

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	Sanchez, 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)  
Benishke  
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  
Inlee  
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  
McColum  
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  
Benishke  
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  
Inlee

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  
Inlee

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  
McColum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Olver  
Pallone

Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant

Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant

Lewis (CA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
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)



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  
 Ruppertsberger 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 Pallone T. Sarbanes Towns Wittman  
 Schock Stutzman Whitfield Pascrell Sarbanes Tsongas Walden Wolf  
 Schwartz Sullivan Wilson (FL) Pastor (AZ) Schakowsky Van Hollen Velazquez  
 Schweikert Terry Wittman Paul Terry Schwartz Scott (VA) Schultz  
 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 Young (AK) Young (FL) Wilson (FL)  
 Sessions Turner Young (IN) Quigley Rahall Speier Stark  
 Sewell Van Hollen Young (FL) Young (IN) Rangel  
 Shimkus Walberg Young (IN) Rangel  
 Shuster Walden Walsh (IL)  
 Simpson Walsh (IL)

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 Moore  
 Davis (CA) Holt

Moran Reyes Stutzman  
 Murphy (CT) Rothman (NJ)  
 Nadler Roybal-Allard  
 Napolitano Rush  
 Neal Ryan (OH)  
 Olver Sánchez, Linda  
 Pallone T.  
 Pascrell Sarbanes  
 Pastor (AZ) Schakowsky  
 Paul Terry  
 Paulsen Payne Pelosi Peters Serrano  
 Payne Pelosi Peters Serrano  
 Peters Serrano  
 Pingree (ME) Sherman  
 Polis Sires  
 Price (NC) Slaughter  
 Quigley Smith (WA)  
 Rahall Speier  
 Rangel Stark

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 Gosar Myrick  
 Barletta Gowdy Noem  
 Barrow Granger Nugent  
 Bartlett Nunes  
 Barton (TX) Graves (GA) Nunnelee  
 Bass (NH) Graves (MO) Olson  
 Benishek Griffin (AR) Olsson  
 Berg Grimm  
 Biggert Guinta  
 Bilbray Guthrie  
 Bilirakis Hall  
 Bishop (GA) Hanna  
 Bishop (UT) Harper  
 Black Harris  
 Blackburn Hartzler  
 Bonner Hastings (WA)  
 Bono Mack Hayworth  
 Boren Heck  
 Boustany Hensarling  
 Brady (TX) Herger  
 Brooks Herrera Beutler  
 Broun (GA) Hinojosa  
 Buchanan Huelskamp  
 Bucshon Huizenga (MI)  
 Buerkle Hultgren  
 Calvert Hunter  
 Camp Hurt  
 Campbell Issa  
 Canseco Jenkins  
 Cantor Johnson (IL)  
 Capito Johnson (OH)  
 Cardoza Jordan  
 Carter Kelly  
 Cassidy Kind  
 Chabot King (IA)  
 Chaffetz King (NY)  
 Chandler Kingston  
 Coble Kinzinger (IL)  
 Cole Kline  
 Conaway Labrador  
 Cooper Lamborn  
 Costa Lance  
 Cravaack Landry  
 Crawford Lankford  
 Crenshaw Latham  
 Critz LaTourette  
 Cuellar Latta  
 Davis (KY) Lewis (CA)  
 Denham LoBiondo  
 Dent Long  
 DesJarlais Lucas  
 Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer  
 Dicks Lummis  
 Dold Lungren, Daniel  
 Dreier E.  
 Duffy Mack  
 Duncan (SC) Manzano  
 Duncan (TN) Marchant  
 Ellmers Marino  
 Emerson Matheson  
 Farenthold McCarthy (CA)  
 Fincher McCaul  
 Fitzpatrick McClintock  
 Flake McCotter  
 Fleischmann McHenry  
 Fleming McKeon  
 Flores McKinley  
 Forbes McMorris  
 Fortenberry Rodgers  
 Frelinghuysen Meehan

