

Buchson
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris

NOES—139

Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Frelinghuysen
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Upton
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Davis, Danny
Delaney
Dent
Edwards
Eilmers
Farr
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grimm
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coble
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Jones
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1922

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2792, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-173) on the bill (H.R. 2792) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Schock
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walorski
Waters
Watt
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2218, COAL RESIDUALS REUSE AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1582, ENERGETIC CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-174) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2218) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2397.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1927

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 113-170 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 312, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 31, 68, and 85, printed in House Report No. 113-170, offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$60,000,000)".

Page 143, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$14,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain or improve Department of Defense real property with a zero percent utilization rate according to the Department’s real property inventory database, except in the case of maintenance of an historic property as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) or maintenance to prevent a negative environmental impact as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to operate an unmanned aerial system in contravention of the fourth amendment to the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I want to thank the chair from the great State of Florida and the ranking member for their work putting together this bipartisan legislation.

I rise today in support of the en bloc amendments that include my bipartisan amendment to the Defense appropriations bill with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN). Our amendment would eliminate wasteful spending on unused facilities, which can save tens of millions of dollars in fiscal year 2014 alone.

The Department of Defense has hundreds, possibly thousands, of buildings and structures that it has rated at zero percent utilization. This is an incredible number of useless facilities the Department of Defense is paying to maintain.

Federal agencies as a whole must do a better job at managing their facilities. Taxpayers cannot continue paying for unused and underused buildings while the Nation is at record levels of debt. That is not good government and not smart spending.

□ 1930

That is why earlier this year I introduced the SAVE Act to root out up to \$200 billion in wasteful and duplicative government spending over the next 10 years.

This amendment is an extension of one of the 11 commonsense solutions included in the bipartisan SAVE Act, preventing the Department of Defense from spending money on facilities that the Department itself has rated at zero percent utilization.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that we must rein in government spending, and the best place to start is by rooting out waste. My amendment is a commonsense solution to do just that, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for this bipartisan en bloc amendment and rise in support of my amendment that would better ensure that we meet the urgent mental health needs and addiction treatment needs of military personnel returning from Afghanistan.

After more than a decade of war, many of our heroes are returning home from several tours of duty in Afghanistan and Iraq. To honor their service, we have the responsibility of ensuring that we develop treatments to address the specific health needs of our returning veterans. This year, as our troops return home to their families and loved ones, Congress should be increasing investments in the research that will help us better understand how to provide these veterans with the care they need and deserve.

Early indications and analysis suggest the need to focus our efforts on psychological health and substance abuse. Importantly, in many cases, our returning veterans suffer from both mental health and substance abuse disorders simultaneously. Delivering health care to these patients is exceedingly difficult, but it is our responsibility to address this critical health need among our Nation’s heroes.

I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member because this legislation contains important investments in peer-reviewed traumatic brain injury and psychological health research programs, but I believe that we have the means and the ability to do more. As this health need grows more acute and as more veterans return home, we should be increasing these investments. That’s why this amendment would increase funding for psychological health research by \$13 million and substance abuse research by \$1 million.

To pay for these increases, my amendment would slightly reduce the increase in funding for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund by \$60 million, a modest decrease of a total allocation of \$7.7 billion. My amendment would shift a small fraction of this increased funding, reducing the total allocation by less than 1 percent, in order to provide a small increase in funding for critical health research for our veterans and returning military personnel here at home.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for including this in the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 113–170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$279,000,000)”.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$279,000,000)”.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I first ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to reflect the figure of \$200 million as the reduction in the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund because of the passage of the previous amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would shift funding away from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund in order to reduce our deficit and focus on investing here at home.

This bill appropriates \$270 million to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund over the next year. This fund is notorious for its inefficiency. Several government watchdogs, including the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, have repeatedly found that projects funded through the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund are hopelessly behind schedule, lack proper oversight, and are poorly administered.

One example, the Kandahar Bridging Solution Project, which was developed to help provide electricity to a troubled region in Afghanistan, went 20 percent over budget in its first year of development, costing \$8 million more than planned. Even with these cost overruns, the anticipated gains from this project are in serious jeopardy because of the slow pace of construction of related infrastructure that are central to the region’s long-term electricity needs.

The failure to complete this project has led to higher fuel costs borne by the American taxpayer and raises serious questions about Afghanistan’s ability to sustain electricity production in the future because of these high costs.

The original intent of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was to identify a small group of infrastructure

projects in 2011 that were shovel ready and capable of being completed by the middle of 2013. The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was never meant to last beyond the completion of these seven projects or into fiscal year 2014. And yet here we are, once again, appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for projects that remain stalled and ineffective. Meanwhile, we're making major cuts in critical domestic funding here at home and doing almost nothing to rebuild the crumbling infrastructure in our own country.

Congress has appropriated more than \$1.1 billion over the last 3 fiscal years to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. This bill would commit another \$279 million in fiscal year 2014, despite the release of a Special Inspector General report indicating five of seven projects remain six to 15 months behind schedule. The same report also concluded that "Congress and the U.S. taxpayers do not have reasonable assurance" that projects completed using AIF funds would be sustained or made viable by the Afghan Government after we leave.

This is increasingly disconcerting when we consider that only about 10 percent of the \$400 million appropriated in fiscal year 2012 has been dispersed as of April 2013, with another \$325 million of taxpayer money from the current year appropriations remaining unspent.

So we know the money is not being sent out quickly enough to accomplish the original intent of the program—to complete infrastructure projects by the middle of 2013. And we know that even if we were to complete these expensive projects, that they will likely not be maintained by the people of Afghanistan after our withdrawal. Knowing these facts, why should we provide an additional \$279 million to this fund for next year? That is the definition of throwing good money after bad.

Of course, it is also useful to remember the context in which we're spending the additional money on Afghanistan's infrastructure. These are incredibly difficult fiscal times here in our own country.

Earlier today, we passed a rule for consideration of legislation that makes deep cuts to investments in domestic transportation and infrastructure. It eliminates the TIGER program to fund local transportation programs; it zeroes out our investments in high-speed rail; and it decreases funding to upgrade our airports and other FAA facilities by more than \$500 million. Does this Congress really believe it's more important to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Afghanistan's infrastructure when we're cutting those same investments in our own roads, bridges, airports and transportation systems? Let's put America's needs first.

My amendment reduces the deficit, eliminates the inefficient Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, and allows us to refocus on building our own infrastructure here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent the completion of the two most strategic initiatives funded by the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund—the Northeast and Southeast Power Systems—and limit the lasting counterinsurgency effects intended by the AIF program. Available, reliable power promotes jobs and economic development, which increases stability and reduces insurgency and insurgent influence.

Mr. Chairman, Kandahar Province has been a primary focus for AIF investment. Of all the areas in Afghanistan, none is more important to the future of the Afghan Government or to the Taliban insurgency than this province—the Taliban's birthplace, location of its former capital, and spiritual heart.

AIF projects support the "Build" phase of the Shape, Clear, Hold, Build counterinsurgency strategy and are a critical component of the integrated civil/military campaign that sets the conditions for Afghanistan's decade of transformation beyond 2014.

Power distribution is currently provided through 12 provinces, serving 10 million Afghans. And Mr. Chairman, let me just remind you that we just passed an amendment that already cuts this account by \$79 million. This amendment cuts more funds than are left in the account.

According to DOD, the lack of reliable electricity is the single greatest impediment to Afghanistan's economic growth, and thereby the stability necessary to support drawdown and transition.

Significant work on five of the seven power projects is in its beginning stages and is unlikely to be completed until well after the NATO mission ends in 2014. If project goals are set and not achieved, both the U.S. and Afghan Governments can lose the populace's support. It's for these reasons that we remain in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would associate myself with his comments.

I do appreciate the gentleman's concern. The money spent in Afghanistan ought to be spent carefully and efficiently and we ought to have an investment made for those expenditures. But I harken back to the last debate we had when we did abandon this country in 1989, and as a result, that region of the world gave us the Taliban and al Qaeda. I don't want to take that type of chance. And simply because we have failed ourselves in this country by a failure to invest in our infrastructure,

I do not believe this is the time to fail the Afghan people. I do associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and am opposed to the amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the argument that we owe it to the Afghan people to ensure that we rebuild their economy, we owe that responsibility first to the American people.

We have a crumbling infrastructure in this country—our roads, our bridges, our ports, our transit systems. Every economist I know says that investing in infrastructure so that we can get goods, services and information in this competitive 21st century economy is critical.

I hardly believe, with all due respect, that giving \$1.1 billion, where only a little over \$100 million has actually been spent, that that is abandoning Afghanistan. This is \$1.1 billion of taxpayer money; only \$111 million has been spent. And we're now appropriating another \$279 million. I don't believe we're abandoning anybody.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$139,000,000)".

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$139,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which as originally drawn was like the amendment I offered last year that passed with a pretty strong majority, halves the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Mr. WALBERG and I were cosponsors on a bipartisan amendment that passed that cut \$79 million.

To get this amendment to the same point, we would have to amend it down \$70 million, I believe, to get it from the 269 to the cut. I don't know if we want to do an amendment or not. The more money it takes, for me it's fine, but if we wanted to halve it.

I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to reflect the cut not to be—an amount of 139, but to take into consideration the 79, and so to make this amendment only \$60 million. So I would like to offer an amendment to the amendment to make this amendment reflect a \$60 million cut to make the total cut 139, which would be half.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

□ 1945

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, that is just better, because this amendment is kind of a compromise between the amendment Mr. WALBERG and I had and Mr. CICILLINE's. Mr. CICILLINE's cut the fund entirely. This cuts it in half. A little more than half is really better.

The fact is, yes, we need the infrastructure in America; but we spent a lot of money on the infrastructure fund in Iraq, and we know from experience that a lot of that money, if not most of it, was stolen and wasted.

The same things happened in Afghanistan. The Inspector General has reported it; and, in fact, Afghani officials have reported it. They do not have the expertise, nor do they have the abilities, to maintain products after they are built. When the roads are constructed, they can't maintain them. So it is throwing money away.

The same thing happened with air-conditioners and other products that we gave the Iraqis and we have given the Afghans. They cannot maintain them. They can't maintain them when they do construct them, but before that half of it is ripped off and graft. There are rankings of the most corrupt countries on the face of the Earth. Afghanistan is always number one or number two, and continues to be.

No matter how long we stay there and how long we have been there, the level of corruption has remained right at the top. That is not going to change.

Giving this money away is basically encouraging and endorsing and seconding corruption and graft that we have seen in Afghanistan over the years, and waste. This Congress should not be passing funds that we know are going to be corruptly going to officials who are putting it in their pockets, not helping the Afghani people.

In a perfect world, I wouldn't offer the amendment. In a perfect world, I would say, oh, "Charlie Wilson," what a great movie, what a great story, we pulled out too soon. Well, Charlie Wilson was right in theory. He was wrong

in application, because they steal and it is corrupt and they cannot maintain it. We couldn't have put enough money and enough people. You have to change the ethics.

I've heard a lot of people here on this floor talk about situations in America. They say, we can't do it, it has got to be the family do it. Well, talk about the family—the whole country is corrupt. They have stolen and stolen and stolen American dollars. We are throwing them away, and we need to stop it.

It should be a place, just as the Walberg-Cohen-Esty-Rigell amendment passed, that this amendment passes, so that we limit the amount of money that is at risk and we save this money for the American taxpayer. We put the money into deficit reduction, the next generation doesn't have to pay for the corruption of the Afghani officials and the waste of Afghanistan with the inability to maintain the projects that they finally might get squeezed out after they steal as much as they can. We should not be funding this.

I would ask that we approve our amendment in the name of fiscal austerity, deficit reduction, anticorruption, and just plain old, good old common sense. We might as well just have a bonfire and burn this money up before it goes over there because it is not going to work. In theory it is great, but in reality it doesn't work. The definition of "insanity" is expecting something different when you do the same thing over and over and over and you get the same result and you keep doing it.

So this Congress, which has less than 10 percent popularity right now, doesn't pass an insane amendment to give money to corruption and to waste. I ask you to approve this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, let's remind ourselves the Afghan Infrastructure Fund is aimed at providing water, power, and transportation projects, and more recently to increase the electricity supply throughout but, specifically in southern Afghanistan, to light shops and power factories and to construct provincial justice centers around the country.

It is clear that remaining projects could take 12 to 24 months to complete. A lot of work has already taken place, in particular on the seven power projects in its beginning stages; and as I said in the previous amendment, unlikely to be completed until well after the NATO mission ends in 2014. If these goals are not met, then a lot of great investment and a lot of good work will have gone for naught.

We remain in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

If the ranking member would like to speak on behalf, then I would be happy

to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and simply would take a bit of a different tack.

I do appreciate the gentleman's outrage over any act of corruption, whether it is in the country of Afghanistan or whether it is in the United States of America. We do have a responsibility to make sure these moneys are spent for the intended purposes.

But there is an insinuation that all expenditures in Afghanistan today are subject to corruption. I doubt there is a congressional district in this country that has not had, at some point in time, a public official sent to Federal prison for public corruption.

We then find people in our individual districts who are honest, law-abiding and who make the necessary investments. I am certain that the overwhelming number of people in Afghanistan and their government, as with the United States, are of that ilk. Those are the people we ought to assiduously make sure get this money, and for that reason would be opposed to the amendment.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

All you have to do is look at the top, Mr. Karzai and his brother, who was killed, who was one of the main drug runners down there who was killed. The whole country from the top to the bottom is corrupt.

I thank the gentleman for his thoughts. You can't find honest people there to see that this money gets to their people. They don't care about their people. They care about their own power, their own money, their own riches. They are corrupt, and we are throwing this money away.

Let's face reality and pass the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$553,800,000)”.

Page 157, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$553,800,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Last year, this body, in the FY13 Defense authorization bill, specifically prohibited the Department of Defense from using any taxpayer funds to purchase Russian-built Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing.

Our reasoning was simple: the Russian export company involved in the deal, Rosoboronexport, had an established track record for aiding our adversaries, having supplied both Iran and Syria with advanced weaponry in the years prior.

However, despite our entirely reasonable objections to using taxpayer dollars to fund our enemies, the Department of Defense was intent on circumventing the will of Congress.

The language of the bill prohibited the use of FY13 funding. DOD responded by using any unobligated FY12 funds, circumventing the will of Congress as expressed in a law we passed and the President signed.

On June 16 of this year, DOD awarded a \$553.8 million contract to Rosoboronexport for the purchase of 30 brand-new Mi-17 helicopters.

Last month, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, or SIGAR, released an audit of the Afghan Special Mission Wing, and their findings were shocking. The very first sentence of the audit reads:

The Afghans lack the capacity—in both personnel numbers and expertise—to operate and maintain the existing and planned SMW fleets.

Finding recruits who are both literate and have no known association with criminal and terrorist elements is incredibly challenging.

The Afghan Special Mission Wing, or SMW, was stood up in July of 2012 in order to provide air support for Afghan Special Forces executing counter-narcotics and counterterrorism missions, many of which are flown at night.

Further complicating the issue is the fact that the pilots assigned to the SMW, less than 15 percent are qualified to fly with night-vision goggles. The vast majority of counterterrorism missions take place under the cover of darkness.

My bipartisan amendment reduces the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

by \$553.8 million, an amount equal to the contract DOD entered into with Rosoboronexport for 30 Mi-17 helicopters, and increases the Spending Reduction Account by the same amount.

Frankly, my preference would have been to rescind the FY 2012 dollars that DOD used to circumvent the will of Congress and enter into this deal, but an amendment of that nature would be subject to a point of order. This amendment forces DOD to reallocate resources if they want to continue down this path.

Mr. Chairman, I am not debating whether this helicopter is ideal for the rugged terrain of Afghanistan, or whether it is an easier platform for the Afghans to train on and execute missions. There seems to be an overall consensus that, in fact, it is.

My concern, and the reason I introduced this amendment, is that the United States taxpayer should not be paying for 30 brand-new helicopters when, A, they don't have the pilots to fly them; B, they don't have the trained personnel to repair them. In fact, SIGAR reports that only 50 percent of the current wing is airworthy due to a lack of maintenance; and, C, Congress explicitly prohibited DOD from entering into this agreement in the first place.

Furthermore, the DOD is asking the American taxpayer to spend over \$700 million a year to maintain these helicopters, and that spending is not scheduled to end in 2014 when we pull out our forces from Afghanistan.

Additionally, the Pentagon just announced last week that the purchase of Russian-built Mi-17 helicopters will not end with the 30 they just purchased for the SMW. Their plan is to equip the Afghan Air Force with an additional 86 brand-new Mi-17s. If you consider that the cost of 30 helicopters was over \$500 million, this new purchase will be well over \$1 billion, and probably over \$1.5 billion. This for a helicopter that the Afghans have proven they lack the personnel to fly and the capability to maintain.

I urge my colleagues to support the Coffman-Garamendi-Murphy-Cohen amendment.

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

Mr. WOMACK. I claim the time in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment's sponsor is to reduce the Afghanistan National Security Force's Fund by over \$550 million in order to limit the purchase of Mi-17 helicopters.

I am pleased that my friend from Colorado at least acknowledged that he was not going to argue with the purpose of the helicopters and the need for the helicopters, because as we all know, a properly trained and equipped Afghanistan National Security Force is the safest and quickest path for our

forces to leave Afghanistan. Reducing funding from this account will only inhibit our ability to achieve the goal.

The amount that the amendment seeks to cut, over \$550 million, is for the purchase of 30 Mi-17 helicopters that were purchased with fiscal year 2012 funds, and Congress was later notified of the Secretary of Defense's intent to exercise the purchase on April 1 of 2013.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of funds is being taken from a prior year allocation, or a prior year appropriation, which makes this amendment just simply a punitive amendment to this year's funding.

I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 134, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,615,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we've had a lot of discussion here in the last several minutes about Afghanistan. This amendment follows along the same line, but it's actually far greater in dollars.

Last year, we appropriated \$5.1 billion to the Afghanistan National Army for their support. In this year's budget, an additional \$2.6 billion was added for—who knows what? It was \$2.6 billion of American taxpayer money for something—airplanes? supplies? support equipment? trucks? It was unspecified, unknown, to be used by one of the most corrupt governments—no, excuse me—the most corrupt government in the world. \$2.6 billion of American taxpayer money for something, unspecified, to be used somewhere, somehow—I suspect, more likely, in some bank account in Bahrain.

What are we doing? What justification is there for \$2.6 billion of additional expenditure for the Afghan National Army? Have we lost our minds?

No. We're just going to lose our money. What is going on here? What are we doing? What is this all about?

This money should never be spent for some unspecified purpose. We take our Department of Defense, and we hold them to a very tight account. We don't let them spend money without a contract, without reviews by the inspector general, without reviews by our committee, but here is \$2.6 billion, unspecified.

Oh, Mr. Karzai, use it wisely.

Come on. Come on. Let's not do this. This amendment would simply say, You can't have that money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Afghan National Security Forces include both the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police. It has been one of the United States' top priorities since operations began in Afghanistan in 2001.

The purpose of the Afghan National Security Force development program is to grow the capacity and the capability of the Afghan National Security Forces in line with international agreements. This year's request totals \$7.7 billion. The request is further delineated into the categories of Defense Forces, Interior Forces, and Detainee Operations. Included within the categories is the base request for operations and sustainment to conduct day-to-day operations, totaling just over \$5 billion, and an additional \$2.6 billion for the enablers, which my friend refers to in his comments from the well.

The gentleman says, if I heard him correctly, that we don't know what these enablers are. We do know what these enablers are, and people who have backgrounds in security or in the military would understand the importance of howitzers or of night vision devices or of regional military hospitals, training, logistics, and maintenance expenses, and a host of other associated items that we refer to in this legislation as "enablers."

The Department of Defense has taken steps to right-size the funding needed to support the needs of the Afghan National Security Forces. The core request is, indeed, the right amount. Calendar year 2014, Mr. Chairman, will be the last year that a large U.S. troop concentration will be in Afghanistan. In the years to follow, the Afghan National Security Forces will be there as the frontline force, thus helping to protect the U.S. and NATO troops against our foes.

