforms to improve the financial integrity and stability of the program, and to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risk, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

REAFFIRMING COMMITMENT TO NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 268) reaffirming the United States commitment to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 6, answered “present” 13, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—407

Ackerman	Cassidy	Fitzpatrick
Adams	Castor (FL)	Flake
Aderholt	Chabot	Fleischmann
Akin	Chaffetz	Fleming
Alexander	Chandler	Flores
Altmire	Chu	Forbes
Andrews	Cicilline	Fortenberry
Austria	Clarke (MI)	Foxy
Baca	Clarke (NY)	Frank (MA)
Bachmann	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Clyburn	Fudge
Barletta	Coble	Gallegly
Barrow	Coffman (CO)	Garamendi
Bartlett	Cohen	Garner
Barton (TX)	Cole	Garrett
Bass (CA)	Conaway	Gerlach
Bass (NH)	Connolly (VA)	Gibbs
Becerra	Conyers	Gibson
Benishek	Cooper	Gingrey (GA)
Berg	Costa	Gohmert
Berkley	Costello	Gonzalez
Berman	Courtney	Goodlatte
Biggart	Cravaack	Gosar
Bilbray	Crawford	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Critz	Graves (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Black	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Griffin (AR)
Bonner	Davis (IL)	Griffith (VA)
Bono Mack	Davis (KY)	Grijalva
Boren	DeFazio	Grimm
Boswell	DeGette	Guinta
Boustany	DeLauro	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	Denham	Gutierrez
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hall
Braley (IA)	DesJarlais	Hanabusa
Brooks	Deutch	Hanna
Broun (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Harris
Buchanan	Dingell	Hartzler
Bucshon	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Buerkle	Dold	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Donnelly (IN)	Hayworth
Burton (IN)	Doyle	Heck
Butterfield	Dreier	Heinrich
Calvert	Duffy	Hensarling
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Herger
Canseco	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Cantor	Ellmers	Higgins
Capito	Emerson	Himes
Capps	Engel	Hinchee
Capuano	Eshoo	Hinojosa
Cardoza	Farenthold	Hirono
Carnahan	Farr	Hochul
Carney	Fattah	Holden
Carter	Filner	Holt
	Fincher	Honda