Thornberry Walsh (IL) Womack  
 Tiberi Walsh (MN) Woodall  
 Tipton Webster Yoder  
 Turner West Young (AK)  
 Upton Westmoreland Young (FL)  
 Visclosky Wilson (SC) Young (IN)  
 Walberg Wittman  
 Walden 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  
 Braley (IA) Heck Peters  
 Brooks Herrera Beutler Petri  
 Broun (GA) Higgins Pingree (ME)  
 Buchanan Holt Poe (TX)  
 Buerkle Honda Posey  
 Burgess Huizenga (MI) Price (GA)  
 Campbell Hultgren Reed  
 Capuano Hunter Rohrabacher  
 Chaffetz Hurt Rokita  
 Clarke (MI) Jackson (IL) Rooney  
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (IL) Ross (FL)  
 Clay Johnson, E. B. Royce  
 Cleaver Jones Sanchez, Loretta  
 Coble Jordan Schilling  
 Cohen Kaptur Schrader  
 Conyers Kucinich Sensenbrenner  
 Costello Labrador Serrano  
 Cummings Landry Sessions  
 DeFazio Lankford Slaughter  
 DesJarlais LaTourette Southerland  
 Doggett Lee (CA) Stark  
 Duffy Lewis (CA) Stearns  
 Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Stutzman  
 Duncan (TN) Lummis Thompson (PA)  
 Edwards Lynch Tiberi  
 Emerson Marchant Tierney  
 Engel Markey Tonko  
 Filner McCaul Velazquez  
 Fincher McCintock Walsh (IL)  
 Fitzpatrick McKinley Waters  
 Frank (MA) Michaud Welch  
 Garrett Miller (NC) West



Westmoreland Woolsey Yoder  
Woodall Wu Young (AK)

Walberg Waxman Wolf  
Walden Webster Womack  
Walz (MN) Whitfield Yarmuth  
Wasserman Wilson (FL) Young (FL)  
Schultz Wilson (SC) Young (IN)  
Watt Wittman

Berg Guinta Nunnelee  
Berkley Guthrie Olson  
Berman Hall Owens  
Biggert Hanabusa Palazzo  
Billbray Hanna Pascrell  
Bilirakis Harper Paulsen  
Bishop (GA) Harris Pearce  
Bishop (UT) Hartzler Pence  
Black Hastings (FL) Peterson  
Blackburn Hastings (WA) Pitts  
Bonner Hayworth Platts  
Bono Mack Heck Poe (TX)  
Boren Heinrich Polis  
Boswell Hensarling Pompeo  
Boustany Herger Posey  
Brady (PA) Herrera Beutler Price (GA)  
Brady (TX) Higgins Quayle  
Brooks Hinojosa Quigley  
Broun (GA) Hochul Rahall  
Buchanan Holden Reed  
Bucshon Hoyer Rehberg  
Buerkle Huelskamp Reichert  
Burgess Huizenga (MI) Renacci  
Burton (IN) Hultgren Reyes  
Calvert Hunter Ribble  
Camp Hurt Rigell  
Campbell Inslee Rivera  
Canseco Israel Roby  
Cantor Issa Roe (TN)  
Capito Jenkins Rogers (AL)  
Cardoza Johnson (GA) Rogers (KY)  
Carnahan Johnson (OH) Rogers (MI)  
Carney Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher  
Carson (IN) Jordan Rokita  
Carter Kaptur Rooney  
Cassidy Kelly Ros-Lehtinen  
Chabot Kildee Roskam  
Chandler Kind Ross (AR)  
Coffman (CO) King (IA) Ross (FL)  
Cole King (NY) Rothman (NJ)  
Conaway Kingston Royce  
Connolly (VA) Kinzinger (IL) Runyan  
Cooper Kissell Ruppberger  
Costa Kline Ryan (WI)  
Cravaack Labrador Sánchez, Linda  
Crawford Lamborn T.  
Crenshaw Lance Sarbanes  
Critz Landry Scalise  
Crowley Langevin Schiff  
Cuellar Lankford Schilling  
Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Schmidt  
Davis (KY) Latham Schock  
Denham LaTourette Schwartz  
Dent Latta Schweikert  
DesJarlais Lewis (CA) Scott (SC)  
Deutch Deuch Lipinski Scott (VA)  
Diaz-Balart LoBiondo Scott, Austin  
Dicks Long Scott, David  
Dingell Lowey Sensenbrenner  
Dold Lucas Sessions  
Donnelly (IN) Luetkemeyer Sewell  
Dreier Luján Shimkus  
Duffy Lummis Shuler  
Duncan (SC) Lungren, Daniel Shuster  
Ellmers E. Simpson  
Emerson Mack Sires  
Engel Manzullo Smith (NE)  
Farenthold Marchant Smith (NJ)  
Fincher Marino Smith (TX)  
Fitzpatrick Matheson Smith (WA)  
Flake McCarthy (CA) Souterland  
Fleischmann McCarthy (NY) Stearns  
Fleming McCaul Stivers  
Flores McClintock Stutzman  
Forbes McCollum Sullivan  
Fortenberry McCotter Terry  
Foxy McHenry Thompson (PA)  
Frelinghuysen McIntyre Thornberry  
Gardner Gallegly McKeon Tipton  
Garrett McKinley Turner  
Gerlach McMorris Upton  
Gibbs Rodgers Van Hollen  
Gibson McNeerney Visclosky  
Gingrey (GA) Meehan Walberg  
Gohmert Meeks Walden  
Gonzalez Mica Walsh (IL)  
Goodlatte Miller (FL) Walz (MN)  
Gosar Miller (MI) Wasserman  
Gowdy Miller, Gary Schultz  
Granger Moran Waxman  
Graves (GA) Mulvaney Webster  
Graves (MO) Murphy (PA) West  
Green, Al Myrick Westmoreland  
Green, Gene Nadler Whitfield  
Griffin (AR) Neugebauer Wilson (FL)  
Griffith (VA) Nugent Wilson (SC)  
Grimm Nunes Wittman  
Wolf