With that, I remain opposed to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I request to know how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PAULSEN). The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I find it difficult that our esteemed Appropriations Committee, which watches the taxpayers' money with such ardor and intensity, would increase by 51 percent the amount of support that the American taxpayers are giving to the Afghan National Security Forces—the police, which are among—no, excuse me—they are the most corrupt—and the army, which is questionable, and certainly the government, which we know to be the most corrupt in the world—that it would simply write \$2.6 billion more money than we were giving them last year, for a total of \$7.6 billion, for something—something—unspecified.

We would never do this for our own military. Never would we do that. We would have them lay out how they were going to spend the money before we would even consider giving them the money, and then we would hold them to tight account.

I cannot understand why we would do this. There is no justification other than, oh, we're leaving, and we've got to help them, so throw some more money at them. They already have been appropriated \$52 billion, and only \$40 billion of that has been spent. There is \$12 billion left in the account, and you're going to add \$7.6 billion to that.

What are you doing? What justification is there for this other than, oh, they may need it because we're leaving? They're going to use it for—let's see—other things—well, maybe for some field hospitals, maybe for some airplanes, maybe for some supplies—maybe, maybe, maybe—but there is nothing written. There is nothing written. Oh, yes. We know the American Army or the American military will somehow spend it wisely. There is a 10-year record of its being spent unwisely. \$2.6 billion.

What could we do with it? Could we reduce the deficit? Could we build some levees? Could we educate some kids? Could we do some research in the United States?

Come on. Of all of the things we're doing here today, this is the most disgusting.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOMACK. First of all, we have the list.

I recognize that the gentleman has argued that, while there may be something printed on the list, on paper, of "how would we know that it's actually going to go for those purposes?" I get that, but let me also remind the gentleman that this was all in the President's request as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOMACK. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. How many times have I heard from this side that the

President is wrong? The President is wrong in this case.

Mr. WOMACK. So I'm assuming that the gentleman would admit that the President is wrong in this case as well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. He most certainly is wrong in this case. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WOMACK. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just simply say that we have the list. On the list are, certainly, items that would go to the very core of the capability of the Afghan National Security Forces in order for them to be able to protect themselves and to be able to protect us as we continue to prepare for leaving that theater of operation. So I am strongly opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

At this time, in my having no further comments, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 34 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to appoint chaplains for the military departments in contravention of Department of Defense Instruction 1304.28, dated June 11, 2004, incorporating change 2, dated January 19, 2012, as in effect on July 1, 2013, regarding the appointment of chaplains for the military departments.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

My amendment is fairly simple. The DOD is permitted to appoint military chaplains—individuals who minister to the spiritual needs of any and all members of the armed services—in accordance with the current DOD policy. Chaplains must possess appropriate educational credentials, 2 years of religious leadership experience, and, more

importantly, must receive an endorsement from a qualified religious organization attesting to the tenets of the endorser's faith.

In June, the Members of this body—Democrats and Republicans alike—twice affirmed that the military is not permitted to appoint atheist chaplains. Despite these recent votes and by completely bypassing Congress—the voice of the people—and current DOD standards, it has been confirmed that the military is considering the possibility of appointing an atheist chaplain. Since the formation of the chaplaincy in 1775, chaplains have been affiliated with faith and spirituality. By definition, chaplains minister to the spiritual needs of our men and women in the armed services—a vital function that an individual without any inclination towards spirituality would not be able to perform.

I would like to thank my colleagues—Representatives FORBES, BRIDENSTINE, JORDAN, PITTS, and LANKFORD—for their support of this amendment.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support the chaplaincy of the U.S. military, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fleming amendment.

I think there is a basic misunderstanding here about the needs of people who lack a particular faith tradition. I would also point out that we already ordain nontheistic chaplains in our military, including Buddhists, which is a nontheistic faith. Some Unitarians may also have a nontheistic faith tradition. However, over 20 percent of the members of our military identify as nonbelievers. While, of course, their needs should be catered to by members of the chaplaincy from diverse faiths, it's only fair to have their humanism, or outlooks, represented.

Now, why is this different than a reason a member of the military might seek support from a medical professional or from a psychologist as the gentleman has argued one should? Those are different needs.

A psychiatrist or a medical professional is not equipped to answer those kinds of existential questions that a member of the military might seek out to discuss with a chaplain: Why am I here? What's the meaning of life? How do I justify the use of force? People who are nontheistic in their outlooks and who are humanists wrestle with those same existential questions as those of us of faith. So I strongly encourage my colleagues to not adopt an amendment that would be restrictive on the military.

Now, to be clear, the military has not announced plans to move forward with ordaining humanist chaplains; but what this amendment does is to lock in

place a 2004 rule, placing it in statute and preventing the military, even if they feel the need should arise for the good of the chaplaincy, from having the flexibility they need to appoint humanist chaplains.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oklahoma, JIM BRIDENSTINE.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Dr. FLEMING, for your leadership on this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. I support this amendment to prohibit the appointment of atheist chaplains.

My constituents back in Oklahoma are shaking their heads. The secular left is so invested in ripping God from everything that I must stand here with my friend Dr. FLEMING in order to prohibit Obama's Department of Defense from establishing an oxymoron—atheist chaplains.

Military chaplains have a duty to faithfully serve all servicemembers and to facilitate the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment. As a Navy pilot with combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, I recognize that war affects all servicemembers—believers and atheists. However, those without faith have plenty of options, from counselors to psychologists, from whom to seek emotional support.

Why does the secular left insist on ruining the integrity of the chaplaincy in order to serve their agenda of institutionalized godlessness?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 2015

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, our intent is not to promote institutionalized godlessness. Our intent is to promote constitutional fealty.

When a young man or young woman raises their right hand and swears allegiance to this country and agrees to serve in the Armed Forces, they do not consign themselves to serve as a second-class citizen, irrespective of their faith or their life philosophy.

It is wrong to say to a soldier who comes from such a tradition, that he or she, if they have an issue on which they're troubled, must go to a mental health professional in order to receive counseling, rather than someone who comes from their philosophical faith or tradition.

The other problem with this amendment is it frankly second guesses the military leadership of this country, the Pentagon of this country, the Defense Department, and says that even if they would decide that such a decision would be appropriate, they're prohibited from doing so.

Our law recognizes that our Constitution establishes no religion. We should

have equality of treatment for our Armed Forces. I'd urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS, who is, by the way, a chaplain himself.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting amendment, especially for me, because I am currently a chaplain in the United States military.

I appreciate the arguments that have been made here, but let's just bring back something that needs to be made. When we deal with this in the contradiction of terms, a chaplain is there to provide services and spiritual guidance and a guiding hand, if you would, to all—those of faith and those with no faith. That is done in a confidential setting, and it is done in a way in which the person who brings to the chaplain their feelings, their needs, and their conversations are kept in that in-violate conversation.

What I'm here to do is to support this amendment because I believe it attacks the basis of the chaplaincy, it attacks the chaplaincy as a whole, this introduction into the DOD to bring an atheist chaplain to, really, the heart of the chaplaincy itself.

I think it is beyond mere than just do those who have no faith have a place to go. It's not about that. I believe it's about the faith of the chaplaincy as a whole and the standards that have been set up.

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if a chaplain is doing their job right, then all feel welcome.

When I was in Iraq, I would go across and see everyone at night. I had many times those who profess no faith at all who would come to me and say, Chaplain, I don't believe there is a God, but I have a wife at home that I'm having trouble with. Can you talk to me? That's what a chaplain does.

This amendment reaffirms the establishment of our chaplaincy, and I believe that is what it protects; and it protects those with faith and those without faith and those who are somewhere in between. This amendment needs to be approved.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for his efforts on behalf of the chaplaincy. I agree with his interpretation of the rules and responsibilities of the chaplaincy. And we try to represent the diverse faith tradition of the men and women who serve.

In that faith tradition are those who look at objective fact, free thinkers, humanists, atheists. They too have the same mentoring, spiritual existential needs as others. And, of course, just as Catholics have to handle the needs of Jews and Muslims in the service and Buddhist chaplains handle the needs of

others, they're all trained to handle the needs of soldiers. We also want to make sure we have a chaplaincy that reflects the broad diversity of belief systems.

Over 20 percent of today's members of the military don't have a theistic outlook, are nonbelievers. That's an important thing to represent in the chaplaincy. Many major universities have humanist chaplains. Hospitals have humanist chaplains. Many of our allied European militaries have humanist chaplains.

As one of the other gentlemen argued, there is no political goal or secular agenda here. We simply want to make sure the military is not prevented from providing chaplaincy services for the men and women who put their lives at risk defending our country every day. Every man and woman who serves should be able, when the need arises, to have a private consultation with a chaplain; and we should include in the chaplaincy people who represent the full diversity of the beliefs of the quality of men and women who serve.

Increasingly, there are seminaries who prepare humanist chaplains for ordination and work in the field, in hospitals, in universities, and again in the militaries that have them. I personally hope that this is a direction that our military considers in the future. We ran a similar amendment that would move it in this direction to an authorization bill; 150 Members voted for it. I'm confident even more Members will want to vote against restricting the military from moving in this direction.

Again, to be clear, the Obama administration and the military have given no indication that they want to go this way; but as we reassess our ongoing personnel needs and how best to support the men and women who serve, I believe that many members of the military will come to the conclusion that this is an excellent way to do this.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, with all due respect to my good friend from Colorado, there is no way that an atheist chaplain or atheist whatever can minister to the spiritual needs of a Christian or a Muslim, or a Jew, for that matter.

As a result, that is the whole problem here. When you're talking about a chaplain, what are you talking about? How do we define chaplain? A chaplain is a person who ministers to spiritual needs, but who is assigned to a secular organization. The military is 99.9 percent secular. The only thing that we add to it that is nonsecular is the chaplaincy.

Also, I would say to you is that there is a limited number of chaplains. And if

we begin to displace chaplains who are actually from religious organizations with those who are atheists, who do not believe in spirituality or a deity, then that's going to limit even the number that's going to be available to the others.

It's nonsensical. It's an oxymoron. But as I've said before, and I'll say this again, remember that an atheist is a person who does not believe in a deity, does not believe in a spiritual world. It's impossible for that person through his or her beliefs or training to minister to the spiritual needs of somebody who does.

In the final analysis, I believe that an atheist chaplain would be the last person in the world that we would want for a dying soldier who needs that last moment of counseling in their life.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act for the "Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund" may be used to plan, develop, or construct any project for which construction has not commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which would prohibit any of the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund to be used to begin new infrastructure projects.

There are a host of amendments that will address current projects. That's not the focus of my amendment. My amendment is focused on new projects.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the summary of an audit provided to Congress on July 12, by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. It contains key findings that really make the case that my amendment is needed. The opening paragraph states this:

More than 10 years after international intervention in Afghanistan, the U.S. Gov-

ernment, the international community, and the Afghan Government continue to face challenges in implementing programs to build basic infrastructure.

That's certainly consistent with what I observed firsthand during my trip to Afghanistan.

It goes on to say that five of the seven infrastructure projects for fiscal year 2011 are up to 15 months behind schedule. USAID, the lead agency of this effort, certainly doesn't need to be taking on new projects when it can't get control of its current projects.

Really of far more importance and what is so deeply troubling, Mr. Chairman, is what is stated at the close of that same paragraph:

In some instances, these projects may result in adverse counterinsurgency efforts.

Let that sink in, Mr. Chairman. The Inspector General is making clear to us that the American taxpayers' dollars may be funding infrastructure projects that actually work against our counterinsurgency efforts.

It goes on to state the two reasons why that might occur.

First, these projects create an expectations gap among the affected population; second, they lack citizen support.

Look, even the Afghans don't want some of these projects.

The harsh reality is this, Mr. Chairman: while we're furloughing hard-working Americans who work alongside and support our men and women in uniform, we have poured not millions, but literally billions, \$89.4 billion, in reconstruction efforts really into a cauldron of graft and corruption. It's not the way to spend America's tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop building infrastructure in Afghanistan.

Finally, the Inspector General's report makes clear that we are building infrastructure that the Afghans cannot possibly maintain and sustain. They don't have the money, and they won't have the money. Buildings will deteriorate. Generators will run out of fuel. Lights will go out. Yet we keep building. We keep adding to the national debt.

Look, we're hiring Afghans and laying off American workers. This doesn't make any sense, Mr. Chairman. It's time to stop building infrastructure in Afghanistan.

That is why I urge my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, to look carefully at this issue. I believe that will lead to a vote for my amendment, which will prohibit any of the Afghanistan infrastructure funds be used to begin new infrastructure projects.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, this is another in a line of amendments that we have debated here this evening;

and I hate to be repetitive, but I am going to be. We and the international community have failed the country of Afghanistan in the last century. Today, in terms of the loss of life, in terms of injury, and in terms of our national treasure, we are paying the price. For over a decade, we have now had a commitment to this country, and we ought to meet that commitment at the end just as we did at the beginning.

The gentleman wants to prohibit essentially any new projects from commencing. I think it is important for our colleagues to understand that there are a number of very important projects that do need to be undertaken and completed. All of them involve, basically, power systems.

I don't think there's anybody in this Chamber who has not at one time or another lost power to their home or their business. It's something we all take for granted as American citizens. If any of you have read the Caro biography on Lyndon Johnson, in the first volume I was most struck by his chapter describing the day in the life of a woman in Texas with no energy and how hot that house was and how hard it was to bring that water to that house and how difficult it was to make sure clothes were cleaned and food was prepared and how exhausted and bent and broken these women were in the State of Texas before rural electrification took place.

□ 2030

I think there are a lot of people in the country of Afghanistan today, because they lack power, that they are bent and broken, and potentially are subject to being persuaded that there are other avenues to take in life for a better one, as opposed to the principles that our country espouses. I think particularly for those women who are bent and broken because they have no power in the country of Afghanistan, we ought to give them a fighting chance at the end.

We've been fighting in that country for 12 years, let's give them a fighting chance at the end. Let us undertake some new construction to give them that chance. Simply because we have failed in some instances in this country is not, again as I have said before, is a reason that we should fail others.

I see the gentleman from California rise, and I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in opposition to this amendment.

I understand the gentleman's concerns about what's happened in Afghanistan, what is happening in Afghanistan. Many of us have been to Afghanistan many times. That country was totally destroyed by the Russians during the prior war. They were left with nothing. It is probably, if not the poorest, one of the poorest countries on the face of the Earth, rubble on rubble.

And when we leave, and we are going to leave Afghanistan in 2014, what we're saying is we're going to give

them the basic parts of energy production, which is what the primary source of this money is going to develop.

So I reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and join the gentleman in his opposition.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. I appreciate the comments of both of my colleagues. I certainly don't agree with them. However, if I understood the gentleman correctly who led in opposition, and I do want to get this right, and I will yield if I don't get it correct, but I made the notes here that the gentleman said we have failed the nation, the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I did not. I don't want to fail them.

Mr. RIGELL. Don't want to. Thank you for the clarification.

Mr. Chairman, by any measure, we won't and have not and will not fail those people because we have sacrificed so great a measure of treasure and loss of life. We have met every obligation to the people of Afghanistan. And look, our principle and primary and exclusive obligation, of course, is to the American people. The best indicator of future performance is past performance. We have not demonstrated competence, as much as we've tried and good people have given their all. In fact, some of our civilians at USAID, as we all know, have given their life in this effort. But we have not demonstrated a competency to advance these projects, and here are the facts on the economy.

The entire revenue stream for the Afghan government is about a billion dollars a year. We've raised up a military operation there, the Afghan army and police, the largest employer by far in the country, that has an annual expenditure of about 7 or \$8 billion. Look, the math doesn't work. We've created a structure here that's going to require, absent some difficult decisions, a sharp reduction of expenditures there.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract after the date of the enactment of this Act for the procurement or production of any non-petroleum based fuel for use as the same purpose or as a drop-in substitute for petroleum.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I bring forward is a very basic, straightforward, commonsense amendment that deals with the funding priorities within the Department of Defense. We know we are living in a post-sequester world. We have many hearings here on Capitol Hill where we have generals and, in fact, even the Secretary of Defense talking about the threats to military operations through the sequester cuts. We all know that those are real, and especially in these tight economic times, and even if we weren't in tight economic times, but especially right now, we ought to be watching every single dollar that is spent within the Department of Defense and work to find ways to make smarter use of those dollars.

One of the things that we've found as we've combed through is that the Department of Defense has been entering into contracts to buy renewable fuels, biodiesel and other forms of renewable fuels to supplant what are the traditional, conventional fuels. The problem is that the contracts they are entering into are tremendously more expensive to the taxpayer than if they just bought conventional fuel.

So what this amendment would do is to say that the Department of Defense cannot enter into those contracts to buy nontraditional fuels at these higher costs.

I want to give a couple of examples. I think it is important to note a few of them because this is something that has been happening recently that we found. There is a memorandum of understanding between the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Energy for each of those entities to spend \$170 million each to "assist development and support of a sustainable commercial biofuels industry."

Now, Mr. Chairman, whatever you think of expanding and developing a biofuels industry, that's not a mission of the Department of Defense, and especially when their budgets are being cut and the generals and the Secretary of Defense are saying they don't have enough money to perform and execute their basic military operations. Yet they're spending \$170 million to prop up a failing biofuels industry when

they could instead be buying traditional fuels.

I just want to give one example of what we call this renewable energy sticker shock. Here you've got furloughs at the Pentagon, the military has grounded the Blue Angels, and yet they have a contract right now to buy renewable jet fuel at \$59 per gallon—\$59 per gallon—when the traditional cost of conventional jet fuel is \$3.73 per gallon. And yet the military, to carry out some kind of social agenda, is spending an extra \$56, almost \$56 more per gallon, so they can buy renewable fuel. So this is one example of many where the military is not making the smartest use of their military dollars, at a time when Secretary Hagel himself has testified before committee that the services have begun to significantly reduce training and maintenance of operating forces.

So if they're reducing the training and maintenance of operating forces, why are they spending hundreds of millions of dollars to prop up a renewable energy industry that is clearly not viable yet. One day it will be, but today it's not, and yet they're spending in some cases 5, 10, 12 times more to buy this renewable energy than they would pay for conventional, wasting hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. This amendment just says that has to stop.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would begin by pointing out that the Department of Defense is the single largest consumer of energy in the United States of America, and I certainly do believe that we need to move from a carbon-based economy, particularly given some of the countries in the world where we procure carbon products such as petroleum. Many people talk about it as an economic problem, and it is. Many people characterize it as an environmental problem, and it is. We're talking about the national defense today, and I certainly agree with former Senator Richard Lugar from the State of Indiana who has always characterized our dependency on foreign petroleum as a national security issue.

This is the perfect bill to have the largest consumer of energy begin to reduce our dependence on these very countries that have cost us so much of our treasure and so many of our lives.

This amendment would defund section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act. The fact is the argument is made that this hurts our readiness and that's not the case. In July the Department of Defense stated very clearly:

The provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we need today worldwide to support military missions, but

it also sets an important baseline in developing the fuels we need for the future.

The gentleman would indicate that there is nearly a 20-fold difference in the price of renewables and the price of petroleum at the pump today. The price of \$3-some cents a gallon, unfortunately some jurisdictions \$4 a gallon, can be purchased very close to this building. Many of these fuels have to be transported to places like Afghanistan. There's an additional cost that is worked into that 20-fold increase.

Additionally, I do not think we need to complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy options. We want to give our warfighters as many options as possible when they are in the field to take advantage of.

This section also does not prevent the sale of petroleum products, nor does it prevent Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need them. Instead, it simply prevents the Federal Government from propping up the makers of these types of fuels with long-term contracts when we're trying to wean ourselves from them.

So I do think that the amendment should be opposed, and I do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I reserve the balance of my time, and it is my understanding that I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has the right to close.

Mr. SCALISE. I will close, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman makes an important point when he says that the Department of Defense is America's largest user of energy. Then I think it is even more important that they watch every penny. You know, I've got hard-working taxpayers, soccer moms in my district, that will drive an extra three blocks just to save a penny a gallon on gasoline because they can see that price at the pump, and it matters to them. If they can save a penny a gallon, they'll drive a couple of extra blocks. And yet you've got the Department of Defense, the largest user of energy in the Nation, according to my friend, saying that they're willing to not drive an extra block to save money; they'll drive a couple of extra blocks to spend \$59 a gallon when they can buy that same jet fuel for \$3.73 a gallon.

Again, another contract, there was a big, high-profile production on the Great Green Fleet where they flew some planes on renewable energy. It cost an extra \$10 million just for that one example.

Again, they're flying the Blue Angels—they're grounded right now, and we're out there flying jets that run on algae and cooking oil, spending hundreds of millions of dollars more than if you used traditional jet fuel.

So while I applaud the gentleman's effort to support renewable energy, that's not something that the Department of Defense should be wasting hun-

dreds of millions of dollars on when the Secretary of Defense has said that we actually are right now significantly reducing training and maintenance of operational forces. We should take those hundreds of millions of dollars we'll save with this amendment and provide it for our troops for the support they need because right now it actually risks our troops' lives. It's a 50 percent higher risk for them to be transporting renewable fuels than it is to transport traditional fuels because of the density of that renewable fuel. So it puts them more at risk. I urge support of this amendment. Let's save those hundreds of millions of dollars and dedicate it towards our Nation's security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I maintain my opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

□ 2045

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise because of 650,000 people in my district; 4,400 employees who serve at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska are being used as political footballs.

Programs like the section 526 that we just heard the gentleman from Louisiana discuss mandate that the armed services spend entirely too much money on fuels. Section 526 also bans our military from using other traditional energy sources like oil sands from Alberta, or even coal-to-liquids.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support, though, for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who has done this amendment in the past. To me, it's not about who gets the credit or who reaps the rewards, just that it gets done.

I'm tired of the Pentagon using civilian workers on base as a political football and then spends the money that they do on fuels. So by working together to cut waste from this bill, like

section 526, we can find ways to protect our constituents who have devoted their lives to serving the men and women who wear the uniform.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have before you today provides that none of the funds in this year's Defense appropriations act may be made available to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round, better known as BRAC.

Remember, we have a current BRAC in place that continues to cost our Nation dollars in the defense budget; and I want to remind folks, too, that this same language passed in this year's National Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 315-108 on June 14, and it says that we want to make sure that we're making the right decisions in the context of what's going on around us.

We have an existing BRAC that will not save a penny until 2018. The original cost-savings estimates on that BRAC were \$21 billion. Today, the cost of that BRAC is estimated at \$35 billion, and the Nation won't break even until 2018. In fact, in this year's President's budget, the estimated cost of that BRAC is \$450 million.

Now, we wouldn't want to proceed with another BRAC with potential cost savings somewhere in the future while we're still paying for the additional BRAC, especially in light of the budgetary needs that are before us with our Nation's defense budget.

With the sequester going on, with those reductions, and with the uncertainty surrounding the current state of affairs with our national defense, why would we want to continue in the realm of uncertainty spending more dollars with an uncertain future about when savings would occur, when we haven't even accrued savings from the 2005 BRAC?

Again, just not the time to go about this, not the time to put in place another Base Realignment and Closure commission.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I seek to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

I note that the gentleman's amendment says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to propose, plan, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

If the gentleman had simply said today we should not execute that national additional Base Realignment and Closure round, I would not have stood on my feet. But the fact is, he said we shouldn't propose or plan either.

He also indicated that because we are today paying, I believe, some hundreds of millions of dollars for the current base closure, we should not consider paying for another one.

But the question I would ask, rhetorically, not necessarily of my colleagues, is, don't we have to sometimes make an investment for the future?

That is, there are cleanup costs, there are close-up costs, there are demolition costs, and those are short-term costs. But potentially, those are investments year in and year out for decades where this Nation's taxpayers can save money.

And where the gentleman says we shouldn't consider another closure and, at this point I'm not aware that there's a proposal pending, what if we could save money by doing that?

Should we simply say no?

Should we just say no to everything?

Is it wrong to consider how we might look at every last base and military facility in this country to save taxpayers money?

Essentially, the gentleman's amendment says it's wrong to look at them. It would be wrong to propose to the Congress, that has the authority under article I of the Constitution, to decide whether, then, we execute that proposal.

Is it wrong for an administration to look nationwide where we're spending almost \$600 billion for a more expensive Department of Defense, but not a larger one, that says we have a plan, and they send it to the Congress?

But we can't even do that, so we can't have a discussion. We can't have an open and free debate. We can't even, would not be allowed, under the gentleman's amendment, to say, you know what, you've got a plan, but we can make it better. We could make it more efficient. We could amend it, but we're prohibited from doing that.

I think the time for simply saying no, no, no, no, no is gone, and I think the gentleman's amendment is wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that, in light of what we have today, with the

uncertainty, with the sequester, with the reduction in funds where we are saving money by furloughing Federal employees, now is not the time to spend more money in this realm of uncertainty, especially when the Secretary of Defense is undertaking a strategic choice in management review to determine what our strategy should be going forward. We certainly want to determine the strategy first before we're going to make additional expenditures on closing bases.

Also, there's a current evaluation going on with our facilities in Europe and our facilities in the Pacific. Shouldn't we finish that first before we start even considering closing bases here in the United States where, by the way, we still haven't gotten to the point of saving money from the last BRAC round, which will take at least 13 years to save money?

So if we start another one that would take another 13 years, are we in the position to spend more money to do that while we have these areas of uncertainty surrounding us, a sequester resulting in furloughs, an evaluation of the current strategy for the United States, an evaluation of base structures in other areas of the world?

I say that this is absolutely the wrong time to pursue a BRAC in any way, shape or form, to propose, plan or execute a BRAC in all those areas.

Let's create some certainty with what's happening right now with this Nation's defense, with what we're doing with planning, to make sure it's a logical, a thoughtful process where there's some certainty, not throwing more uncertainty in the process, which is what a BRAC round would do now.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I understand I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to emphasize, at this time in our Nation's defense budgeting, we ought to be looking at where we can save dollars, where we can apply dollars to those areas of greatest need. And I argue those areas of greatest need are for this Nation's readiness, the training of our troops, the operation and maintenance of our equipment, making sure that we get those dollars there; and that before we pursue a BRAC, we ought to know what the areas are, where we are going to go with this Nation's strategy, what our base structure should be in other areas of the world.

After being at war for nearly 12 years, now we have a well-trained, battle-hardened, combat-tested force, and they are an all-volunteer force that's more joint than ever. We want to understand where we need to be going forward to make sure that we provide for them.

Closing these bases now, or even pursuing a Base Realignment and Closure commission, this is not the time to do that.

Mr. Chairman, again, this is the wrong time. We ought to be looking at the place in time where we have actually accrued the savings on the last BRAC, which started in 2005. Before we pursue another, we ought to make sure we know what this Nation's strategy is, militarily, before we pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission. We ought to know what should our base structures be elsewhere in the world.

Before we pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission here in the United States, we ought to make sure we understand where we're going with the sequester, where we're going with furloughs, where we're going with end-strength with our military before we close bases.

If we're going to be reducing end-strength by 100,000 and say, by the way, let's pursue a Base Realignment and Closure commission now, how do we know where we need to be?

That uncertainty is not where we need to be, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the gentleman, on any number of occasions during his discussion, talked about the uncertainty that we face in this country because of sequestration, and I couldn't agree with him more and would point out that the gentleman voted for the Budget Control Act that created sequestration that has now created the uncertainty that we face, which I find very regrettable.

The gentleman, also, in his concluding remarks, indicated that we need to look to save money. I couldn't agree with him more.

He also indicated, and I would accept it for the sake of our discussion here on the House floor, that some of these processes take 13 years. I think the gentleman makes my argument. If it takes 13 years, we ought to start today, so that that child who is born later this week has the benefit of these savings we both want before they get to high school.

Why wait to save the American taxpayers money by potentially not considering a plan?

I think we ought to be thoughtful here, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 113-170.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels unless their lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources.

My amendment is simple. It would stop the government from enforcing this ban on agencies funded by the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), said a few minutes ago, the initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel.

We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and that it can rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel. One of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable, Middle East crude resources.

I offered this amendment to the Fiscal Year 2014 Homeland Security Appropriations Act and the Fiscal Year 2014 Energy and Water Appropriations Act, and they both passed on the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

□ 2100

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my good friend from Texas.

I also want to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Section 526 was added to the 2007 energy bill as a last-minute add-on, with no hearings, without any information about it whatsoever, and it is beyond misguided. It may sound good on paper, but it is totally unenforceable.

No one in their right mind has a clue what the life-cycle greenhouse gases are for any of the fuels that anybody buys. And, quite frankly, as we blend crude oil sources at a refinery to run through the refinery on a most efficient basis, there is absolutely no way

to separate out the gasoline jet fuel diesel that comes from that refining that would be required if—let's assume for sake of this conversation we actually get the Keystone pipeline done, some of that oil from Canada starts flowing south into our refineries. There is absolutely no way anyone can certify which gasoline coming out is related to those sources versus some others.

So this is misguided. It's unworkable and extreme. I would prefer that we exempt the entire all of government from section 526, but that's obviously beyond the scope of tonight's legislation. I want to thank my friends—Mr. FLORES, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. GINGREY—for, again, posing the striking or exempting of the Department of Defense from the misguided requirements in section 526, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, as we said earlier, this amendment is a simple fix, and that fix is to not restrict our fuel choices based on bad policies or misguided regulations like those in section 526. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us to promote American energy, grow the American economy, create American jobs, and become more energy secure.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I won't prolong the debate because this is either the third or fourth installment, if you would, of this debate, but my response to the current iteration is the same as I have expressed throughout the night. We do have an energy problem in the United States of America, and I agree with former Senator Richard Lugar that it is, first and foremost, a national security interest, given where we get petroleum products.

We've been at war in the Middle East. We've been at war in Afghanistan. We have other problems internationally, much of it precipitated because of our dependence on that fuel. This is not the time, I believe, that we ought to in any way, shape, or form retard the largest consumer of energy in this country from examining and helping to create a vibrant market for alternatives to reduce that.

So, for those reasons and the reasons discussed earlier in this evening's debate, I would be opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed the debate tonight and I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

I would say this. This amendment does not do any of those things that he

said it would. It does not prevent and does not restrict the ability of the Federal Government or the Department of Defense to purchase any alternative fuels—it does not restrict those—including biodiesel, ethanol, or other fuels from renewable resources. So it does not do any of those things that would prevent the flexibility of the Department of Defense in acquiring fuels. As a matter of fact, it helps the Department of Defense have more flexibility.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this a amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time

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

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

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out a furlough (as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) that—

(1) includes in the notice of the furlough made pursuant to section 752.404(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, “sequestration” as the reason for the furlough; and

(2) is of a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is paid from amounts in a Working Capital Fund Account pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I’m offering a bipartisan amendment this evening, Mr. Chairman, to prevent funds from the so-called Working Capital Fund from being used to implement furloughs of DOD employees. This amendment would affect approximately 180,000 workers scattered around the country in different working Capital Fund units. Tinker, Hill, Robbins, the great Air Logistics Centers, account for 26,000 of those.

Working Capital Fund employees are indirectly funded by the government and not by direct appropriations. The commands where these employees are

paid have more than sufficient funds to continue to operate without a furlough. Indeed, furloughing these workers would be counterproductive and ultimately cost money.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s concern and the fact that he is focused on working capital that is essentially funded through customer reimbursement, but as I mentioned in an earlier debate, I am opposed to the gentleman’s amendment.

I voted against the Budget Control Act. I think sequestration is an abhorrent way to run the government. I was disappointed last year when we made every Federal agency in this Nation, including the Department of Defense, wait 7 months until we told them how much money we were going to give them. And then, we told most of the agencies that we’re going to give you what we gave you last year.

Now we’re suffering because of furloughs. And the concern I have here, again, is making distinctions between one Federal employee and another. They’re all very important. I don’t know what going to work every day as a guard in a maximum security Federal prison must be like, but I don’t know that we carve out an exception for them. I don’t know what it is like to be a Federal law enforcement official working undercover, putting your life at risk, getting reimbursed, but not being carved out for furlough.

We have people at NIH, the National Institutes of Health, doing groundbreaking research as far as people’s health and safety; and perhaps they not themselves are risking their lives, but tomorrow, if they were at work, could make a discovery that could improve or prolong someone’s life. And I think it’s a very difficult proposition to begin to make those distinctions between various Federal employees.

I absolutely share the gentleman’s concern as to what is happening with the Federal workforce. I have mentioned in committee and on this floor more than once today that I’m appalled that for 4 years we hold Federal employees in so little regard. We have not given any of them a raise in 4 years. But we scurried to the floor because people were going to be inconvenienced at airports because of potential slowdowns at the FAA. Well, Federal employees actually do things for our safety like make sure, when we leave the ground in an airplane, we’re safe.

So, again, I’m very concerned here. The fact is I do think allowing exceptions for one agency is unfair to others. Allowing exceptions that pit one agency against another wrongly determines

the value of the work performed by some government employees vis-a-vis others. We ought to value all of their work collectively, together, and should not be looking for temporary fixes of one dislocation, as great as it is, caused by sequestration. What we ought to be about—and I know the gentleman is about—is to end this madness, if you would, and get back to the business of governing this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from the State of Washington (Mr. KILMER), a new Member from the Sixth District.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Let me take a second here to say I oppose sequestration, I oppose the furloughs, and I believe Congress should be moving forward on a plan to eliminate sequestration and the process of furloughing workers. But Congress hasn’t done that, and now we’re forced to deal with an ugly process where we’re cutting accounts and cutting workers, not because it makes any sense for the public interest or for our security, but because Congress can’t get its act together.

This amendment responds to what I believe was an incorrect decision by the Department of Defense to furlough civilian workers who work at entities that were funded through Defense Working Capital accounts. The Working Capital Funds are revolving funds that provide goods and services across the DOD that were established to promote stable pricing and reliable access. They were designed to be self-sustaining.

I certainly empathize with the other workers and groups that are facing furloughs, but these workers are not funded through direct appropriation. I believe that these indirectly funded employees are specifically exempted by law from sequestration. Furthermore, I believe that furloughing these employees and, thereby, delaying their work will not save any money, will only increase costs for DOD and hurt taxpayers and jeopardize our military readiness.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority whip from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This issue is straightforward. It deals with Defense Working Capital Funds.

This is just like owning a business. When you provide a service or a product, you get paid for it. That is how Defense Working Capital Funds operates. They’re paid through reimbursements for the services they provide to the Department of Defense, which is already funded for the fiscal year. Thus, Working Capital Funds do not receive direct

appropriations and, therefore, furloughing these individuals have no savings. They actually have the direct opposite effect. It will cost you more, there will be delays, and, most importantly, individuals will be harmed in the process.

The specialized work the Defense Working Capital Fund employees perform is vital to our Nation's security and our warfighters around the globe. A blanket 11-day furlough policy, such as China Lake in my district, will only end up slowing down getting our warfighters the best and latest technology to complete their mission when called upon to protect and defend America and safely return home to their families.

This is very simple. They are a business that performs work and they get paid for it, and the money is already there. That's why I ask and urge all of us to join in supporting this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my classmate and colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as stated, this workload is a self-sustaining process, which means, if the workload is there, and it is, then the money is there, and it is. To furlough the employees in this area saves no money, it completes no work, but it does raise the cost of overhead for all of the depots.

I have empathy for the Pentagon. They made a decision that everyone should share the pain in an effort to be fair. Unfortunately, title 10, section 2472, tells us how this fund should be managed. Sharing the pain isn't one of the options.

I appreciate what is going on here, but the Defense Department cannot simply pick and choose. This amendment does not start a new program. It simply requires that the existing law be followed.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I yield 1 minute to my good friend from the great State of Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am a proud cosponsor of this truly bipartisan amendment, as demonstrated by those who are speaking in favor of it tonight. I, too, voted against sequestration, and I oppose furloughing any DOD citizens who work on behalf of our national security and our troops. Those working at the Rock Island Arsenal, which I represent, proudly serve our country. They don't deserve a pay cut because of Washington's dysfunction. It's as simple as that. That's why Congress and the administration must find a balanced, commonsense way to replace sequestration.

This amendment addresses the unique situation of Working Capital

Fund civilians like those at the Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center, who are already funded from prior years. I think that's important to keep in mind. Furloughing these men and women doesn't create direct savings, as has already been mentioned; rather, it delays work for our troops, hurts our readiness, and increases costs for taxpayers without direct savings.

□ 2115

Again, I oppose all furloughs, and I do oppose sequestration. This amendment, I believe, is a commonsense policy for DOD and for Working Capital Fund employees, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Again, it's a fully bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend from the great State of Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a sensible, bipartisan solution. It helps the country by helping those who work at our depots and other areas. I would just ask that my colleagues join this bipartisan coalition that's working in support of this amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 43 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to train the Afghan National Security Forces Special Mission Wing to operate or maintain Mi-17 helicopters.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds in this bill from being used by the Defense Department to train the Afghan Special Mission Wing to operate or maintain Russian-made Mi-17 helicopters.

Over 93,000 people have died in a tragic war in Syria that is being fueled by

Russian arms being supplied to the Assad regime. Over 1.6 million Syrian refugees are now hosted across five countries. By the end of the year, half the population of Syria will be in need of aid.

We know for a fact that the Russian arms manufacturer, Rosoboroneport, is arming Syria. The Syrian Army requested 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenades, and sniper rifles with night-vision sights. And Russia also recently announced it would provide Assad with advanced S-300 missile defense batteries. Yet, our Defense Department continues to channel business to this Russian arms manufacturer.

DOD recently skirted around a prohibition on purchasing Mi-17 helicopters from Russia's state arms dealer in last year's Defense appropriations bill, signing a contract with Rosoboroneport to procure 30 Mi-17s for the Afghan Specialty Mission Wing using 2012 Afghanistan Security Forces Fund moneys.

This contract signing, flying in the face of congressional intent, incredibly came just days after this House voted 423-0 to strengthen the prohibition on Pentagon business with the Russian arms dealer—a prohibition also included in this Defense appropriations bill.

Even more egregious, it also came on the heels of a report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction that recommended suspension of the plans to purchase these helicopters for the Afghan Special Mission Wing as the Afghans do not even have the capacity to use them.

The Defense Department touts the 30 years of experience the Afghans have with the Mi-17 helicopters as a key reason to purchase them, yet we are still trying to train them to fly these helicopters instead of American-made helicopters—training that the Inspector General report says has been slow and uneven.

The report also argues that moving forward with the acquisition of these Mi-17 helicopters is highly imprudent until, among other things, an agreement is reached on NATO's Afghanistan Training Mission concept for reorganization within the Afghan Government to support this Special Mission Wing.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. taxpayers should not be subsidizing the Russian state arms dealer that is fueling the war in Syria. The language already included in this bill states this. We should also not be spending money to train an Afghan unit to fly these Russian helicopters, particularly when the Inspector General has raised serious questions about the content of that unit's capabilities.

I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the Afghan National Army Special Forces are the most capable component of the Afghan National Security Forces and have made significant strides toward becoming an independent and effective force in Afghanistan.

The only path forward to getting out of Afghanistan is to make sure that we have an effective army, special force, that can do the necessary work to make sure that the fragile Afghan governance that is there survives.

The purpose of this amendment is not to limit the Afghan Special Forces but to further restrict the use of the helicopter it employs to support its mission. The development of the Afghan Army Special Operators remains a critical component of the overall operation structure and strategy to sustain the transition to Afghan security lead.

In other words, if we want to get out of there by 2014, 2015, the Afghan Air Force must succeed. And it has a history, whether we like it or not, with the Mi-17. It's more efficient to expand its fleet and build on their existing knowledge of maintaining that fleet than to completely shift to an entirely different aircraft.