NOES—297

Ackerman Fudge Miller, George  
Aderholt Gallegly Moore  
Akin Garamendi Moran  
Alexander Gardner Murphy (CT)  
Altmire Gibbs Murphy (PA)  
Andrews Gingrey (GA) Myrick  
Austria Gonzalez Nadler  
Baca Gosar Neal  
Bachmann Granger Neugebauer  
Bachus Green, Al Noem  
Barletta Griffin (AR) Nunes  
Barrow Grijalva Nunnelee  
Bartlett Grimm Olson  
Bass (CA) Guinta Owens  
Becerra Guthrie Palazzo  
Berkley Gutierrez Pascrell  
Berman Hanabusa Pastor (AZ)  
Biggert Hanna Paulsen  
Billbray Harper Pelosi  
Bilirakis Harris Pence  
Bishop (GA) Hartzler Perlmutter  
Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Peterson  
Blackburn Hastings (WA) Pitts  
Bonner Hayworth Platts  
Bono Mack Heinrich Polis  
Boren Hensarling Pompeo  
Boswell Herger Price (NC)  
Boustany Himes Quayle  
Brady (PA) Hinchey Quigley  
Brady (TX) Hinojosa Rahall  
Brown (FL) Hirono Rangel  
Bucshon Hochul Rehberg  
Burton (IN) Holden Reichert  
Butterfield Hoyer Renacci  
Calvert Huelskamp Reyes  
Camp Inslee Ribble  
Canseco Israel Richardson  
Cantor Issa Richmond  
Capito Jackson Lee  
Capps (TX) Rigell  
Cardoza Jenkins Rivera  
Carnahan Johnson (GA) Roby  
Carney Johnson (OH) Roe (TN)  
Carson (IN) Johnson, Sam Rogers (AL)  
Carter Kelly Rogers (KY)  
Cassidy Kildee Rogers (MI)  
Castor (FL) Kind Roskam Ros-Lehtinen  
Chabot King (IA) Ross (AR)  
Chandler King (NY) Rothman (NJ)  
Chu Kingston Roybal-Allard  
Cicilline Kinzinger (IL) Runyan  
Clyburn Kissell Ruppberger  
Coffman (CO) Kline Rush  
Cole Lamborn Ryan (OH)  
Conaway Lance Ryan (WI)  
Connolly (VA) Langevin Sánchez, Linda  
Cooper Larsen (WA) T.  
Costa Larson (CT) Sarbanes  
Courtney Latham Scalise  
Cravaack Latta Schakowsky  
Crawford Levin Schiff  
Crenshaw Lewis (GA) Schmidt  
Critz Lipinski Schock  
Crowley Loeb sack Schwartz  
Cuellar Lofgren, Zoe Schweikert  
Davis (CA) Long Scott (SC)  
Davis (IL) Lowey Scott (VA)  
Davis (KY) Lucas Scott, Austin  
DeGette Luetkemeyer Scott, David  
DeLauro Luján Sewell  
Denham Lungren, Daniel Sherman  
Dent E. Shimkus  
Deutch Mack Shuler  
Diaz-Balart Maloney Shuster  
Dicks Manzullo Simpson  
Dingell Marino Sires  
Dold Matheson Smith (NE)  
Donnelly (IN) Matsui Smith (NJ)  
Doyle McCarthy (CA) Smith (TX)  
Dreier McCarthy (NY) Smith (WA)  
Ellison McCollum Speier  
Ellmers McCotter Stivers  
Eshoo McDermott Sullivan  
Farenthold McGovern Sutton  
Farr McHenry Terry  
Fattah McIntyre Thompson (CA)  
Flake McKeon Thompson (MS)  
Fleischmann McMorris Thornberry  
Fleming Rodgers Tipton  
Flores McNeerney Towns  
Forbes Meehan Tsongas  
Fortenberry Meeks Turner  
Foxy Mica Upton  
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Van Hollen  
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI) Visclosky