Additionally, U.S. helicopters are more technologically advanced. They're a better helicopter, I'll agree. But it would further prolong the timelines of getting the AAF where they need to be to completely take over the program.

The Mi-17 has been certified by the Department of Defense and is to be the right aircraft for the missions in Afghanistan. The Mi-17 has a long history in Afghanistan and was designed for the high altitude terrain there.

So I reluctantly oppose the gentlelady's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to say to my good friend that I think that we ought to be amenable to working with Afghanistan in these final days, but I don't make up this information.

Our Defense Department continues to channel business to this Russian arms manufacturer. DOD skirted around the prohibition on purchasing Mi-17 helicopters in the last appropriations bill. We voted overwhelmingly—I don't know that there has been a vote in this House on a bipartisan basis that was 423-0—to prohibit this.

So what did the DOD do? The DOD went around that and went to a different pot of money. And one could acknowledge that, but in addition to acknowledging that, I'm going to quote to you from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction:

Afghan Special Mission Wing: DOD plans to spend \$908 million to build air wing that the Afghans cannot operate and maintain.

Now, I don't know why we keep in business an Inspector General that would give us this report, and then we fly in the face of it and not acknowledge its veracity. In addition to which, we are dealing with an arms dealer that is supplying arms, grenades, Kalashnikovs, missiles to Syria, where over 93,000 people have already been killed.

The point is that we shouldn't enter a contract when there is no capability to fly these helicopters.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, we're not talking about a helicopter manufacturer that would suffer. It's the combat unit in Afghanistan that would be devastated and unable to fulfill its mission, and if it's not able to fulfill its mission, then we will not have a capable military to take over when the United States leaves in 2014.

I'm not going to defend Russia or their foreign policy and what they're doing in Syria, but we do want Afghanistan to succeed. So I reluctantly must oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ (a) The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by one percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available—

- (1) under title I for "Military Personnel";
- (2) under title VI for "Defense Health Program"; or
- (3) under title IX.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congressmen POLIS, BLUMENAUER, CONYERS, and SCHRADER, who have joined me in offering this amendment.

Our amendment is very straightforward. It would trim Pentagon spending by a very modest 1 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates our amendment would result in a reduction of discretionary spending of \$5.9 billion, and it does so while maintaining our national security and protecting our Active Duty military personnel.

This Defense appropriations bill is \$28.1 billion more than the Pentagon's current funding level, which includes \$5 billion more than the President's request for war spending in the Overseas Contingency Account. In total, this bill includes over \$85 billion in war spending at a time when the majority of the American people and a growing bipartisan group in Congress are calling for an expedited end of military activities in Afghanistan.

Our amendment simply takes the total amount in the bill, reduces that amount by 1 percent, and then allows the Department of Defense to choose what accounts to take the reduction from. As I mentioned before, military personnel accounts and medical and health care programs are exempt from this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, month after month we have been talking about ways to address the budget and the impacts of the harmful sequester. The question before the body today is: How do we ensure that we have a budget that reflects our national security priorities, our moral values, and our underlying economic strength? I'm talking about a budget that protects the most vulnerable in our country and a budget that ensures that we have priorities to create jobs and turn this economy around—in other words, nation-building in our own country.

What this amendment does is say that we need to put everything on the table—and I mean everything—and that includes the Pentagon. Believe me, if I could, I would support much greater cuts to the Pentagon. But surely \$5 billion can be found among the tens of billions of dollars lost each year at the Pentagon due to waste, fraud, and abuse. You know that that \$5 billion is a mere drop in the bucket when you look at what has been actually taken away without knowledge of where that money has gone, when you look at the suitcases filled with cash in Afghanistan, and previously in Iraq.

Even with this modest cut of 1 percent, the Pentagon base budget would still far outpace any other nation in defense spending. The United States spends as much on its military as 13 countries combined. But all three of these are close allies. I'm talking about China, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, India, Saudi Arabia, Germany, of course Brazil, Italy, South Korea, Australia and Canada. Combined, we spend more than those countries.

Finally, Americans believe that no Federal agency should really be immune from cuts, including the Pentagon. In fact, the average American would pursue a much larger cut of over \$93 billion, according to a poll released in 2012 by the Stimson Center.

So it's long overdue that we be honest with the American people and begin to have some real debate about deficit reduction, job creation, and the reduction of spending. And that includes the Pentagon.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I'm the first to admit that the Department of Defense should not be immune to reasonably based reductions. We should be doing that. That's exactly what we've been doing the past few years and will continue to do this year.

□ 2130

This bill that we are deciding today and tomorrow is \$3.4 billion below the President's request. In fact, over the past 3 fiscal years, this committee has produced defense budgets which totaled \$71 billion below the request, only \$32 billion of which has been due to sequestration.

The Department is already facing another \$44 billion arbitrary reduction in spending if we don't stop sequestration from going into effect in FY 2014. Any further immediate and arbitrary reductions would likely bring the Department to a grinding halt, perhaps past the point of recovery.

Specifically, reductions could require reducing/canceling training for returning troops; canceling Navy training exercises; reducing Air Force flight training; delaying or canceling maintenance of aircraft, ships, and vehicles; and delaying important safety and quality-of-life repairs to facilities and military barracks.

Finally, the allocation of this bill is essentially in line with both the Ryan budget, as well as the Defense authorization bill. National security should not be subject to partisan politics. Instead, we should show our support for these brave men and women who have sacrificed so much and continue to do so.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentlewoman's approach. I have on more than one occasion in talking about the Department of Defense, my constituency indicated, as the gentleman noted, no one should be immune to cuts; and if you can't find 1 cent out of every dollar at the Department of Defense to save, there is something wrong with the leadership at the Department of Defense.

But I rise in reluctant opposition for two reasons:

One is I have an inherent objection to across-the-board cuts because I think we ought to make sure we are very targeted as far as our financial decisions.

Secondly, given the across-the-board cut that has been referenced of more than \$30 billion in the current fiscal year because of sequestration under a bill I voted against, we are talking in this instance about filling a significant arbitrary hole.

So again, I would reluctantly be opposed to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first thank our ranking member for his comments and just reiterate the fact that while this is a 1 percent cut across-the-board, it allows the Pentagon to make those decisions about where the Pentagon and our military officials believe the cuts should come from and how to reallocate our funds.

Certainly as the daughter of a veteran of 25 years—I'm an Army brat—I recognize and support our young men and women who have been placed in harm's way and who have sacrificed so much for our country. There is no way that I would offer an amendment that would harm our troops.

A 1 percent cut really forces us to pause, quite frankly, and forces us to look where we can find savings when we scrutinize the Pentagon budget, the same way that we scrutinize our domestic discretionary spending. At a time when American families, businesses, and government agencies are facing budget cuts, why shouldn't the Pentagon be asked to become more efficient and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse?

Let me reiterate that this bill includes \$5 billion more than the President's request for the overseas contingency account. So it makes no sense. We need to begin to focus our resources on nation-building at home, ensure our national security, and really make sure that all of our agencies begin to look at waste, fraud, and abuse. Certainly, the Pentagon should be the first to do that, especially given the fact that we have not had audit requirements of the Pentagon and still don't know what type of resources there have been wasted and misallocated.

I ask for support for this very modest amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have made significant cuts in our national defense and continue to do so. We are at lowest levels as a percentage of GDP expenditures for our national security in a long time.

I would rise in opposition to this amendment, would urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate or maintain more than 300 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It simply reduces the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear missiles, by a third, from 450 to 300.

We are in the midst of an extraordinary budget crisis. We are facing unsustainable debt. Yet we continue to spend approximately \$50 billion to \$55 billion annually to maintain and even grow a nuclear arsenal and associated programs designed for a Cold War that no longer exists.

Russia is no longer the existential threat it once was, and we are working closely with Russian leaders to reduce our nuclear arsenals together. While other nations, such as China, have some nuclear weapons, their stockpiles pale in comparison. China has no more than 50 to 75 single warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We can significantly reduce our nuclear arsenal of 1,700 and still maintain a robust military edge over any rival. As we look to reduce our nuclear stockpile, we should be strategic and make targeted cuts.

According to a recent report issued by General James Cartwright, retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of U.S. nuclear forces; Secretary Chuck Hagel; and a number of other military and foreign experts, all land-based ICBMs could be eliminated. Let me take a moment to repeat that. The former commander of all U.S. nuclear forces thinks we don't need any ICBMs—none. According to the report:

The U.S. ICBM force has lost its central utility.

The report outlines four key reasons ICBMs should be eliminated:

First, “Direct wartime nuclear operations against Russia alone, were Cold War scenarios that are no longer plausible.”

Second, flight paths over all land-based ICBMs to any potential adversaries—Iran, North Korea, China—would have to travel through Russian air space. This could trigger “confusing Russia, and triggering nuclear retaliation.”

Third, “U.S. Trident submarines and B-2 strategic bombers can deliver nuclear weapons to virtually any point on the Earth.”

Fourth, “ICBMs in fixed silos are inherently targetable.”

Once again, these are not my assessments, nor the assessments of some anti-nuclear groups. These are the assessments of General Cartwright, the retired vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former commander of U.S. nuclear forces; Richard Burt, a former chief nuclear arms negotiator; Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, former Ambassador to Russia, Thomas Pickering; and General John Sheehan, a former senior NATO official.

The former commander of U.S. nuclear forces has issued his support for the elimination of ICBMs.

This amendment merely calls for a reduction by one-third. We have limited resources, and that means we have to make choices. As we look to cut spending, let’s cut military investments that do nothing to keep us safe in today’s threat environment, such as ICBMs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment, which amounts to the unilateral reduction of our nuclear forces. Unilateral reductions of our nuclear forces are wrong for national security—period.

These reductions have been directly and explicitly recommended against by the Joint Chiefs and senior DOD civilian officials, all who have said that reductions must be made bilaterally in concert with Russia.

I am deeply concerned that not only is this proposal to unilaterally disarm unwise; it is also shortsighted. It could seriously diminish the long-term security of our Nation.

We face a world today in which nuclear threats to the United States are increasing and our conventional military capabilities face dramatic reductions. Given this, our nuclear deterrent is becoming more important, not less.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, in my home State of Montana, is home to 150 of our Nation’s intercontinental ballistic missiles. Earlier this year, I visited Malmstrom and I met with the leaders of the 341st Missile Wing to discuss the importance of our ICBM mission to our national security.

Colonel Robert W. Stanley, the commander at Malmstrom, gave me this commander’s coin, which bears a motto that truly sums up why our defense strategy is effective. It says this: “Scaring the hell out of America’s enemies since 1962.”

This motto clearly demonstrates the importance of our peace-through-strength strategy. We cannot underestimate the role that our strong nuclear defenses have played in keeping America secure and maintaining peace not only with Russia, but throughout the world. In fact, some say we have never had to use our ICBMs. I would argue we use them every day to ensure that the world is a safer place.

That is why I urge my colleagues to also support the amendment that I’ve introduced, alongside Congressman LAMBORN, Congresswoman LUMMIS, and Congressman CRAMER. Our amendment will help keep America safe by maintaining a strong nuclear deterrent and preventing the Obama administration from pursuing efforts to unilaterally reduce our nuclear arsenal.

The Obama administration requested funds in their 2014 budget proposal to do environmental impact studies of our ICBMs, which is widely seen as a back door to attempting to reduce our ICBM fleet.

Our amendment simply prohibits this study. Now is not the time to reduce our ICBM fleet, which is why I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose Mr. QUIGLEY’s amendment and to support the Daines-Lamborn-Lummis-Cramer amendment.

I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Quigley amendment as well. It will defund the operation and maintenance of 150 of our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Regardless of your stance on the nuclear triad—and we will have the opportunity to discuss it later—it is irresponsible to stop funding maintenance of our nuclear weapons with no formal reduction plan.

Are we supposed to leave warheads rotting in the silos? This amendment does not fund the decommissioning of warheads. If it did, a full-scale reduction of our force would be a costly endeavor, one that takes time and is a decision that should not be taken lightly.

But it will effectively reduce our ICBM capabilities by one-third without any strategic considerations or multilateral negotiations with other nuclear powers. The Joint Chiefs have directly and explicitly recommended against a unilateral reduction.

As the administration continues to weigh final force structure decisions scheduled to occur in FY 15, I ask my colleagues to consider the consequences of removing this funding the year before.

The mission of the Air Force Global Strike Command is to provide a safe,

secure, effective nuclear deterrent force for the President of the United States. The Quigley amendment would impede the Air Force’s ability to fulfill that mission, preempts the President’s force structure decision, and lacks feasibility without preparation.

I urge you to oppose the Quigley amendment.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

This cut is not required by any treaty. There is no strategic analysis, as the gentlelady said. There is no estimate of how this would affect the balance between the United States and other nuclear powers.

Events over the last several years, as well as through analysis, such as that done under the Nuclear Posture Review, have confirmed that we need to maintain and revitalize our nuclear deterrent.

I rise in strong opposition to this reckless amendment.

□ 2145

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I am always concerned when the Joint Chiefs have a strong opinion about our national defense. Given that, these reductions have been directly and explicitly recommended against by the Joint Chiefs and by senior DOD civilian officials. These gentlemen have all said the reductions must only be made bilaterally, in concert with Russia.

This is shortsighted; it is unwise; and it is a threat to our national security. Therefore, I oppose this unilateral reduction in our nuclear forces.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Let me just say that I’ve been here 4 years now, and I recognize what the Department of Defense is—it is our jobs program.

I respect my colleagues for defending jobs in their districts, but this isn’t about national security—it’s about job maintenance, which is not what this is supposed to be about. If we’re going to spend money in creating jobs, I want to build bridges and schools and transit systems.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VIS-CLOSKY).

Mr. VIS-CLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I quoted in my opening remarks, rather than getting larger and more expensive over the past decade, the military has simply grown to be more expensive. Our world has fundamentally changed since the days of the Cold War, and certain aspects of our military’s national security strategies have evolved. However,

I do not believe that our nuclear weapons have had a corresponding change relative to our consideration as to their deployment in numbers.

I do think that Congress has a very important role to play in helping the administration make rational decisions as to the size and composition of the stockpile and of the complex that supports it. In talking about that complex as a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I will point out that there are significant costs over and above those in this particular bill given the civilian control over the warheads at that particular Department.

I also do not have a concern that, in any way, shape, or form, the gentleman is proposing that we unilaterally disarm this Nation. I believe that we certainly have adequate protection, and I support his amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to implement the Trans Regional Web Initiative.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is crucial in this time of limited budgets that we transfer funds from those programs which are either duplicative or ineffective to the highest priority uses for the Department, such as maintaining readiness and taking care of our personnel. With that in mind, I have introduced a limiting amendment to prohibit the Department of Defense from using funds to implement the Trans-Regional Web Initiative.

This program consists of a series of general news Web sites that cater to foreign audiences. The Department requested \$19.7 million to continue this effort during fiscal year 2014. An April 2013 GAO report found that the TRWI

program lacks meaningful performance metrics and is poorly coordinated with other U.S. Government public diplomacy programs. I want to put this \$19.7 million in perspective.

With this money, the Army National Guard could have retained 2,000 soldiers of the 4,000 it has been forced to reduce from its end strength due to budget cuts. That is 2,000 guardsmen who could be supporting our active component, responding to natural disasters, or securing our border. Instead, that money is going to Web sites providing entertainment news and lifestyle advice to the Balkans and Middle East.

It is important to remember that the United States already spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year in providing quality, independent journalism overseas through the Broadcasting Board of Governors. In fact, every week, more than 203 million listeners, viewers, and Internet users around the world engage with U.S. international broadcasting programs which are completely separate from the duplicative and expensive TRWI program.

How can we possibly justify unnecessary and ineffective, duplicative measures by the Department of Defense? How can I tell someone in my district that he was furloughed but that we found the cash to pay for an article about the plight of child actors in Turkey?

Our colleagues in the Senate have already acted. The Senate Armed Services Committee found that the costs to operate the Web sites are excessive, that the effectiveness of the Web sites is questionable, and that the performance metrics do not justify the expense.

I want to thank Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the Project on Government Oversight for their support on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of limited Federal resources, we cannot afford to continue wasteful programs like this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, over the past several years, this committee has taken a very hard look at all of our military information operations programs—a very hard look. While the committee reduced or eliminated funding for those we judged not to be appropriate Defense Department activities, this was not one of them.

This is a fully acknowledged program, with each Web site sponsored by a geographic combatant commander. These Web sites provide important news and information about events in their regions and about U.S. activities being conducted in those regions. These Web sites are an important opportunity for the United States Gov-

ernment to inform foreign audiences about U.S. military activities in their regions, including joint military training exercises or, very importantly, about humanitarian assistance.

Too often, we find ourselves frustrated that foreign populations fail to appreciate the support they receive from the United States, particularly from the United States military, or to understand the U.S. position on issues impacting their parts of the world. This is often because people are unaware of our efforts. These Web sites offer the combatant commanders the ability to get the word out, and I believe and we, the committee, believe that that's important. Therefore, I urge the rejection of the amendment.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. I would simply associate myself with his remarks and, particularly, with his introduction.

The subcommittee has had concerns and questions about the program in the past and has worked very closely with the Department of Defense. I do think it shows the oversight that this subcommittee continues to exercise. Again, I join with the gentleman in opposition.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just end by saying that this is another attempt to cut waste.

Give the Department of Defense the flexibility to retain our personnel. 2,160 National Guardsmen, to be exact, could be saved and retained by cutting this amount of waste. As well as having Citizens Against Government Waste, the Senate has shown great wisdom in this particular instance in coming together with us and cutting this type of waste.

I think this is a great opportunity to really show that we support those brave men and women by retaining those positions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this program also supports our very brave men and women.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. CICALLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. FLEMING of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 44 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 45 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. DENHAM of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. CICALLINE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—184

Amash	DeLauro	Jeffries
Andrews	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Doyle	Jones
Beatty	Duffy	Keating
Becerra	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kilmer
Bonamici	Ellison	Kingston
Brady (PA)	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Braley (IA)	Enyart	Kuster
Broun (GA)	Eshoo	Labrador
Brown (FL)	Farr	Langevin
Buchanan	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Burgess	Fincher	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Foxx	Lewis
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Loebsack
Capuano	Fudge	Lofgren
Carney	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lummis
Cassidy	Garrett	Maffei
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney,
Chu	Grayson	Carolyn
Cicilline	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Clarke	Green, Gene	Massie
Clay	Grijalva	McClintock
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Clyburn	Hahn	McDermott
Coffman	Hanabusa	McGovern
Cohen	Hanna	McIntyre
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	McKinley
Courtney	Higgins	Meadows
Crowley	Himes	Meeks
Cummings	Hinojosa	Mica
Daines	Honda	Michaud
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
DeFazio	Huffman	Miller, George
DeGette	Jackson Lee	Moore

Moran	Radel	Sinema	Thompson (PA)	Vargas	Williams
Mulvaney	Rahall	Sires	Thornberry	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (FL)	Rangel	Slaughter	Tiberi	Visclosky	Wittman
Nadler	Reed	Speier	Tipton	Wagner	Wolf
Napolitano	Renacci	Stockman	Titus	Walorski	Womack
Neal	Ribble	Stutzman	Tonko	Wasserman	Yoder
Negrete McLeod	Richmond	Thompson (CA)	Tsongas	Schultz	Young (AK)
Neugebauer	Rigell	Thompson (MS)	Turner	Weber (TX)	Young (FL)
Nolan	Rohrabacher	Tierney	Valadao	Wenstrup	Young (IN)
O'Rourke	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton	Van Hollen		
Pallone	Royce	Vela			
Pascarell	Rush	Velázquez			
Paulsen	Sanchez, Loretta	Walberg			
Payne	Sanford	Walden			
Peters (CA)	Scalise	Walsh			
Peters (MI)	Schakowsky	Walters			
Peterson	Schiff	Watt			
Petri	Schneider	Waxman			
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Webster (FL)			
Pitts	Schwartz	Welch			
Pocan	Schweikert	Westmoreland			
Poe (TX)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)			
Polis	Scott, David	Woodall			
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Yarmuth			
Price (GA)	Serrano	Yoho			
Quigley	Shea-Porter				

NOES—237

Aderholt	Forbes	Marchant
Alexander	Fortenberry	Marino
Amodei	Foster	Matheson
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Matsui
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Barber	Gallego	McCaul
Barletta	Garcia	McHenry
Barr	Gardner	McKeon
Barrow (GA)	Gerlach	McMorris
Barton	Gibbs	Rodgers
Benishek	Gibson	McNerney
Bentivolio	Goodlatte	Meehan
Bera (CA)	Gosar	Meng
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Messer
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Miller (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Noem
Bonner	Grimm	Nugent
Boustany	Guthrie	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hall	Nunnelee
Bridenstine	Harper	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Owens
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Palazzo
Brownley (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Calvert	Hensarling	Perlmutter
Camp	Holding	Perry
Capito	Hoyer	Pittenger
Cárdenas	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Carson (IN)	Hultgren	Price (NC)
Carter	Hunter	Reichert
Castor (FL)	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Roby
Chabot	Issa	Roe (TN)
Cole	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Connolly	Jordan	Roskam
Cook	Joyce	Ross
Cooper	Kaptur	Rothfus
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Roybal-Allard
Cotton	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cramer	Kildee	Ryunan
Crawford	Kind	Ruppersberger
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Davis (CA)	Kline	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	LaMalfa	T.
Delaney	Lamborn	Sarbanes
DeBene	Lance	Scott, Austin
Denham	Lankford	Sessions
Dent	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
DeSantis	Latham	Sherman
DesJarlais	Latta	Shimkus
Deuch	Levin	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Smith (MO)
Dingell	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Duckworth	Long	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Lowe	Smith (TX)
Ellmers	Lucas	Smith (WA)
Esty	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Farenthold	Lujan Grisham	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	(NM)	Stivers
Fleischmann	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Fleming	(NM)	Takano
Flores	Lynch	Terry

Thompson (PA)	Vargas	Williams
Thornberry	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Visclosky	Wittman
Tipton	Wagner	Wolf
Titus	Walorski	Womack
Tonko	Wasserman	Yoder
Tsongas	Schultz	Young (AK)
Turner	Weber (TX)	Young (FL)
Valadao	Wenstrup	Young (IN)
Van Hollen	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)
Cantor	Holt	Rokita
Coble	Horsford	Schock
Gohmert	Hudson	Simpson

□ 2222

Messrs. TONKO, ISRAEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Messrs. PASTOR of Arizona and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, RIBBLE, WATT, GINGREY of Georgia, LANGEVIN, FINCHER, MEEKS, HANNA, and YOHO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 173, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—249

Amash	Clay	Fattah
Andrews	Cleaver	Fincher
Bachmann	Clyburn	Pitzpatrick
Bass	Coffman	Foster
Beatty	Cohen	Foxx
Becerra	Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)
Bentivolio	Cooper	Fudge
Bera (CA)	Costa	Gabbard
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Cramer	Garrett
Bonamici	Crowley	Gibbs
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gibson
Braley (IA)	Daines	Gingrey (GA)
Bridenstine	Davis (CA)	Gohmert
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Goodlatte
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Broun (GA)	DeFazio	Gowdy
Buchanan	DeGette	Grayson
Bucshon	DeLauro	Green, Al
Burgess	DeBene	Green, Gene
Bustos	DeSantis	Griffin (AR)
Camp	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Capito	Doggett	Grijalva
Capps	Doyle	Gutiérrez
Capuano	Duffy	Hahn
Carney	Duncan (SC)	Hanabusa
Cartwright	Duncan (TN)	Hanna
Cassidy	Ellison	Harris
Castor (FL)	Engel	Hastings (FL)
Chaffetz	Enyart	Heck (WA)
Chu	Eshoo	Higgins
Cicilline	Esty	Himes
Clarke	Farr	Hinojosa

Honda Miller (MI) Sanford
 Huelskamp Miller, George Scalise Ruppertsberger
 Huffman Moore Schalko Ryan (OH)
 Huizenga (MI) Moran Schiff Ryan (WI)
 Hultgren Mulvaney Schneider Sarbanes
 Hunter Murphy (FL) Schrader Scott, Austin
 Hurt Nadler Schwartz Sewell (AL)
 Issa Napolitano Schweikert Shimkus
 Jackson Lee Neal Scott (VA) Shuster
 Jeffries Negrete McLeod Scott, David
 Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer Sensenbrenner
 Jones Nolan Serrano Sessions
 Joyce Nugent Shea-Porter
 Keating O'Rourke Sherman
 Kelly (IL) Pallone Simpson
 Kilmer Pascrell Sinema
 Kind Paulsen Sires
 Kingston Payne Smith (MO)
 Kirkpatrick Perlmutter Smith (NJ)
 Kuster Peters (CA) Speier
 Labrador Peters (MI) Stivers
 LaMalfa Peterson Stockman
 Lance Petri Stutzman
 Langevin Pingree (ME) Thompson (CA)
 Larson (CT) Pitts Thompson (MS)
 Lee (CA) Pocan Tiberi
 Lewis Poe (TX) Tierney
 LoBiondo Polis Titus
 Loebsack Posey Tonko
 Lofgren Price (GA) Upton
 Lowenthal Quigley Vela
 Lummis Radel Velázquez
 Lynch Rahall Walberg
 Maffei Rangel Walden
 Maloney, Sean Reed Walz
 Carolyn Renacci Waters
 Maloney, Sean Ribble Watt
 Massie Rice (SC) Waxman
 Matheson Rigell Webster (FL)
 Matsui Roe (TN) Welch
 McClintock Rogers (MI) Westmoreland
 McCollum Rohrabacher Whitfield
 McDermott Rooney Williams
 McGovern Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (FL)
 McIntyre Roybal-Allard Wolf
 McKinley Royce Woodall
 Meadows Rush Yarmuth
 Meeks Salmon Sánchez, Linda
 Meng T. Yoder
 Mica Sanchez, Loretta Young (AK)
 Michaud

NOES—173

Aderholt Fleischmann Long
 Alexander Fleming Lowey
 Amodei Flores Lucas
 Bachus Forbes Luetkemeyer
 Barber Fortenberry Lujan Grisham
 Barletta Franks (AZ) (NM)
 Barr Frelinghuysen Luján, Ben Ray
 Barrow (GA) Gallego (NM)
 Barton García Marchant
 Benishek Gardner Marino
 Billirakis Gerlach McCarthy (CA)
 Bishop (GA) Granger McCaul
 Bishop (UT) Graves (GA) McHenry
 Black Graves (MO) McKeon
 Blackburn Grimm McMorris
 Bonner Guthrie Rodgers
 Boustany Hall McNeerney
 Brady (TX) Harper Meehan
 Brown (FL) Hartzler Messer
 Brownley (CA) Hastings (WA) Miller (FL)
 Butterfield Heck (NV) Miller, Gary
 Calvert Hensarling Mullin
 Cantor Holding Murphy (PA)
 Cárdenas Hoyer Noem
 Carson (IN) Hudson Nunes
 Carter Israel Nunnelee
 Castro (TX) Jenkins Olson
 Chabot Johnson (GA) Owens
 Collins (NY) Johnson (OH) Palazzo
 Conaway Johnson, Sam Pastor (AZ)
 Connolly Jordan Pearce
 Cook Kaptur Pelosi
 Cotton Kelly (PA) Perry
 Crawford Kennedy Pittenger
 Crenshaw Kildee Pompeo
 Cuellar King (IA) Price (NC)
 Culberson King (NY) Reichert
 Delaney Kinzinger (IL) Richmond
 Dent Kline Roby
 Deutch Lamborn Rogers (AL)
 Diaz-Balart Lankford Rogers (KY)
 Dingell Roskam Carson (IN)
 Duckworth Latham Ross
 Edwards Latta Rothfus
 Ellmers Levin Ruiz
 Farenthold Lipinski Runyan

Stewart Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey

Campbell
 Coble
 Cole
 Conyers

NOT VOTING—11

Denham
 Herrera Beutler
 Holt
 Horsford

□ 2228

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

Messrs. GOSAR and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 346, noes 79, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—346

Amash
 Andrews
 Bachmann
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Black
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brown (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Camp
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais

Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walorski
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yoho
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gense
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Kirkpatrick
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McCarty
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKinley
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roe (TN)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Rush
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wolf
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOES—79

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amodei
 Bachus
 Barton
 Billirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Cantor
 Cárdenas
 Carter
 Conaway
 Cook
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Ellmers
 Fleischmann
 Forbes
 Foster
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Grimm
 Hartzler
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, Sam
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Lamborn
 Long
 Luetkemeyer
 Marino
 McKeon

McNerney Ruiz Turner
Miller (FL) Runyan Visclosky
Mullin Ruppertsberger Walorski
Pearce Sewell (AL) Wenstrup
Pompeo Smith (NE) Whitfield
Reichert Smith (TX) Wilson (SC)
Roby Smith (WA) Wittman
Rogers (AL) Stewart Womack
Rogers (KY) Thivers Young (FL)
Rogers (MI) Thornberry
Roskam Tiberi

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell Holt Rokita
Coble Horsford Schock
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2232

Messrs. COLE and GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 276, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—150

Amash Doggett Kind
Andrews Doyle Kirkpatrick
Bachmann Duncan (TN) Labrador
Bass Edwards Larson (CT)
Beatty Ellison Lee (CA)
Becerra Enyart Loebsock
Bentivolio Eshoo Lofgren
Bera (CA) Esty Lowenthal
Bishop (NY) Farr Lummis
Blumenauer Fattah Lynch
Bonamici Fudge Maffei
Brady (PA) Garamendi Maloney,
Braley (IA) Garrett Carolyn
Broun (GA) Gibson Massie
Buchanan Gingrey (GA) Matsui
Burgess Gohmert McClintock
Camp Gowdy McDermott
Capps Grayson McGovern
Capuano Green, Gene McKinley
Carson (IN) Griffith (VA) Meeks
Carter Grijalva Mica
Cartwright Gutiérrez Michaud
Castor (FL) Hahn Miller (MI)
Chaffetz Hanabusa Miller, George
Chu Harris Moran
Cicilline Hastings (FL) Mulvaney
Clarke Higgins Murphy (FL)
Clay Himes Nadler
Cleaver Hinojosa Napolitano
Coffman Honda Neal
Cohen Huelskamp Negrete McLeod
Conyers Huffman Nolan
Courtney Huizenga (MI) O'Rourke
Cummings Hurt Pallone
Davis, Rodney Jeffries Pascrell
DeFazio Johnson, E. B. Payne
DeGette Jones Peters (CA)
DeLauro Kelly (IL) Peters (MI)

Petri Sánchez, Linda
Pingree (ME) T.
Pocan Sanchez, Loretta
Poe (TX) Sanford
Polis Schakowsky
Posey Schweikert
Price (GA) Scott (VA)
Quigley Sensenbrenner
Rahall Serrano
Rangel Sires
Ribble Slaughter
Rohrabacher Speier
Ros-Lehtinen Stutzman

NOES—276

Aderholt Gerlach Moore
Alexander Gibbs Mullin
Amodei Goodlatte Murphy (PA)
Bachus Gosar Neugebauer
Barber Granger Noem
Barletta Graves (GA) Nugent
Barr Graves (MO) Nunes
Barrow (GA) Green, Al Nunnelee
Barton Griffin (AR) Olson
Biden Benishek Grimm Owens
Bilirakis Guthrie Palazzo
Bishop (GA) Hall Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (UT) Hanna Paulsen
Black Harper Pearce
Blackburn Hartzler Pelosi
Bonner Hastings (WA) Perlmutter
Boustany Heck (NV) Perry
Brady (TX) Heck (WA) Peterson
Bridenstine Hensarling Pittenger
Brooks (AL) Holding Pitts
Brooks (IN) Hoyer Pompeo
Brown (FL) Hudson Price (NC)
Brownley (CA) Hultgren Radel
Bucshon Hunter Reed
Bustos Israel Reichert
Butterfield Issa Renacci
Calvert Jackson Lee Rice (SC)
Cantor Jenkins Richmond
Capito Johnson (GA) Rigell
Cárdenas Johnson (OH) Roby
Carney Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)
Cassidy Jordan Rogers (AL)
Castro (TX) Joyce Rogers (KY)
Chabot Kaptur Rooney
Clyburn Keating Roskam
Cole Kelly (PA) Ross
Collins (GA) Kennedy Rothfus
Collins (NY) Kildee Roybal-Allard
Conaway Kilmer Royce
Connolly King (IA) Ruiz
Cook King (NY) Runyan
Cooper Kingston Ruppertsberger
Costa Kinzinger (IL) Rush
Cotton Kline
Cramer Kuster Ryan (OH)
Crawford LaMalfa Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw Lamborn Salmon
Crowley Lance Sarbanes
Cuellar Langevin Scalise
Culberson Lankford Schiff
Dairolsen Larsen (WA) Schneider
Davis (CA) Latham Schock
Davis, Danny Latta Schrader
Delaney Levin Schwartz
DeBene Lewis Scott, Austin
Denham Lipinski Scott, David
Dent LoBiondo Sessions
DeSantis Long Sewell (AL)
DesJarlais Lowey Shea-Porter
Deutch Lucas Sherman
Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer Shimkus
Dingell Lujan Grisham Shuster
Duckworth (NM) Simpson
Duffy Luján, Ben Ray Sinema
Duncan (SC) (NM) Smith (MO)
Ellmers Maloney, Sean Smith (NE)
Engel Marchant Smith (NJ)
Farenthold Marino Smith (TX)
Fincher Matheson Smith (WA)
Fitzpatrick McCarthy (CA) Sutherland
Fleischmann McCaul Stewart
Fleming McCollum Stivers
Flores McHenry Stockman
Forbes McIntyre Swalwell (CA)
Fortenberry McKean Takano
Foster McMorris Thompson (MS)
Foxy Rodgers Thompson (PA)
Frankel (FL) McNerney Thornberry
Franklin Meadows Tiberi
Franks (AZ) Meehan Tipton
Frelinghuysen Meng Tsongas
Gabbard Messer Turner
Gallego Miller (FL)
Garcia Miller, Gary
Gardner

Terry Wasserman Wittman
Thompson (CA) Schultz Wolf
Tierney Watt Womack
Titus Weber (TX) Woodall
Tonko Wagner Webster (FL)
Upton Wenstrup Yoho
Velázquez Westmoreland Young (AK)
Waters Walorski Young (FL)
Waxman Walz Williams
Welch Wilson (SC) Young (IN)
Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Holt Rokita
Coble Horsford
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2236

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 173, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—253

Aderholt Cook Gohmert
Alexander Cooper Goodlatte
Amodei Costa Gosar
Bachmann Cramer Gowdy
Bachus Crawford Granger
Barber Crenshaw Graves (GA)
Barletta Cuellar Graves (MO)
Barr Culberson Green, Gene
Barrow (GA) Daines Griffin (AR)
Barton Davis, Danny Griffith (VA)
Biden Benishek Grimm
Bilirakis Denham Guthrie
Bishop (UT) Dent Hall
Black DeSantis Hanna
Blackburn DesJarlais Harper
Bonner Diaz-Balart Harris
Boustany Duffy Hartzler
Brady (TX) Duncan (SC) Hastings (WA)
Bridenstine Duncan (TN) Heck (NV)
Brooks (AL) Ellmers Hensarling
Brooks (IN) Enyart Holding
Broun (GA) Farenthold Hudson
Buchanan Fincher Huelskamp
Bucshon Fitzpatrick Huizenga (MI)
Burgess Fleischmann Hultgren
Bustos Fleming Hunter
Calvert Flores Hurt
Camp Forbes Issa
Cantor Fortenberry Jenkins
Foxy Johnson (GA)
Capito Franks (AZ) Johnson (OH)
Carter Frelinghuysen Johnson, Sam
Cassidy Gallego Jones
Chabot Garcia Jordan
Chaffetz Gardner Joyce
Coffman Garrett Kelly (PA)
Cole Gerlach Kilmer
Collins (GA) King (IA)
Collins (NY) Gibson King (NY)
Conaway Gingrey (GA) Kingston

Kinzinger (IL) Nunnelee
 Kline Olson
 Labrador Owens
 LaMalfa Palazzo
 Lamborn Paulsen
 Lance Pearce
 Lankford Perry
 Latham Peterson
 Latta Petri
 Lipinski Pittenger
 LoBiondo Pitts
 Long Poe (TX)
 Lucas Pompeo
 Luetkemeyer Posey
 Lummis Price (GA)
 Maffei Radel
 Marchant Rahall
 Marino Reed
 Massie Reichert
 Matheson Renacci
 McCarthy (CA) Ribble
 McCaul Rice (SC)
 McClintock Rigell
 McHenry Roby
 McIntyre Roe (TN)
 McKeon Rogers (AL)
 McKinley Rogers (KY)
 McMorris Rogers (MI)
 Rodgers Rohrabacher
 Meadows Rooney
 Meehan Ros-Lehtinen
 Messer Roskam
 Mica Ross
 Michaud Rothfus
 Miller (FL) Royce
 Miller (MI) Ruiz
 Miller, Gary Runyan
 Mullin Ryan (WI)
 Mulvaney Salmon
 Murphy (FL) Sanford
 Murphy (PA) Scalise
 Neugebauer Schock
 Noem Schweikert
 Nugent Scott, Austin
 Nunes Sensenbrenner

Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Vela
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko

Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz

Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Hinojosa
 Holding
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt

McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Jones
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Salmon
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Turner
 Upton
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Holt Rokita
 Coble Horsford
 Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2239

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

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 332, noes 94,
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—332

Amash
 Andrews
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Kaptur
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty

McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Bucshon
 Lewis
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)

Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Andrews
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barton
 Bass
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Cooper
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 DeBene
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castro (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz

Chu
 Cicilline
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Costa
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Eshoo

Esty
 Farenthold
 Fattah
 Matsui
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Cohen
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Fortenberry
 Forbes
 Franks (AZ)
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes

Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kingston
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeback
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley

Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Runyan

NOES—94

Aderholt
 Barber
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Beatty
 Bishop (GA)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Clarke
 Cole
 Connolly
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Davis (CA)
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Enyart
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Grayson

Grijalva
 Grimm
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Hudson
 Israel
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Levin
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Dingell
 McCaul
 Meeks
 Meng
 Nunnelee
 Owens
 Hastings (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Price (NC)

Reichert
 Roby
 Rogers (KY)
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schock
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stewart
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thornberry
 Pastor (AZ)
 Tsongas
 Valadao
 Van Hollen

Vargas Visclosky Young (FL)
Veasey Wilson (FL) Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Holt Rokita
Coble Horsford
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2244

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her
vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of
Georgia). The unfinished business is
the demand for a recorded vote on the
amendment offered by the gentleman
from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on which fur-
ther proceedings were postponed and
on which the noes prevailed by voice
vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 237, noes 189,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—237

Aderholt Daines Hensarling
Alexander Davis, Rodney Holding
Amash Denham Hudson
Amodi Dent Huelskamp
Bachmann DeSantis Huizenga (MI)
Bachus DesJarlais Hultgren
Barletta Diaz-Balart Hunter
Barr Duffy Hurt
Barrow (GA) Duncan (SC) Issa
Barton Duncan (TN) Jenkins
Benishek Ellmers Johnson (OH)
Bentivolio Farenthold Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis Fincher Jordan
Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Joyce
Black Fleischmann Kelly (PA)
Blackburn Fleming King (IA)
Bonner Flores King (NY)
Boustany Forbes Kingston
Brady (TX) Fortenberry Kinzinger (IL)
Bridenstine Foxx Kline
Brooks (AL) Franks (AZ) Labrador
Brooks (IN) Frelinghuysen LaMalfa
Broun (GA) Gallego Lamborn
Buchanan Gardner Lance
Buchson Garrett Lankford
Burgess Gerlach Latham
Calvert Gibbs Latta
Camp Gingrey (GA) Lipinski
Cantor Gohmert LoBiondo
Capito Goodlatte Long
Carter Gosar Lucas
Cassidy Gowdy Luetkemeyer
Chabot Granger Lummis
Chaffetz Graves (GA) Marchant
Coffman Graves (MO) Marino
Cole Green, Gene Massie
Collins (GA) Griffin (AR) Matheson
Collins (NY) Griffith (VA) McCarthy (CA)
Conaway Grimm McCaul
Cook Guthrie McClintock
Costa Hall McHenry
Cotton Hanna McIntyre
Cramer Harper McKeon
Crawford Harris McKinley
Crenshaw Hartzler McMorris
Cuellar Hastings (WA) Rodgers
Culberson Heck (NV) Meadows