NOT VOTING—3

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 Fattah Pastor (AZ)  
Baca Filner Paul  
Baldwin Frank (MA) Payne  
Bass (CA) Fudge Pelosi  
Becerra Garamendi Perlmutter  
Benishek Grijalva Peters  
Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Petri  
Blumenauer Himes Pingree (ME)  
Braley (IA) Hinchey Price (NC)  
Brown (FL) Hirono Rangel  
Butterfield Holt Richardson  
Capps Honda Richmond  
Capuano Jackson (IL) Roybal-Allard  
Castor (FL) Jackson Lee  
Chaffetz (TX) Rush  
Chu Johnson (IL) Ryan (OH)  
Cicilline Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Loretta  
Clarke (MI) Jones Schakowsky  
Clarke (NY) Kucinich Schrader  
Clay Larson (CT) Serrano  
Cleaver Lee (CA) Sherman  
Clyburn Levin Slaughter  
Coble Lewis (GA) Speier  
Cohen Loeb sack Stark  
Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Sutton  
Costello Lynch Thompson (CA)  
Courtney Maloney Thompson (MS)  
Cummings Markey Tierney  
Davis (IL) Matsui Tonko  
DeFazio McGovern Towns  
DeGette Michaud  
DeLauro Miller (NC)  
Doggett Miller, George  
Doyle Moore  
Duncan (TN) Murphy (CT)  
Edwards Napolitano  
Ellison Neal  
Eshoo Olver  
Farr Pallone

NOES—314

Ackerman Altmire Barletta  
Adams Andrews Barrow  
Aderholt Austria Bartlett  
Akin Bachmann Barton (TX)  
Alexander Bachus Bass (NH)

Berg Guinta Nunnelee  
Berkley Guthrie Olson  
Berman Hall Owens  
Biggert Hanabusa Palazzo  
Billbray Hanna Pascrell  
Bilirakis Harper Paulsen  
Bishop (GA) Harris Pearce  
Bishop (UT) Hartzler Pence  
Black Hastings (FL) Peterson  
Blackburn Hastings (WA) Pitts  
Bonner Hayworth Platts  
Bono Mack Heck Poe (TX)  
Boren Heinrich Polis  
Boswell Hensarling Pompeo  
Boustany Herger Posey  
Brady (PA) Herrera Beutler Price (GA)  
Brady (TX) Higgins Quayle  
Brooks Hinojosa Quigley  
Broun (GA) Hochul Rahall  
Buchanan Holden Reed  
Bucshon Hoyer Rehberg  
Buerkle Huelskamp Reichert  
Burgess Huizenga (MI) Renacci  
Burton (IN) Hultgren Reyes  
Calvert Hunter Ribble  
Camp Hurt Rigell  
Campbell Inslee Rivera  
Canseco Israel Roby  
Cantor Issa Roe (TN)  
Capito Jenkins Rogers (AL)  
Cardoza Johnson (GA) Rogers (KY)  
Carnahan Johnson (OH) Rogers (MI)  
Carney Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher  
Carson (IN) Jordan Rokita  
Carter Kaptur Rooney  
Cassidy Kelly Ros-Lehtinen  
Chabot Kildee Roskam  
Chandler Kind Ross (AR)  
Coffman (CO) King (IA) Ross (FL)  
Cole King (NY) Rothman (NJ)  
Conaway Kingston Royce  
Connolly (VA) Kinzinger (IL) Runyan  
Cooper Kissell Ruppberger  
Costa Kline Ryan (WI)  
Cravaack Labrador Sánchez, Linda  
Crawford Lamborn T.  
Crenshaw Lance Sarbanes  
Critz Landry Scalise  
Crowley Langevin Schiff  
Cuellar Lankford Schilling  
Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Schmidt  
Davis (KY) Latham Schock  
Denham LaTourette Schwartz  
Dent Latta Schweikert  
DesJarlais Lewis (CA) Scott (SC)  
Deutch Deuch Lipinski Scott (VA)  
Diaz-Balart LoBiondo Scott, Austin  
Dicks Long Scott, David  
Dingell Lowey Sensenbrenner  
Dold Lucas Sessions  
Donnelly (IN) Luetkemeyer Sewell  
Dreier Luján Shimkus  
Duffy Lummis Shuler  
Duncan (SC) Lungren, Daniel Shuster  
Ellmers E. Simpson  
Emerson Mack Sires  
Engel Manzullo Smith (NE)  
Farenthold Marchant Smith (NJ)  
Fincher Marino Smith (TX)  
Fitzpatrick Matheson Smith (WA)  
Flake McCarthy (CA) Souterland  
Fleischmann McCarthy (NY) Stearns  
Fleming McCaul Stivers  
Flores McClintock Stutzman  
Forbes McCollum Sullivan  
Fortenberry McCotter Terry  
Foxy McHenry Thompson (PA)  
Frelinghuysen McIntyre Thornberry  
Gardner Gallegly McKeon Tipton  
Garrett McKinley Turner  
Gerlach McMorris Upton  
Gibbs Rodgers Van Hollen  
Gibson McNeerney Visclosky  
Gingrey (GA) Meehan Walberg  
Gohmert Meeks Walden  
Gonzalez Mica Walsh (IL)  
Goodlatte Miller (FL) Walz (MN)  
Gosar Miller (MI) Wasserman  
Gowdy Miller, Gary Schultz  
Granger Moran Waxman  
Graves (GA) Mulvaney Webster  
Graves (MO) Murphy (PA) West  
Green, Al Myrick Westmoreland  
Green, Gene Nadler Whitfield  
Griffin (AR) Neugebauer Wilson (FL)  
Griffith (VA) Nugent Wilson (SC)  
Grimm Nunes 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  
Cleverer 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  
Coffman (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  
Galleghy 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  
Cleverer 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 Hurt  
 Carnahan Carnahan Issa  
 Carney Carney Jackson Lee  
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN) (TX)  
 Carter Jenkins  
 Cassidy Johnson (GA)  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (OH)  
 Chabot Johnson, Sam  
 Chandler Jordan  
 Coffman (CO) Kaptur  
 Cole Kelly  
 Conaway Kildee  
 Connolly (VA) Kind  
 Cooper King (NY)  
 Costa Kingston  
 Courtney Kinzinger (IL)  
 Cravaack Kissell  
 Crawford Kline  
 Crenshaw Labrador  
 Critz Lamborn  
 Crowley Lance  
 Cuellar Landry  
 Cummings Langevin  
 Davis (CA) Lankford  
 Davis (KY) Larsen (WA)  
 DeGette Larson (CT)  
 Denham Latham  
 Dent LaTourette  
 DesJarlais Latta  
 Diaz-Balart Levin  
 Dicks Lewis (CA)  
 Dingell Lipinski  
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo  
 Dreier Loebsock  
 Duffy Long  
 Edwards Lowey  
 Ellmers Lucas  
 Emerson Luetkemeyer  
 Engel Lujan  
 Farenthold Lummis  
 Fattah Lungren, Daniel  
 Fincher E.  
 Fitzpatrick Lynch  
 Flake Mack  
 Fleischmann Manzullo  
 Fleming Marchant  
 Flores Marino  
 Forbes Matheson  
 Fortenberry McCarthy (CA)  
 Fox McCarthy (NY)  
 Franks (AZ) McCaul  
 Frelinghuysen McClintock  
 Gallegly McCollum  
 Gardner McCotter  
 Garrett McDermott  
 Gerlach McHenry  
 Gibbs McIntyre  
 Gingrey (GA) McKeon  
 Gonzalez McKinley  
 Goodlatte Morris  
 Gosar Rodgers  
 Granger McNeerney  
 Graves (MO) Meehan  
 Green, Al Meeks  
 Griffith (AR) Miller (FL)  
 Griffith (VA) Miller (MI)  
 Grimm Miller (NC)  
 Guinta Miller, Gary  
 Guthrie Moore  
 Hall Moran  
 Hanabusa Murphy (PA)  
 Hanna Myrick  
 Harper Neugebauer  
 Harris Noem  
 Hartzler Nugent  
 Hastings (WA) Nunes  
 Hayworth Nunnelee  
 Heck West  
 Heinrich Owens  
 Hensarling Palazzo  
 Herger Pascrell  
 Hinchey Pastor (AZ)  
 Hinojosa Paulsen  
 Holden Pearce  
 Hoyer Pelosi  
 Huelskamp Pence  
 Huizenga (MI) Perlmutter  
 Hultgren Peterson  
 Hunter Pitts Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

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	Sires
Flores	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Forbes	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry	McKeon	Smith (WA)
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Stearns
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Sullivan
Fudge	Meehan	Terry
Galeggly	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Gibbs	Miller, Gary	Towns
Gonzalez	Moore	Tsongas
Gosar	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Myrick	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Nadler	Walberg
Griffin (AR)	Neal	Walden
Grimm	Neugebauer	Walz (MN)
Guinta	Noem	Wasserman
Guthrie	Nunes	Schultz
Gutierrez	Nunnelee	Watt
Hanabusa	Olson	Waxman
Hanna	Oliver	Webster
Harper	Owens	Westmoreland
Hartzer	Palazzo	Whitfield
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Pascrell	Wilson (SC)
Hayworth	Pastor (AZ)	Wittman
Hensarling	Paulsen	Wolf
Herger	Payne	Womack
Himes	Pelosi	Yarmuth
Hinchee	Pence	Yoder
Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Young (FL)
Hirono	Peters	Young (IN)
Hirono	Peterson	
Holden		