Meehan Rigell Stockman
Messer Roby Stutzman
Mica Roe (TN) Terry
Miller (FL) Rogers (AL) Thompson (PA)
Miller (MI) Rogers (KY) Thornberry
Miller, Gary Rogers (MI) Tiberi
Mullin Rohrabacher Tipton
Mulvaney Rooney Turner
Murphy (PA) Ros-Lehtinen Upton
Neugebauer Roskam Valadao
Noem Ross Vela
Nugent Rothfus Wagner
Nunes Royce Walberg
Nunnelee Runyan Walden
Olson Ryan (WI) Walorski
Palazzo Salmon Weber (TX)
Paulsen Sanford Webster (FL)
Pearce Scalise Wenstrup
Perry Schock Westmoreland
Petri Schweikert Whitfield
Pittenger Scott, Austin Williams
Pitts Sensenbrenner
Poe (TX) Sessions
Pompeo Shimkus
Posey Shuster
Price (GA) Simpson
Radel Smith (MO)
Rahall Smith (NE)
Reed Smith (NJ)
Reichert Smith (TX)
Renacci Southerland
Ribble Stewart
Rice (SC) Stivers

NOES—189

Andrews Gibson
Barber Grayson
Bass Green, Al
Beatty Grijalva
Becerra Gutierrez
Bera (CA) Hahn
Bishop (GA) Hanabusa
Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer Heck (WA)
Bonamici Higgins
Brady (PA) Himes
Braley (IA) Hinojosa
Brown (FL) Honda
Brownley (CA) Hoyer
Bustos Huffman
Butterfield Israel
Capps Jackson Lee
Cavano Jeffries
Cárdenas Johnson (GA)
Carney Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN) Jones
Cartwright Kaptur
Castor (FL) Keating
Castro (TX) Kelly (IL)
Chu Kennedy
Cicilline Kildee
Clarke Kilmer
Clay Kind
Clever Kirkpatrick
Clyburn Kuster
Cohen Langevin
Connolly Larsen (WA)
Conyers Larson (CT)
Cooper Lee (CA)
Courtney Levin
Crowley Lewis
Cummings Loebsock
Davis (CA) Lofgren
Davis, Danny Lowenthal
DeFazio Lowey
DeGette Lujan Grisham
Delaney (NM)
DeLauro Luján, Ben Ray
DelBene (NM)
Deutch Lynch
Dingell Maffei
Doggett Maloney,
Doyle Carolyn
Duckworth Maloney, Sean
Edwards Matsui
Ellison McCollum
Engel McDermott
Enyart McGovern
Eshoo McMorris
Esty Meeks
Farr Meng
Fattah Michaud
Foster Miller, George
Frankel (FL) Moore
Fudge Moran
Gabbard Murphy (FL)
Garamendi Nadler
Garcia Napolitano

Waters Vaxman Wilson (FL)
Watt Welch Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Holt Rokita
Coble Horsford
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2247

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms.
DELAURO) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 333, noes 93,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—333

Amash Cooper Gibson
Andrews Costa Gohmert
Bachmann Cotton Goodlatte
Barber Courtney Gosar
Barr Crawford Gowdy
Barrow (GA) Crowley Graves (GA)
Bass Cuellar Grayson
Beatty Culberson Green, Al
Becerra Cummings Green, Gene
Benishek Davis (CA) Griffin (AR)
Bentivolio Davis, Danny Griffith (VA)
Bera (CA) Davis, Rodney Grijalva
Bishop (GA) DeFazio Grimm
Bishop (NY) DeGette Guthrie
Black Delaney Gutiérrez
Blumenauer DeLauro Hahn
Bonamici DelBene Hall
Brady (PA) Dent Hanabusa
Braley (IA) DeSantis Hanna
Bridenstine DesJarlais Harper
Broun (GA) Deutch Harris
Brown (FL) Dingell Hastings (FL)
Browley (CA) Doggett Hastings (WA)
Buchanan Doyle Heck (NV)
Bucshon Duckworth Heck (WA)
Bustos Duffy Hensarling
Camp Duncan (TN) Higgins
Capito Edwards Himes
Capps Ellison Hinojosa
Capuano Engel Honda
Carney Enyart Hoyer
Carson (IN) Eshoo Huelskamp
Cartwright Esty Huffman
Cassidy Farenthold Huizenga (MI)
Castor (FL) Farr Hultgren
Castro (TX) Fattah Hunter
Chabot Fincher Hurt
Chaffetz Fitzpatrick Israel
Chu Fleischmann Issa
Cicilline Fleming Jackson Lee
Clarke Fortenberry Jeffries
Clay Foster Johnson (OH)
Clever Foxx Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn Frankel (FL) Jones
Coffman Fudge Jordan
Cohen Gallego Kaptur
Cole Garamendi Keating
Collins (GA) Garcia Kelly (IL)
Collins (NY) Garrett Kennedy
Connolly Gerlach Kildee
Conyers Gibbs Kilmer

Kind Napolitano Schneider
 King (IA) Neal Schock
 Kingston Negrete McLeod Schrader
 Kinzinger (IL) Neugebauer Schwartz
 Kirkpatrick Nolan Schweikert
 Kuster Nugent Scott (VA)
 LaMalfa Nunes Scott, David
 Lance Nunnelee Sensenbrenner
 Langevin O'Rourke Serrano
 Lankford Owens Sessions
 Larsen (WA) Palazzo Sewell (AL)
 Larson (CT) Pallone Shea-Porter
 Latham Pascrell Sherman
 Latta Pastor (AZ) Shimkus
 Lee (CA) Paulsen Simpson
 Levin Payne Sinema
 Lewis Pelosi Sires
 Lipinski Perlmutter Slaughter
 LoBiondo Peters (CA) Smith (MO)
 Loeback Peters (MI) Smith (NE)
 Lofgren Peterson Smith (NJ)
 Lowenthal Petri Southerland
 Lowey Pingree (ME) Speier
 Lucas Pittenger Stockman
 Lujan Grisham Pitts Stutzman
 (NM) Pocan Swalwell (CA)
 Luján, Ben Ray Poe (TX) Takano
 (NM) Polis Terry
 Lynch Posey Thompson (CA)
 Maffei Price (GA) Thompson (MS)
 Maloney, Price (NC) Tierney
 Carolyn Quigley Tipton
 Maloney, Sean Radel Titus
 Massie Rahall Tonko
 Matheson Rangel Tsongas
 Matsui Reed Upton
 McCarthy (CA) Renacci Van Hollen
 McClintock Ribble Vargas
 McCollum Rice (SC) Veasey
 McDermott Richmond Vela
 McGovern Rigell Velázquez
 McHenry Roe (TN) Visclosky
 McIntyre Rohrabacher Wagner
 McKinley Rooney Walberg
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen Walden
 Rodgers Ross Walz
 McNerney Rothfus Wasserman
 Meehan Roybal-Allard Schultz
 Meeks Royce Waters
 Meng Ruppertsberger Watt
 Messer Rush Waxman
 Mica Ryan (OH) Webster (FL)
 Michaud Ryan (WI) Welch
 Miller (MI) Salmon Westmoreland
 Miller, Gary Sánchez, Linda Williams
 Miller, George T. Wilson (FL)
 Moore Sanchez, Loretta Wolf
 Moran Sanford Womack
 Mulvaney Sarbanes Woodall
 Murphy (FL) Scalise Yarmuth
 Murphy (PA) Schakowsky Young (AK)
 Nadler Schiff Young (IN)

NOES—93

Aderholt Franks (AZ) Pearce
 Alexander Frelinghuysen Perry
 Amodei Gabbard Pompeo
 Bachus Gardner Reichert
 Barletta Gingrey (GA) Roby
 Barton Granger Rogers (AL)
 Bilirakis Graves (MO) Rogers (KY)
 Bishop (UT) Hartzler Rogers (MI)
 Blackburn Holding Roskam
 Bonner Hudson Ruiz
 Boustany Jenkins Runyan
 Brady (TX) Johnson (GA) Scott, Austin
 Brooks (AL) Johnson, Sam Shuster
 Brooks (IN) Joyce Smith (TX)
 Burgess Kelly (PA) Smith (WA)
 Butterfield King (NY) Stewart
 Calvert Kline Stivers
 Cantor Labrador Thompson (PA)
 Cárdenas Lamborn Thornberry
 Carter Long Tiberi
 Conaway Luetkemeyer Turner
 Cook Lummis Valadao
 Cramer Marchant Walorski
 Crenshaw Marino Weber (TX)
 Daines McCaul Wenstrup
 Denham McKeon Whitfield
 Diaz-Balart Meadows Wilson (SC)
 Duncan (SC) Miller (FL) Wittman
 Ellmers Mullin Yoder
 Flores Noem Yoho
 Forbes Olson Young (FL)

Campbell Holt Rokita
 Coble Horsford
 Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

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

□ 2250

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 109, noes 317,
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—109

Amash Grayson Payne
 Bass Green, Gene Pelosi
 Beatty Griffith (VA) Perlmutter
 Becerra Grijalva Peters (MI)
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Pingree (ME)
 Bonamici Hahn Pocan
 Brady (PA) Hastings (FL) Polis
 Braley (IA) Himes Quigley
 Butterfield Hinojosa Rangel
 Capuano Honda Richmond
 Carney Huffman Roybal-Allard
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Rush
 Castor (FL) Jeffries Sánchez, Linda
 Chu Keating T.
 Cicilline Kelly (IL) Sanchez, Loretta
 Clarke Kennedy Sarbanes
 Clay Kildee Schakowsky
 Cleaver Lee (CA) Schiff
 Clyburn Lewis Schrader
 Cohen Lofgren Scott, David
 Conyers Lowenthal Serrano
 Costa Lynch Sires
 Crowley Maloney, Slaughter
 Cummings Carolyn Smith (WA)
 Davis, Danny Matsui Swalwell (CA)
 DeFazio McDermott Thompson (CA)
 Delaney McGovern Thompson (MS)
 Deutch Meng Tierney
 Doyle Michaud Tonko
 Duckworth Miller, George Tsongas
 Duncan (TN) Moore Velazquez
 Edwards Nadler Waters
 Ellison Neal Watt
 Farr Negrete McLeod Welch
 Fattah Nolan Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Pallone Yarmuth

NOES—317

Aderholt Bera (CA) Broun (GA)
 Alexander Bilirakis Brown (FL)
 Amodei Bishop (GA) Brownley (CA)
 Andrews Bishop (NY) Buchanan
 Bachmann Bishop (UT) Bucshon
 Bachus Black Burgess
 Barber Blackburn Bustos
 Barletta Bonner Calvert
 Barr Boustany Camp
 Barrow (GA) Brady (TX) Cantor
 Barton Bridenstine Capito
 Benishek Brooks (AL) Capps
 Bentivolio Brooks (IN) Cárdenas

Carter Cartwright Issa
 Cassidy Jenkins Price (GA)
 Castro (TX) Johnson (GA) Price (NC)
 Chabot Johnson (OH) Radel
 Chaffetz Johnson, E. B. Rahall
 Coffman Johnson, Sam Reed
 Cole Jones Reichert
 Collins (GA) Jordan Renacci
 Collins (NY) Joyce Ribble
 Conaway Kaptur Rice (SC)
 Connolly Kelly (PA) Rigell
 Cook Kilmer Roby
 Cooper Kind Roe (TN)
 Cotton King (IA) Rogers (AL)
 Courtney King (NY) Rogers (KY)
 Cramer Kingstom Rogers (MI)
 Crawford Kinzinger (IL) Rohrabacher
 Crenshaw Kirkpatrick Rooney
 Cuellar Kline Ros-Lehtinen
 Culberson Labrador Roskam
 Daines LaMalfa Ross
 Davis (CA) Lamborn Rothfus
 Davis, Rodney Lance Royce
 DeLauro Langevin Ruiz
 DeBene Lankford Runyan
 Denham Larsen (WA) Ruppertsberger
 Dent Larson (CT) Ryan (OH)
 DeSantis Latham Ryan (WI)
 DesJarlais Latta Salmon
 Diaz-Balart Levin Sanford
 Dingell Lipinski Scalise
 Doggett LoBiondo Schneider
 Duffy LoBiondo Schock
 Duncan (SC) Loeback Schwartz
 Ellmers Long Schweikert
 Engel Lowey Scott (VA)
 Enyart Lucas Scott, Austin
 Eshoo Luetkemeyer Sensenbrenner
 Esty Lujan Grisham Sessions
 Farenthold (NM) Sewell (AL)
 Fincher Luján, Ben Ray Shea-Porter
 Fitzpatrick (NM) Sherman
 Fleischmann Lummis Shimkus
 Fleming Maffei Shuster
 Flores Maloney, Sean Simpson
 Forbes Marchant Sinema
 Fortenberry Marino Smith (MO)
 Foster Massie Smith (NE)
 Foxx Matheson Smith (NJ)
 Frankel (FL) McCarthy (CA) Smith (TX)
 Franks (AZ) McCaul Southerland
 Frelinghuysen McCollum Speier
 Gabbard McHenry Stewart
 Garamendi McIntyre Stivers
 Garcia McKeon Stockman
 Gardner McKinley Stutzman
 Garrett McMorris Takano
 Gerlach Rodgers Terry
 Gibbs McNerney Thornberry
 Gibson Meadows Tiberi
 Gingrey (GA) Meehan Tipton
 Gohmert Meeks Titus
 Goodlatte Messer Turner
 Gosar Upton Upton
 Gowdy Miller (FL) Valadao
 Granger Miller (MI) Van Hollen
 Graves (GA) Miller, Gary Vargas
 Graves (MO) Moran Veasey
 Green, Al Mullin Vela
 Griffin (AR) Mulvaney Visclosky
 Grimm Murphy (FL) Wagner
 Guthrie Murphy (PA) Walberg
 Hall Neugebauer Walden
 Hanabusa Noem Walorski
 Hanna Nugent Wasserman
 Harper Nunes Schultz
 Harris Nunnelee Waxman
 Hartzler O'Rourke Weber (TX)
 Hastings (WA) Olson Webster (FL)
 Heck (NV) Owens Wenstrup
 Heck (WA) Palazzo Westmoreland
 Hensarling Pascrell Whitfield
 Higgins Hensarling Pastor (AZ) Williams
 Holding Paulsen Wilson (SC)
 Hoyer Pearce Wittman
 Hudson Perry Wolf
 Huelskamp Peters (CA) Womack
 Hultzena (MI) Peterson Woodall
 Hultgren Petri Yoder
 Hunter Pittenger Yoho
 Hurt Pitts Young (AK)
 Israel Poe (TX) Young (FL)
 Pompeo Pompeo Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell Holt Rokita
 Coble Horsford
 Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY)

□ 2254

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 283, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—142

Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Heck (WA)	Payne
Becerra	Higgins	Pelosi
Bera (CA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Polis
Braley (IA)	Israel	Price (NC)
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Kaptur	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Keating	Rohrabacher
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Chu	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kuster	Sarbanes
Clay	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sires
Cummings	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lowe y	Speier
DeFazio	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Maffei	Takano
DeLauro	Maloney, Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Matsui	Tierney
Deutch	McDermott	Titus
Dingell	McGovern	Tonko
Doggett	McNerney	Tsongas
Doyle	Meeks	Meng
Edwards	Ellison	Michaud
Enyart	Enyart	Miller, George
Eshoo	Miller, George	Moore
Esty	Moore	Moran
Farr	Farr	Nadler
Foster	Nadler	Napolitano
Frankel (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Neal
Fudge	Fudge	Negrete McLeod
Grayson	Grayson	Nolan
Green, Gene	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Grijalva	Grijalva	Pallone
Gutiérrez	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Hahn	Hahn	

NOES—283

Aderholt	Bentivolio	Broun (GA)
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown (FL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Bachmann	Black	Bucshon
Bachus	Blackburn	Burgess
Barber	Bonner	Bustos
Barletta	Boustany	Butterfield
Barr	Brady (TX)	Calvert
Barrow (GA)	Bridenstine	Camp
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cantor
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Capito

Cárdenas	Hunter	Rangel
Carney	Hurt	Reed
Carter	Issa	Reichert
Cassidy	Jackson Lee	Renacci
Castro (TX)	Jenkins	Ribble
Chabot	Johnson (GA)	Rice (SC)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Richmond
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rigell
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cole	Jones	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Cook	Kilmer	Rooney
Cooper	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Costa	King (NY)	Roskam
Cotton	Kingston	Ross
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Royce
Crenshaw	Kline	Ruiz
Cuellar	Labrador	Runyan
Culberson	LaMalfa	Ruppersberger
Daines	Lamborn	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Delaney	Lankford	Salmon
Denham	Latham	Sanford
Dent	Latta	Scalise
DeSantis	Lipinski	Schock
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Schrader
Diaz-Balart	Long	Schwartz
Duckworth	Lucas	Schweikert
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Ellmers	Luján, Ben Ray	Sessions
Engel	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Farenthold	Lummis	Sherman
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Fincher	Marchant	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Simpson
Fleischmann	Massie	Sinema
Fleming	Matheson	Smith (MO)
Flores	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NE)
Forbes	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Fox	McCollum	Southerland
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Stewart
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre	Stivers
Gabbard	McKeon	Stockman
Galleo	McKinley	Stutzman
Garamendi	McMorris	Terry
Garcia	Rodgers	Thompson (MS)
Gardner	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Garrett	Meehan	Thornberry
Gerlach	Messer	Tiberi
Gibbs	Mica	Tipton
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Upton
Goodlatte	Mullin	Valadao
Gosar	Mulvaney	Vargas
Govdy	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Vela
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wagner
Graves (MO)	Noem	Walberg
Green, Al	Nugent	Walden
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Walorski
Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee	Weber (TX)
Grimm	Olson	Webster (FL)
Guthrie	Owens	Westmoreland
Hall	Palazzo	Whitfield
Hanabusa	Paulsen	Williams
Hanna	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Harper	Perlmutter	Wittman
Harris	Perry	Wolf
Hartzler	Peterson	Womack
Hastings (WA)	Petrie	Woodall
Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Yoder
Hensarling	Pitts	Yoho
Holding	Poe (TX)	Young (AK)
Hudson	Pompeo	Young (FL)
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Young (IN)
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)	
Hultgren	Radel	

NOT VOTING—8

Bass	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)
Campbell	Holt	Rokita
Coble	Horsford	