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	McColum
Berman	Galleghy	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  
Speier Tsongas  
Stark Van Hollen  
Stearns Velazquez  
Sutton Visclosky  
Terry Walden  
Thompson (PA) Walsh (IL)  
Tierney Waters  
Tipton Waxman

NOES—201

Adams Gutierrez  
Aderholt Hall  
Akin Harris  
Alexander Hastings (FL)  
Andrews Hastings (WA)  
Austria Hayworth  
Baca Hensarling  
Bachus Herger  
Barletta Hinchey  
Bartlett Huelskamp  
Barton (TX) Hultgren  
Berkley Hunter  
Bilbray Issa  
Bilirakis Jackson Lee  
Bishop (GA) (TX)  
Bishop (UT) Jenkins  
Black Johnson (OH)  
Blackburn Johnson, E. B.  
Bonner Johnson, Sam  
Boustany Jordan  
Brady (TX) Kelly  
Broun (GA) King (IA)  
Brown (FL) King (NY)  
Buchanan Kissell  
Bucshon Kline  
Buerkle Lamborn  
Burgess Landry  
Burton (IN) Lankford  
Calvert Larson (CT)  
Camp Latta  
Canseco Lewis (CA)  
Capito Lewis (GA)  
Capps Lipinski  
Carson (IN) Lucas  
Carter Luetkemeyer  
Clyburn Lungren, Daniel  
Cole E.  
Conaway Lynch  
Cravaack Marchant  
Crawford Marino  
Crenshaw Matheson  
Crowley McCarthy (CA)  
Cummings McCaul  
Davis (KY) McCotter  
DeFazio McHenry  
Denham McIntyre  
Deutch McKinley  
Diaz-Balart McMorris  
Dreier Rodgers  
Engel Miller (FL)  
Farenthold Miller (MI)  
Fincher Miller (NC)  
Fitzpatrick Moore  
Fleischmann Murphy (PA)  
Fleming Myrick  
Flores Neugebauer  
Forbes Nugent  
Fortenberry Nunes  
Foxy Nunnelee  
Frelinghuysen Olson  
Garrett Owens  
Gerlach Palazzo  
Gohmert Pallone  
Gonzalez Pascrell  
Granger Pastor (AZ)  
Graves (MO) Pearce  
Green, Gene Pence  
Griffin (AR) Perlmutter  
Grimm Peterson

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.

Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Woodall  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (IN)

Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Rahall  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Runyan  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Towns  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Webster  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOES—201

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  
Akin  
Alexander  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berman  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Bono Mack  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Burgess  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kingston  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moran  
Neal  
Noem  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sherman  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Sutton  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Walden  
Waters  
Waxman  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Chaffetz  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt

Inslee  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Moore  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

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.

NOES—260

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

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	Paul (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
Gallegly	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

Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grimm  
Gutierrez  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayworth  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
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

Nunes  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richmond  
Rivera  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Baldwin  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishkek  
Berg  
Bilbray  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Bralley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Campbell  
Capito  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Coble  
Cole  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cummings  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
Denham  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleming  
Flores  
Foxx  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert

Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Guinta  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Himes  
Hinchesy  
Honda  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Jackson (IL)  
Johnson (IL)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Kingston  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Landry  
Lankford  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Markey  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mulvaney

Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Royce  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Walters  
West  
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—5

Culberson  
Giffords

Keating  
McHenry

Scott, David

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  
Wolfe Wooleyse  
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	Inslee	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 signifi-

cant 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 rescues.