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

□ 2257

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—185

Amash	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Perry
Barr	Griffith (VA)	Peters (MI)
Benishek	Guthrie	Petri
Bentivolio	Hanna	Pingree (ME)
Bilirakis	Harris	Pitts
Bishop (NY)	Hensarling	Pocan
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Poe (TX)
Black	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hunter	Posey
Blumenauer	Hurt	Price (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Radel
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rahall
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Bucshon	Jones	Renacci
Burgess	Jordan	Ribble
Camp	Kilmer	Roe (TN)
Cantor	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Capito	Kingston	Rooney
Capps	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Cassidy	LaMalfa	Ross
Chabot	Lance	Royce
Chaffetz	Lankford	Ruiz
Chu	Lee (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	Levin	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Lipinski	Sanford
Connolly	Lofgren	Scalise
Conyers	Long	Schakowsky
Cook	Lucas	Schweikert
Costa	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Daines	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Maffei	Slaughter
DeFazio	Marchant	Smith (MO)
DelBene	Massie	Smith (NE)
Denham	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
DeSantis	McCaul	Stewart
Doggett	McClintock	Stockman
Duckworth	McCollum	Stutzman
Duffy	McDermott	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Tiberi
Ellison	Rodgers	Tipton
Engel	Meadows	Tonko
Eshoo	Meng	Upton
Farenthold	Messer	Van Hollen
Farr	Mica	Wagner
Fincher	Michaud	Walden
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Walz
Fleming	Miller (MI)	Waters
Flores	Miller, George	Waxman
Foster	Miller, Gary	Welch
Fox	Moore	Westmoreland
Frankel (FL)	Mullin	Williams
Garrett	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wolf
Gibbs	Napolitano	Yoder
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Yoho
Goodlatte	Noem	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nolan	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Pascarell	

NOES—238

Aderholt	Barber	Becerra
Alexander	Barrow (GA)	Bera (CA)
Amodei	Barton	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Bass	Bonamici
Bachus	Beatty	Bonner

Boustany	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bridenstine	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brooks (AL)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Himes	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Rangel
Bustos	Holding	Reichert
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Hudson	Richmond
Capuano	Huffman	Rigell
Cárdenas	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Carney	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Jackson Lee	Rogers (MI)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Roskam
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rothfus
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Clarke	Joyce	Rush
Clay	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	T.
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cole	Kildee	Schiff
Conaway	Kind	Schneider
Cooper	King (NY)	Schock
Cotton	Kinzinger (IL)	Schrader
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Schwartz
Cramer	Kline	Scott (VA)
Crawford	Kuster	Scott, David
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Serrano
Crowley	Langevin	Sessions
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Culberson	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Latham	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Latta	Shimkus
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Shuster
DeGette	LoBiondo	Simpson
Delaney	Loebsock	Sinema
DeLauro	Lowe	Sires
DesJarlais	Lujan Grisham	Smith (TX)
Deutch	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Dingell	(NM)	Stivers
Doyle	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	Maloney,	Takano
Ellmers	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Enyart	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Esty	Marino	Thornberry
Fattah	Matsui	Tierney
Fitzpatrick	McGovern	Titus
Forbes	McHenry	Tsongas
Fortenberry	McIntyre	Turner
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Valadao
Fudge	McNerney	Vargas
Gabbard	Meehan	Veasey
Galleo	Meeke	Vela
Garamendi	Moran	Velázquez
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Gardner	Nadler	Walberg
Gibson	Neal	Walorski
Gingrey (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Wasserman
Granger	Nugent	Schultz
Grayson	Nunes	Watt
Green, Al	Nunnelee	Weber (TX)
Green, Gene	O'Rourke	Webster (FL)
Grijalva	Olson	Whitfield
Grimm	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Gutiérrez	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Hahn	Pallone	Womack
Hall	Pastor (AZ)	Woodall
Hanabusa	Payne	Yarmuth
Harper	Pelosi	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Holt	Rokita
Coble	Horsford	Ruppersberger
Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JONES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to carry out any activities under the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership Agreement, signed on May 2, 2012, except for such activities authorized by Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I've been here all day, like most of my colleagues. I've watched it on TV, I've been here on the floor. And I've heard so many times other Members say we're going to be out of Afghanistan in 2014. I hate to tell them, but that's not true. The administration is about to finish a negotiation with Mr. Karzai, who is a crook, to say that we will be there for 10 more years.

This amendment, what it does is basically just say that we in Congress have a responsibility to the American people to meet our constitutional responsibility of making sure that any agreement that the President should negotiate with any country, we're responsible for funding that agreement, that we will the vote on it. That's basically what this amendment does; it just says that, as we move forward with this strategic agreement, that the Congress will vote on the funds, and not just have any administration, Democrat or Republican, just to assume for 10 years that the taxpayers are going to buy into this agreement.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and would point out that I do think it is long past time that we should be reconsidering the underlying authority—the Authorized Use of Military Force that was approved by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States in 2001. But I do believe, absent the reconsideration of that legislation—which I do think this body should be about—I believe it does provide the underlying authority for the Strategic Partnership Agreement that the President has initiated. It has been in force for over a year, serving as a guide for the relationship between the United States and Afghanistan. And in May of last year, the President and the Afghan President signed the agreement.

The agreement does, I believe, infer the role of Congress to fund training of the Afghan Security Forces. The agreement indicates that the administration associate such funding annually, and obviously there is a congressional role.

This agreement provides the necessary long-term framework for the relationship between the two countries after the drawdown that will have taken effect by the end of 2014.

I do believe that the amendment offered makes no allowance for what agreement might serve to guide our relationship with Afghanistan in the future. And given it's important in managing our drawdown and in transitioning the Afghan security forces themselves, I believe it is essential for the U.S. to continue to honor this agreement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). I want to thank him for his long and tireless leadership on ending the war in Afghanistan. He always asks the hard questions—or the questions that no one else wants to take on—because he believes so strongly in standing by our uniformed men and women and their families.

In May of 2012, the United States and most of our NATO allies entered into an agreement with Afghanistan called the Strategic Partnership Agreement. That agreement outlined in fairly broad terms how we and our allies will continue to support the security and economic development of Afghanistan over the near and long term.

Now, on the positive side, it was this agreement that provided the outline for how the United States would turn over responsibility for combat operations and national security to Afghanistan forces this year and next year in order to draw down our forces and end the war in Afghanistan by the end of next year. Congressman JONES and I would like to see that drawdown happen faster and sooner, but at a minimum, to happen on the time frame outlined by the President.

The unknown question is: What happens post-2014? Will the President determine that U.S. troops need to remain in Afghanistan? If so, how many troops, for how long, and for what purpose? Will we continue to train the Afghanistan military and police forces? And if so, how many U.S. troops will be involved? How long will it take to complete that mission? How much will it cost?

I believe it is right to demand that Congress specifically authorize the terms and costs of America's continuing involvement in Afghanistan. Congress has put this war on autopilot for too long. It is shameful. We need to take responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. This is a reasonable, rational amendment. And quite frankly, every one of us, Democrat and Republican, should vote for this.

Mr. JONES. May I inquire of the Chairman how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 3¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if this Strategic Partnership Agreement involves the protection of our American troops and our allies, then there's good reason to oppose this amendment.

This is an agreement between two sovereign nations. Understandably, the two proponents of this amendment are against our involvement and would like us to leave tomorrow—and indeed we may. But in the process, I would hope that we wouldn't be putting ourselves and our soldiers at risk by an amendment of this type and nature. For those reasons, I oppose it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the chairman's remarks.

As I mentioned before, I would not argue that we should not be reconsidering the underlying authorization. But to the extent it exists today, I do believe it does authorize this agreement. I continue to be opposed to the gentleman's amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, you know, it is so ridiculous that America is financially broke, can't pay our own bills, and we're going to borrow money to pay for this agreement in Afghanistan.

The former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, when I asked him, what do you think about this agreement? I'll read his one sentence:

Simply put, I am not in favor of this agreement signed. It basically keeps the United States in Afghanistan to prop up a corrupt regime. It continues to place our troops at risk.

We are not being realistic. The American people are fed up and tired. We had 79 Americans killed the first of March to the end of June, and not one person on this floor knows that tonight but me.

Why and how can the American people continue to work their butts off, pay their bills, and we're going to prop up a crook in Afghanistan named Karzai and give him 10 more years of the American taxpayers paying his bills? It is a sad day for the taxpayers of America.

Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN. This is a reasonable approach. All it says is that we in Congress, every year, will vote whether we keep funding the wasted time, life, and money in Afghanistan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Amendment No. 49 has been withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to give covered graduates (as described in section 532(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 503 note)) a lower enlistment priority than traditional high school diploma graduates as described in the second paragraph of the memo with the subject line "Education Credential—Definition and Tier Placement", dated June 6, 2012.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 2315

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

I rise in support of this amendment. As chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, as a retired Marine colonel, I have a unique and fortunate position to ensure the young men and women enlisting in our Armed Forces have the best education in preparation for the defense of our Nation.

Currently, students who earn a high school diploma from charter schools, home schools, hybrid schools, and other means of modern education are required to score significantly higher on the Armed Forces qualification test than others just to qualify to enter the military.

This policy, Mr. Chairman, is in direct contravention of congressional intent established in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

Last month, my colleagues unanimously supported my amendment to

the FY 14 National Defense Authorization Act to reverse the DOD's discriminatory policy and ensure equal treatment for all students who desire to enter military service. The bipartisan Kline-Polis-Paulsen amendment prohibits funds from being used by the Department of Defense to enforce any policy that continues to not equally treat education credentials for enlistment.

This amendment stops DOD from giving a lower enlistment priority to students who attend home schools and charter schools and makes congressional intent clear that all students should be given the same opportunities to enlist in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the dream of military service for all patriotic Americans who simply want the chance to be able to raise their hand and pledge to defend our Nation without unnecessary burdens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment.

I salute the leadership of Chairman KLINE who fully understands the public education side and the military side. We are bringing forth this amendment as another opportunity to make sure that what is already clearly the will of this House, as articulated through the NDAA, actually comes to pass.

Very simply, this is a provision that ensures that any student who receives a diploma from a legally operating accredited secondary school in compliance with the education laws of the State and district in which the person resides is given the same opportunity to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces as a traditional bricks and mortar high school graduate. This includes graduates of online schools and hybrid schools who completed their secondary education and earned a degree.

Currently, these classified students who attend online schools are called tier 2 for purposes of military enlistment. What this effectively means is they can enroll in the military; however, on the Armed Forces qualification test, they have to score 50 or higher instead of 31 to 36, depending on the service branch, for a bricks and mortar high school.

What we should care about in public education and in the military is preparedness for the job, not what particular type or model or size or shape of school that they went to. From the military perspective, we need young men and women who are capable and able to execute their responsibilities to serve our country.

From the education perspective, we want to encourage innovation, and we shouldn't be sending a message—and this body has spoken clearly and has the opportunity to speak clearly again—that we discourage innovation

within public education. We should not say that just because a particular school is distributed or doesn't have a bricks and mortar campus, as long as it is fully accredited by a school district and held to the same standards as any other public school, that should not be dealt with in a separate way in this matter.

Congressional intent is clear. The NDAA bill includes language to not let the DOD make a distinction between graduates of traditional high schools and those who attend online schools. This amendment would ensure that all students are held to the same standard when it comes to being eligible for military service.

That is why I am proud to join Chairman KLINE and Representative PAULSEN, leaders for charter schools and education choice and online education, to propose this amendment to the defense authorization act which would ensure that no funds are used to give a lower enlistment priority to students from online schools as compared to traditional bricks and mortar high school diploma graduates.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

We accept his amendment.

I would note that I know marines never retire.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

I thank my colleague and friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

I think that congressional intent has been absolutely clear and is, in fact, in law. It is astonishing to me that we have to be down here on the floor this evening with this amendment to bar funds from the Department because they are just failing to comply with congressional intent in the law.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues. I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay any fine assessed against a military installation by the California Air Resources Board.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman

from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask for support for my amendment to H.R. 2397.

This amendment ensures that funds appropriated to support our men and women in uniform are used for the purposes the House intends, not diverted by overzealous regulatory agencies attempting to pad their own budgets.

This amendment provides a simple funding limitation prohibiting use of any funds appropriated in H.R. 2397 to pay fines levied against the various branches of the military by the California Air Resources Board.

As you may be aware, the California Air Resources Board is known for the excessive regulatory burdens it attempts to impose on virtually every sector of California's economy from personal automobiles to farming. In recent years CARB, and its subsidy regional boards, have targeted military installations for alleged emissions violations, in many cases as minor as simply failing to notify CARB of activities in the manner that CARB finds most convenient.

For example, a northern California Air Force base faced fines of \$10,000 per day after using emergency generators to power radar installations serving a vital anti-ballistic missile warning role.

In another instance, a southern California Navy installation was initially fined \$917,000 for simply demolishing an old and outdated building without approved documentation.

Lastly, Camp Pendleton was fined in July of last year for unapproved solvents in a bottle of spray cleaner.

These California installations are critical to our national defense as we pivot towards the Pacific. How can we tie the hands of these vital installations when they are at the forefront of our national security initiatives?

These amounts may seem minor in the context of the appropriations measure we are taking up. However, at \$10,000 a day, just two days of these fines could actually fund at least a year of college for a veteran under the GI Bill.

Voting for this amendment keeps funding for our military in the hands of our servicemembers instead of the California Air Resources Board.

Please support our servicemembers and vote "yes" on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the amendment, as the gentleman suggests, seeks to exempt the Department of Defense from paying any fines related to infractions

which seem to be environmental in nature from the California Air Resources Board.

I would point out to my colleagues that, as they know, there are a large number of military bases in California, and I believe it is imperative to maintain good working relationships with the communities who host the bases, as well as the various State agencies who ensure good living conditions for all Californians.

Accepting this amendment could create the perception that the Federal military installations in California are above the law when dealing with environmental issues.

I would certainly urge a "no" vote on this particular amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, in responding to that, this is a very narrow amendment that simply gives a green light to our military installations that, yes, we welcome you in California, we like the idea that you are here providing a safety security net over not only our State, but to all of the United States, and that overzealous regulators have had actually a very hostile relationship with these installations, as well as many businesses in California. So we need to send a signal that they can no longer go unchecked with the ability to come write up a fine at any time they choose to.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I think that being such a narrow measure is what we have here, that we do need to send the proper message to our military, to our people, that when they serve in the military and would want to get out and be part of the GI Bill and, importantly, to the American taxpayers, that your dollars are actually being expended for this appropriation towards the type of thing that you care about, and that is defending the Nation and not having to defend themselves from overzealous regulations like anybody could enlist in California.

I hear CARB is one of the biggest complaints of my constituents all around my district, as well as from our friends in the military that are just there to try and defend us.

In taking up this measure here tonight, I think it is a very proper thing that we do to have the right signal that we do support our military, we do support our fighting men and women, and that it is best to put forward the defense of our country rather than defending some frivolous environmental regulation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would notice that the gentleman suggests that his amendment is very narrow in scope, and I appreciate that fact. I appreciate the fact that, for example, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management was not cited, the Department of Environmental Management in the State of Illinois was not cited, nor for the other

47 States in this country relative to the enforcement of environmental statutes.

I would further propose to my colleagues that the gentleman is seeking a solution for a problem that does not exist. I do not know the specifics of the fines that were purportedly imposed at Camp Pendleton. However, the gentleman did allude to a northern California Air Force base and did suggest that fines were imposed by the California Air Resources Board.

I would suggest that that is not necessarily the case. In fact, it was the Feather River Air Quality Management District, it was not the California Air Resources Board, that found that this Air Force base had 526 days of multiple violations of local air district rules. The district came to a settlement agreement with the Air Force base to properly permit its equipment and bring it back into compliance on a certain timeline. The settlement states that if the Air Force base did not hold up its end of the bargain, it could face a fine.

The gentleman provided a second example for a southern California naval installation. In fact, it was not the California Air Resources Board that was involved. It was the San Diego Air Quality District that took enforcement action when this naval base demolished a building without doing proper asbestos removal and remediation that is a danger for those who are engaged in that activity. The San Diego Air Quality District, not the California Air Resources Board, was enforcing a Federal asbestos law in this case, and in the end the Air Quality District fined the Navy—that is true—\$40,000, not \$917,000. So I would suggest the amendment is a solution that is looking for a problem.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2330

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct an envi-

ronmental impact study in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq.) of intercontinental ballistic missiles or the facilities in which, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, such missiles are located.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It prohibits funds in this bill from being used to do an environmental impact study on our intercontinental ballistic missiles. You might think that an environmental impact statement, or an EIS, sounds innocuous, but let me lay out the facts that we have.

First, the Obama administration has made it clear that it believes in nuclear zero—the idea that we can achieve a world without nuclear weapons. This sounds like a wonderful idea, but our competitors and adversaries will almost certainly never give up their nuclear weapons. So, until there is a change of heart on the part of our adversaries, this could be a dangerous idea.

We've had reductions in our nuclear forces to date, and it hasn't stopped our potential adversaries—or hostile countries for that matter—from reducing their nuclear programs. As a matter of fact, they've been increasing. I'm talking about countries like Iran and North Korea. In President Obama's second Berlin speech just a few weeks ago, he announced a desire to reduce America's nuclear arsenal by one-third regardless of what the Russians, the Chinese, the North Koreans, the Iranians, the Pakistanis or anyone else, for that matter, does.

It is in this context that we see in this budget the President's requesting an environmental impact statement for our current ICBM forces. We decisively rejected an amendment not just a few minutes ago here on this House floor that would have defunded one-third of our ICBM forces.

I am proud to be joined in this effort to protect our ICBMs by the three Members who represent States in which bases are located at which we find our ICBMs.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Wyoming, Representative LUMMIS.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the New START Treaty does not require the closing of an ICBM facility, but the purpose of this study is to close an ICBM wing or squadron.

While President Obama has announced plans to further reduce America's nuclear capabilities, there is no negotiated proposal with Russia or a Senate-confirmed treaty for reductions of this size. The Air Force has a plan

for the ratified reductions, placing 30 silos in warm status before February 2018. These baseline numbers will meet the New START deadline if the administration just allows them to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lamborn-Lummis-Daines-Cramer amendment and ensure that Congress provides proper approval of the goal before spending money on the process.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank my colleague for pointing that out. I appreciate her coming to the floor.

I know we are joined in this effort by Representative STEVE DAINES of Montana and by Representative KEVIN CRAMER of North Dakota, and they wholeheartedly support this amendment as well. A strong nuclear deterrent is what we need in the face of uncertainty, not any kind of unilateral disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is directed at the administration's plan to consider further reductions below the levels established in the New START Treaty. As the gentleman indicated, it would prohibit funds from being used to conduct a study of the environmental impact on intercontinental ballistic missiles and their facilities.

The President in his June 2013 guidance on nuclear employment affirms that the United States will maintain a credible deterrent, capable of convincing any potential adversary that our abilities and the adverse consequences of attacking the United States or an ally far outweigh any potential benefit they may seek through such an attack.

I believe that the United States' national security resources ought to also be considering other possibilities as to our national security beyond the remote possibility of a direct nuclear exchange. Events of the past several years demonstrate that the U.S. faces a very complex set of national security threats:

The possibility of attacks such as those preceding 9/11, including the USS *Cole* bombing and the U.S. Embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya;

Regional instability and strategic challenges arising from the Arab Spring in Egypt, Syria, Libya, and elsewhere;

The continuing challenge of Iran, including its support of terrorist organizations with regional and global aims;

Refocusing U.S. national security priorities to the Asia-Pacific region with a focus on China and North Korea; and,

The nearly constant threat of cyberattack.

As I said in an earlier argument, I also do not think we ought to arbitrarily, throughout this evening and

tomorrow, continue to say “no” about proposals and studies and plans. We ought to be having a full and complete conversation and debate about those possibilities.

For those reasons, I do oppose the gentleman’s amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I inquire of the balance of my time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have to take issue with what was just stated as far as maintaining a credible deterrent even with massive unilateral further reductions. We’ve already reduced our nuclear forces under New START to 1,550 weapons, and when you reduce beyond that, it becomes less credible to our allies that we will have a credible deterrent.

We have a nuclear umbrella right now with about 30 countries relying on us. If we start unilaterally reducing the number of our nuclear warheads, they will become less certain about our deterrent. They will be incentivized to go out and start their own nuclear programs. I’m talking about countries like Japan and South Korea, which have a neighbor, North Korea, that is threatening to them. If we want to see more nuclear weapons in the world, we should reduce ours. Other countries are simply not going to follow our example, and it will lead to more nuclear weapons worldwide.