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 (DVVIC) 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 Perlmutter  
 Calvert Hochul Peters  
 Camp Holden Platts  
 Canseco Holt Polis  
 Cantor Hoyer Price (NC)  
 Capps Hunter Quayle  
 Cardoza Insee Rahall  
 Carnahan Israel Rangel  
 Carney Issa Rehberg  
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Reyes  
 Carter (TX) Richmond  
 Cassidy Jenkins Rivera  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA) Roby  
 Chabot Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)  
 Chandler Johnson, E. B. Rogers (KY)  
 Chu Johnson, Sam Rogers (MI)  
 Clyburn Kaptur Ross-Lehtinen  
 Coffman (CO) Kelly Ross (AR)  
 Cohen Kildee Rothman (NJ)  
 Conaway Kind Roybal-Allard  
 Connolly (VA) King (IA) Runyan  
 Cooper King (NY) Ruppertsberger  
 Costa Kinzinger (IL) Ryan (OH)  
 Courtney Kissell Ryan (WI)  
 Cravaack Kline Sánchez, Linda  
 Crawford Lamborn T.  
 Crenshaw Lance Sarbanes  
 Critz Langevin Scalise  
 Crowley Larsen (WA) Schakowsky  
 Cuellar Larson (CT) Schiff  
 Davis (CA) LaTourette Schock  
 DeGette Levin Schwartz  
 DeLauro Lewis (CA) Scott, David  
 Dent Lewis (GA) Sewell  
 Deutch Lipinski Shimkus  
 Diaz-Balart Loeback Shuler  
 Dicks Lofgren, Zoe Shuster  
 Dingell Lowey Simpson  
 Doggett Lucas Sires  
 Dold Luetkemeyer Slaughter  
 Donnelly (IN) Luján Smith (NE)  
 Doyle Lungren, Daniel Smith (TX)  
 Dreier E. Smith (WA)  
 Edwards Marchant Speier  
 Ellison Marino Stark  
 Ellmers Matheson Stivers  
 Engel Matsui Sutton  
 Eshoo McCarthy (CA) Terry  
 Farr McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)  
 Fattah McCaul Thompson (MS)  
 Filner McCollum Thornberry  
 Fleischmann McCotter Tierney  
 Forbes McDermott Tonko  
 Fortenberry McIntyre Tsongas  
 Franks (AZ) McKeon Turner  
 Frelinghuysen McNeerney Van Hollen  
 Fudge Meehan Velázquez  
 Gallegly Meeks Walden  
 Garamendi Miller (NC) Walz (MN)  
 Gerlach Miller, Gary Wasserman  
 Granger Miller, George Schultz  
 Green, Al Moran Watt  
 Green, Gene Murphy (CT) Waxman  
 Griffith (VA) Murphy (PA) Webster  
 Grimm Myrick Welch  
 Guthrie Neal Whitfield  
 Gutierrez Nunes Wilson (FL)  
 Harper Nunnelee Wittman  
 Hartzler Olson Wolf  
 Hastings (FL) Olver Womack  
 Hayworth Owens Yarmuth  
 Heinrich Pallone Young (FL)  
 Hensarling Pascrell Young (IN)  
 Herger Pelosi  
 Higgins Pence

NOT VOTING—6

Culberson Hinojosa Schrader  
 Giffords Payne Towns

□ 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) Kinzinger (IL)  
 Aderholt Duncan (TN) Kissell  
 Akin Ellmers Kline  
 Alexander Emerson Labrador  
 Altmire Farenthold Lamborn  
 Amash Fincher Lance  
 Austria Fitzpatrick Landry  
 Bachmann Flake Lankford  
 Bachus Fleischmann Latham  
 Barletta Fleming LaTourette  
 Barrow Flores Latta  
 Bartlett Forbes Lewis (CA)  
 Barton (TX) Fortenberry Lipinski  
 Bass (NH) Foxx LoBiondo  
 Benishek Franks (AZ) Long  
 Berg Frelinghuysen Lucas  
 Bilbray Gallegly Luetkemeyer  
 Bilirakis Gardner Lummis  
 Bishop (GA) Garrett Lungren, Daniel  
 Bishop (UT) Gerlach E.  
 Black Walden Mack  
 Blackburn Gingrey (GA) Manzullo  
 Bonner Gohmert Marchant  
 Boren Goodlatte Marino  
 Boustany Gosar Matheson  
 Brady (TX) Gowdy McCarthy (CA)  
 Brooks Granger McCaul  
 Broun (GA) Graves (GA) McClintock  
 Buchanan Graves (MO) McCotter  
 Bucshon Green, Gene McHenry  
 Buerkle Griffin (AR) McIntyre  
 Burgess Griffin (VA) McKeon  
 Burton (IN) Grimm McKinley  
 Calvert Guinta McMorris  
 Camp Guthrie Rodgers  
 Campbell Hall Meehan  
 Canseco Harper Mica  
 Capito Harris Miller (FL)  
 Carter Hartzler Miller (MI)  
 Cassidy Hastings (WA) Miller, Gary  
 Chabot Heck Mulvaney  
 Chaffetz Hensarling Murphy (PA)  
 Chandler Herger Myrick  
 Coble Herrera Beutler Neugebauer  
 Coffman (CO) Holden Noem  
 Cole Huelskamp Nugent  
 Conaway Huizenga (MI) Nunes  
 Costello Hultgren Nunnelee  
 Cravaack Hunter Olson  
 Crawford Hurt Palazzo  
 Crenshaw Issa Paul  
 Critz Jenkins Paulsen  
 Cuellar Johnson (IL) Pearce  
 Davis (KY) Johnson (OH) Pence  
 Denham Johnson, Sam Peterson  
 Dent Jones Petri  
 DesJarlais Jordan Pitts  
 Dold Kelly Platts  
 Donnelly (IN) King (IA) Poe (TX)  
 Dreier King (NY) Pompeo  
 Duffy Kingston Posey

Price (GA) Ryan (WI) Thornberry  
 Quayle Scalise Tiberi  
 Rahall Schilling Tipton  
 Reed Schmidt Turner  
 Rehberg Schock Upton  
 Reichert Schweikert Walberg  
 Renacci Scott (SC) Walden  
 Ribble Scott, Austin Walsh (IL)  
 Rigell Sensenbrenner West  
 Rivera Sessions Westmoreland  
 Roby Shimkus Whitfield  
 Roe (TN) Shuler Wilson (SC)  
 Rogers (AL) Shuster Wittman  
 Rogers (KY) Simpson Wolf  
 Rogers (MI) Smith (NE) Womack  
 Rohrabacher Smith (NJ) Woodall  
 Rokita Smith (TX) Yoder  
 Rooney Southerland Young (AK)  
 Roskam Rosstman Young (FL)  
 Ross (AR) Stutzman Terry  
 Ross (FL) Royce Thompson (PA)

NOES—175

Ackerman Green, Al Pallone  
 Andrews Grijalva Pascrell  
 Baca Gutierrez Pastor (AZ)  
 Baldwin Hanabusa Pelosi  
 Bass (CA) Hanna Perlmutter  
 Becerra Hastings (FL) Peters  
 Berkley Hayworth Pingree (ME)  
 Berman Heinrich Price (NC)  
 Biggert Higgins Quigley  
 Bishop (NY) Himes Rangel  
 Blumenuauer Hinchey  
 Bono Mack Hinojosa Reyes  
 Boswell Hirono Richardson  
 Brady (PA) Hochul  
 Braley (IA) Holt  
 Brown (FL) Honda  
 Butterfield Hoyer  
 Capps Capps  
 Capuano Israel  
 Carnahan Jackson (IL)  
 Carney Jackson Lee  
 Carson (IN) (TX)  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)  
 Chu Johnson, E. B.  
 Cicilline Kaptur  
 Clarke (MI) Keating  
 Clarke (NY) Kildee  
 Clay Kind  
 Cleaver Kucinich  
 Clyburn Langevin  
 Cohen Larsen (WA)  
 Connolly (VA) Larson (CT)  
 Conyers Lee (CA)  
 Cooper Levin  
 Costa Lewis (GA)  
 Courtney Loeback  
 Cummings Lowey  
 Davis (CA) Luján  
 Davis (IL) Lynch  
 DeFazio Maloney  
 DeGette Markey  
 DeLauro Matsui  
 Deutch McCarthy (NY)  
 Diaz-Balart McCollum  
 Dicks McDermott  
 Dingell McGovern  
 Doggett McNeerney  
 Doyle Meeks  
 Edwards Michaud  
 Ellison Miller (NC)  
 Engel Miller, George  
 Eshoo Moore  
 Farr Moran  
 Fattah Murphy (CT)  
 Filner Nadler  
 Frank (MA) Napolitano  
 Fudge Neal  
 Garamendi Olver  
 Gonzalez Owens

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor Gibbs Sullivan  
 Cardoza Giffords Towns  
 Culberson Payne

□ 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

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	Loebsack	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.	Sánchez, 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	Loebsack
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  
Richardson  
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

Foxx  
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  
Bauer  
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  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
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  
Lujan  
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  
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)  
Pitts  
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  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
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  
Cleave 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 Tiberti  
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  
Clarke (MI) Hinchey  
Clarke (NY) Hirono  
Clay Chaffetz  
Cleave Hochul  
Clyburn Holt  
Cohen Honda  
Connolly (VA) Hoyer  
Conyers Hurt  
Costa Inslee  
Courtney Israel  
Crowley Issa  
Cummings Jackson (IL)  
Davis (CA) Johnson (IL)  
Davis (IL) Johnson, E. B.  
DeFazio Jones  
DeGette Keating  
DeLauro Kildee  
Dellauro Lowey  
Dicks Lujan  
Doggett Maloney  
Doyle Markey  
Duffy Matsui  
Duncan (TN) McCollum  
Edwards McDermott  
Ellison Mc Govern  
Engel Meeks  
Eshoo Michaud  
Farr Miller (MI)  
Filner Miller (NC)  
Fitzpatrick Miller, George  
Flake Moore  
Frank (MA) Moran  
Fudge Murphy (CT)  
Garamendi Nadler  
Garrett Napolitano  
Gingrey (GA) 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  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

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)

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)

Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Kelly  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Landry  
 Lankford  
 Latham  
 LaTourrette  
 Latta  
 Lewis (CA)  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paul  
 Paulsen  
 Heck  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo

Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Rahall  
 Neel  
 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)

Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz

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)  
 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)  
 Fudge  
 Garamendi  
 Gibson  
 Goodlatte  
 Graves (GA)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 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  
Lowey  
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  
Schroder  
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  
Biggert  
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	Gardner
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
Biggert	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
Bralley (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