So I would urge the adoption of this amendment. I disagree with my colleague from Indiana, and I would ask for a “yes” vote on this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The ICBM land-based missiles are the most cost-economical deterrent of the nuclear triad. This is the most efficient way to deter our enemies.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply reiterate my objection to the gentleman’s amendment, and would ask for a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for a furlough

(as defined in section 7511(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, across this country tonight, 600,000 Defense Department civilian employees are struggling with a 20 percent pay cut due to civilian furloughs, and these are scheduled to go through the end of September.

These are hardworking American patriots who work hard to keep our Nation secure. They are supporting our warfighters. They are doing essential work. They are working side by side, shoulder to shoulder, with Active Duty personnel who, because of the language of the Budget Control Act, are exempt from any kind of furloughs. I approve of that, but it’s sad that the civilians are singled out for this treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I talked today to someone from the administration who came to a hearing for Armed Services. He said that the savings are estimated to be about \$2 billion for the rest of the year. That may sound like a lot of money except when you look at the entire DOD budget of \$500 billion. \$2 billion is four-tenths of 1 percent—less than half a percent—of the total defense budget for this year.

This is a savings that is a false economy. It is demoralizing, and it is hard on the families that are suffering this. We should adopt this amendment, which says that the Defense Department can find other savings but not take it out of the hides of the civilians who are supporting our warfighters.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Texas (Mr. O’ROURKE).

Mr. O’ROURKE. I want to thank Representatives LAMBORN, BARROW, and JENKINS for their bipartisan work on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we obviously need a comprehensive solution to the sequester. Ideally, that’s what we would be doing. I don’t want to proceed in a piecemeal manner, but absent a comprehensive solution, I think we have an obligation to act to ease the pain of the sequester when and where we can.

At Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas, 11,000 Department of Defense civilian employees are furloughed for 11 days, which is a 20 percent pay cut for the remainder of this year. These workers are essential. Many of them work at Beaumont Army Medical Center, where they care for our wounded warriors returning from war. Those wounded soldiers are now facing longer wait times and reduced care because of these furloughs, and it is already becoming harder to retain the best employees.

We have to do better both by our servicemembers and those civilian employees, who are so critical to our mili-

tary. I urge all of my colleagues to help prevent more furloughs and to support this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of this amendment.

Because Congress can’t get its act together, more than 3,200 Department of Defense employees in my district are being furloughed. This amendment offers a simple fix to that serious problem. It’s also a positive indicator of what we can accomplish if Congress is willing to come together on the issues that matter most to the folks back home.

We have a fiscal crisis, but the solution to that problem shouldn’t be built on the backs of the people who didn’t get us in this mess in the first place, especially since our national security depends so much on civilian DOD employees. This amendment allows for the necessary cuts in Federal spending, but it also protects the folks whose livelihoods are on the line.

Issues like this demand that we put aside our differences and find common ground. I urge my colleagues to get behind this bipartisan effort and to support this amendment to end these furloughs.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas, Representative JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

My district is home to Fort Leavenworth and Forbes Field, which are two Kansas military installations at which families are struggling with the DOD civilian furloughs. While they may not serve in uniform, many of these civilians provide critical support for our warfighters.

While I support this level of funding cuts, I oppose the administration’s decision to take certain programs off the table and put an unfair burden on our military. The House acted six times to prevent these furloughs, to resolve sequestration, and to find savings elsewhere in our bloated budget; and even though the administration and the Senate majority had nearly 2 years to develop an alternative, they did nothing.

Civilian employees are not the problem, and they should not be singled out to pay for Washington’s out-of-control spending habits. I ask my colleagues to join me to protect these Americans from another round of painful furloughs next year and support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Colorado that he has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which does away with painful furloughs and which, in very many cases, may have been political in nature.

I represent the Corpus Christi Army Depot at which civilian employees are actually Working Capital Fund employees. They are not funded by appropriations but are funded by the work that they do and are equally subjected to this when, in fact, they could be saving the government money by rebuilding helicopters for less cost than that of the original equipment manufacturers.

We need to relieve all Federal employees from this burden, which, in my opinion, is politically motivated, and this is a good way to do it—through this amendment.

□ 2345

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I agree with the proponent of this amendment on one very important detail. I have noted throughout the evening that a number of my colleagues voted for the Budget Control Act that led to sequestration, that led to some of these problems. And I would like to note that the gentleman voted against that bill, and I think very knowingly anticipated that there could have been very serious unintended consequences.

So I do respect the persistence and consistency of his views. But having said that, again, as I have on a number of these amendments this evening, I have a great concern about differentiating between certain civilian employees in one department and those in another.

There's no question that the civilian employees throughout the Department of Defense do critical work. It could be serving in a hospital. It could be doing security analysis. It could be serving the troops in any number of capacities. No question about it. But I don't think we should make a distinction between that type of work and those who work for OSHA, who make sure that workplaces are also safe for American citizens every day when they go to work. We shouldn't make that distinction between those civilian employees and FBI agents who risk their lives every day. We shouldn't make that distinction between those employees and U.S. marshals who risk their lives every day.

Correctional officers in the Federal Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Capitol Police Officers, U.S. Custom and Border Protection officers, those who serve within the Coast Guard as civilian employees, those who are forestry aides and fight fires out west—all are obviously risking their lives—Federal protective service law enforcement specialists.

Again, the point I would make is we do have a very bad law. We ought not

to be making temporary fixes for dislocations that have been caused by it. That only defers decisions that need to be made of a more permanent basis.

Again, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman, I believe, was correct in the first instance, as far as not wanting to see us reach this point. I understand his impulse in trying to begin to correct some of these problems. I personally think we need a more holistic approach, and for that reason would respectfully oppose his opinion and ask for a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of individuals appointed to their current position through, or to otherwise carry out, paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 5503(a) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It prohibits the use of funds for the payment of salaries to Presidential recess appointees until they're formally confirmed by the Senate.

In 1863, a law was passed that barred unconfirmed recess appointees from being paid. This law stayed on the books until 1940. However, over time, a number of broad exceptions were made that gradually eliminated the original intent of the law and rendered the prohibition useless.

This amendment reapplies the original intent of the law to further reassert the Senate's authority in the confirmation process and prevent taxpayers from having to pay the salaries of unconfirmed Presidential appointees.

Our Founders envisioned a Nation of checks and balances to ensure no branch of government has too much power. The United States Senate is in charge of confirming executive appointees for a reason—to ensure Presidential appointees are in the best interest of the American people.

For too long, both Republicans and Democrats have ceded Congress' authority to the executive branch. This amendment is a positive step, which will ensure the administration is accountable to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour, I urge support and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is trying to undue longstanding rules about when salaries can be paid to people who receive recess appointments under the President's constitutional powers. The amendment is injecting unnecessary and unrelated controversy into this bill. Its enactment could further worsen the paralysis and gridlock that is already affecting our ability to govern.

The Constitution clearly gives the President of the United States the power to make temporary appointments during the recess of the Senate to positions normally requiring Senate confirmation. This is a power that has been routinely exercised by Presidents since the beginnings of our government.

It is true that an issue has recently arisen about the scope of that power. Two Federal courts have recently ruled that the language is being interpreted too broadly and that recess appointments can only be made during a recess between sessions after sine die adjournment. Those rulings are contrary to previous rulings by other courts and to longstanding practice by Presidents of both parties. The new interpretations, of course, would invalidate of course not only certain appointments by President Obama, but also many dozens of appointments made by his predecessors, including Ronald Reagan, George Bush, and George W. Bush.

The issue is now before the Supreme Court, which has accepted these cases for decision during its next term. If the Court does rule that Presidents Obama, Bush, Clinton, Reagan, and their predecessors were misreading the appointments clause of the Constitution, then the whole landscape for these appointments will have changed and the proposed language of this amendment will be largely irrelevant. But if, as many believe likely, the Court upholds the more traditional interpretation, the tight restrictions proposed by this amendment may themselves be contrary to the Constitution.

The proposed amendment would alter rules that have been in place for more than 70 years and which say that recess appointees cannot receive salaries under certain, fairly narrow circumstances. The amendment would greatly expand that prohibition. The current rule strikes a reasonable balance, which the amendment would completely upset.

We already have enough gridlock. I do not want to make it worse, and I certainly do not believe this bill is the place for this particular amendment or this debate and would strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Understanding he has rescinded his time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by title IX (not including amounts made available under the heading "Overseas Deployments and Other Activities—Procurement—National Guard and Reserve Equipment") is hereby reduced by \$3,546,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is very similar, almost identical, to a similar amendment that Mr. VAN HOLLEN and I offered during the National Defense Authorization Act several weeks ago. We've added a couple of cosponsors. We've added Mr. COFFMAN, a Republican, and also Mr. MURPHY, a Democrat. In addition to that, we've made some important changes to the amendment.

What does the amendment do first of all? The amendment simply seeks to take the OCO budget back down to what the Pentagon asked for. The Pentagon asked for roughly \$81 billion. The committee saw fit to give them \$86 billion, and we think maybe letting the Pentagon decide how much the Pentagon needs for OCO is probably a good basis for discussion, and it is the basis for this discussion.

There is one exception to that, Mr. Chairman, and this is where the important difference from the last amendment several months ago comes in, which is there is some concern. Mr. VAN HOLLEN and I believed it was ill founded, but there was some concern as to whether or not the previous amendment prejudiced in some fashion the National Guard. While we disagreed with the National Guard's position, we respect it. So for that specific reason, there is explicit language in this amendment that excludes the National Guard from this reduction. Instead of going all the way back down to where the Pentagon asked for, we're giving the Pentagon what they asked for, plus the \$1.5 billion for the National Guard.

For folks who had some difficulty with our amendment a couple of

months ago because they were concerned about the impact on the National Guard, even though we thought that was, again, ill founded, we have sought to protect that in this particular amendment.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, what we're asking for is simply what the Pentagon asked for in the first place, with extra protections for the National Guard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Budgeting for contingency operations, especially 1½ years in advance, is very difficult. Goodness knows, the war on terror in Afghanistan and what we did in Iraq, we never knew how long we would be there and how expensive it was.

For example, despite having a higher overseas contingency allocation for fiscal year 2013 of \$87 billion, budget execution during fiscal year 2013 has proven that that request was understated by as much as \$10 billion. As a result of the extent possible, funds for OCO are being cash-flowed from baseline funds which have already been squeezed due to the sequester, resulting in profound readiness implications. Ships are not sailing, planes are not flying, and civilians are being furloughed. We've heard a lot about that on the floor today.

Additionally, I think all of us know that we are exiting out of Afghanistan. The timetable may be a year or two, or maybe the Commander in Chief will decide to expedite our departure. Transportation costs are spiked as men and equipment are moved and deployed, and God only knows things can happen on the travel route. We've heard a lot about that on the floor, too. Things can happen in Pakistan that might require additional expenses, billions of dollars more if we have to move men and materiel by aircraft. Contractor costs spike for many functions such as dismantling forward operating bases. Some of that's occurring now in disposing of excess materiel or turned over to the private sector to complete. Of course, the reset of equipment carries a very high price tag. There are a lot of reasons that this money is needed.

I strongly oppose this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague, Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, and our colleagues for offering this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, just last month, Secretary of Defense Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before this House as to the amount of money that would be necessary to support the war in Afghanistan and our

overseas operation, the so-called OCO account. What they told this Congress was that the President's request of \$80 billion was the amount necessary to accomplish our objectives and to support our troops. Yet this defense spending bill that is before us adds another \$5 billion that was unasked for and unnecessary.

So if there are extra moneys stuffed into this account, why are they put in this account as opposed to somewhere else? The answer is that it's a very clever accounting scheme because the other account, the base budget for defense spending, is subject to a cap, but moneys for the war account are not. So every dollar you somehow put into the war account is a dollar that escapes the cap. You can put lots of dollars into that war funding account, even though they have nothing to do with supporting overseas operations. I give the committee an A for creative accounting and an F for truth in budgeting.

What this amendment does is it says to the military we're going to provide you the funds you asked for, but, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, we're actually going to add \$1.5 billion additional for the Guard and the Reserve.

There's no reason we should be throwing money into the war accounts that don't belong there simply as an accounting scheme to avoid the cap.

□ 0000

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before I close, let me just say for the RECORD, the \$5 billion extra was in the National Defense Reauthorization Act which the House passed I believe in June, and just for the record, funding for the overseas contingency fund in our bill matches the amount recommended by the House Budget Committee, which membership is well known and is present on the floor this evening. So it has a pretty good endorsement, and for this reason I strongly oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I thank my friend for the opportunity here today. I would simply agree with him that it is difficult to plan out 18 months in advance as to what is going to be happening in Afghanistan. However, I would think that the folks best suited to be able to do that planning would be the folks who are actually running the overseas operations. It would be the Pentagon and the Armed Forces, who are the folks who asked for the \$81 billion that we are giving them.

To Mr. VAN HOLLEN's point, the Secretary was here saying this is exactly what he needs. I recognize the fact that there could be contingencies, but you have to think that number is already built into the request. More importantly, the additional money, the slush fund, the money over and above the \$80.7 billion that the Defense Department has asked for, is not saved for some rainy day, it's not saved for some

contingency that we haven't anticipated that might come up in the next 18 months—it's spent. It's spent.

So we simply ask for support for this amendment and try to get us back in line with spending the amount of money that the Pentagon asked us to spend, respecting the integrity of the base budget, the 302(b)s, but also not using up money in a wasteful fashion in the OCO account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to rebase Air Force, Air Guard, and Air Force Reserve aircraft until 60 days after the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force has submitted its report under section 363(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the Air Force from making changes in fiscal year 2014 until 60 days after Congress hears from the Commission we established to report on the global structure of the Air Force.

Over the last two years, Congress and the Air Force have engaged in numerous discussions about the future of our forces. I've had an opportunity to engage in many of those conversations about what the Air Force can afford, what provides us the greatest capability, and what ensures that our men and women get home safely.

These discussions have included decisions the Air Force has made regarding the realignment of forces. Some of these decisions made a lot of sense. Some of them did not. But as we've had these conversations as these decisions are being made, I can't help but feel like I'm listening to the Air Force play

the same broken record over and over again.

What I see happening, Mr. Chairman, is the Air Force continues to talk about cutting costs. They talk about mission capabilities and readiness. And then they turn around and spend millions upon millions of dollars re-basing planes and uprooting personnel all over the Nation, only to reevaluate and move them again just a few years later.

And in the end, it seems like the Air Force isn't making smart financial decisions, and some of these moves don't even make sense from a mission perspective.

Last year, my colleagues and I addressed some of these issues during the National Defense Authorization Act process. We included language in the House version of the bill that would have stopped movement of some of these planes until the Air Force could provide better answers for their decisions. I was disappointed that the final version of the bill omitted this amendment.

Instead the final bill established a National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force for the very purpose of reevaluating these basing decisions and reporting back to Congress. Specifically, we are looking for that Commission to tell us if or how the current Air Force structure should be modified to best fulfill mission requirements in a manner that is consistent with our available and limited resources.

The Commission was also given several considerations to keep in mind while completing this study. They wanted to ensure structure meets current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands, achieve the appropriate balance between Active Duty Air Force and reserve components, provide sufficient numbers of active Air Force to ensure we can recruit from the pool for reserve components, and make sure that we maintain an adequate peacetime rotation force.

I am encouraged by the formation and the progress of this Air Force Commission in last year's NDAA. In fact, I went and testified before this Commission earlier this afternoon. I think they have some valuable contributions to make in these discussions.

But I am still disappointed that the Air Force is still determined to enact those questionable decisions before hearing from the Commission. If this body doesn't act, those decisions will go into effect in October of this year—moving hundreds of planes, uprooting families, transferring units, modifying missions, spending millions of dollars possibly to rethink it all and re-base again in a few short years. Yet the commission's report is only a few short months away.

Am I the only one who thinks this doesn't make much sense?

We're making bold decisions on the structure of the Air Force without waiting for the recommendations of the study that we mandated. This is a plain-as-day example of putting the cart before the horse.

My amendment would simply call for a temporary freeze on Air Force movements until we can review the findings of the report. I feel like this is a pretty reasonable amendment given that we asked for the study in the first place. At a time when our military is already under incredible strain, when budgets are already tight, it is imperative that we get this right. My amendment may even save us money in the long run. I ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue about the Air Force's total force plan that was contained in the fiscal year 2013 budget. The subcommittee would agree that, looking back, it was poorly conceived and was made even worse by the lack of communication between the services, the reserve, and Congress. And I supported and the subcommittee supported and the Armed Services Committee supported a requirement that the Air Force go back and re-evaluate its force restructuring.

But I ran for Congress and I'm a Member of the House of Representatives, and we're elected to make decisions. I'm not a member of a commission. I don't support commissions, and I'm disappointed that at the insistence of the other body, the Armed Services authorized another commission. I find it interesting that often we say we need a commission, we need a select committee, each time there is a difficult decision to be made. We ought to make them. That's what we get paid money for. We ought to make those decisions and not give it to a commission.

And what happens when we give it to a commission? Well, that's a bad idea. We don't support the commission's decision, and then that report sits on a desk.

The gentleman mentions that the time is short. We have but a few short months before the Commission's report is due back to the United States Congress. The report is due on February 1, 2014. That means that we have the short month of August, the short month of September, the short month of October, the short month of November, the short month of December, and the short month of January before the Commission reports back to the Congress, before the Congress can begin to act now two years after a botched report by, I would admit, the United States Air Force in the first instance.

The gentleman mentions that budgets are tight. I absolutely agree with him. All the more reason why if the Air Force now has a plan to wait more than another half year to look at a report to decide what we're going to do, we ought to see what the Air Force has

to say. If it makes sense, to do it. If not, to make them have it changed. But not wait for the Commission. I'm a Member of the House of Representatives, not a Commission.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for yielding to me. I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment. It seems as though this amendment attempts to reopen issues that were resolved in the 2013 bill, and would prohibit the Air Force from conducting authorized re-basing actions until April 2014.

This amendment appears to be not so great for the National Guard. The National Guard is depending on re-basing actions or remission or backfilling units that otherwise would lose aircraft. I think that needs to happen, and I don't think it necessarily needs to happen after the receipt of this report, which is due some time in the future.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's remarks, but the Air Force has a very bad track record of doing this every few years. And what they're doing is they're spending millions upon millions of dollars. They're talking about cutting costs, but all they're doing is moving planes around, re-basing them, spending more money on capital investment, and basically upsetting communities that have given their heart and shared everything they've had in support of our armed services over and over again. And I hope eventually that the Air Force can get their act straight and that they will be able to figure out a strategic and structural plan that will save taxpayer dollars. And that's what this is about. We are living in a time of limited resources. I know there are a lot of people out there who want to do Americans harm, and we have to have our national security forefront and center as our top priority. I just wish the Air Force would discontinue disrupting communities all around the country. I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for or

carry out a furlough of a dual status military technician (as defined in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

This is a very simple amendment that corrects what I believe was a simple oversight when exemptions were laid out for sequestration. In July of 2012, OMB offered an exemption for all military personnel accounts. I believe that decision was driven by a desire to relieve all uniformed deployable military personnel from the furloughs that were caused by sequestration's damaging defense cuts.

Unfortunately, a very specific group was left out of this exemption because of a technicality. Our Nation's National Guard and Reserve military technicians—or MILTECHs—are some of the most important assets we have to keeping our servicemen and -women safe. Just like any other servicemember, they proudly wear the military uniform to work, and are expected to abide by the very same standards. Perhaps most importantly, every one of them is deployable. MILTECHs are National Guardsmen and Reserve personnel. Many of them have deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and have been in harm's way all around the world.

These dual status technicians work every day in direct support of our warfighters. They supply our troops with the equipment they need to fight and win and return home safely. But because of a technicality, because they are paid out of a different account, these Guardsmen and Reservists have been on furlough for almost a month now.

All my amendment would do is ensure that these men and women receive the same treatment as our other uniformed personnel and are included in the furlough exemption. The Congressional Budget Office has verified that my amendment is budget neutral.

Let me say, I was one of the first on the House Armed Services Committee to sound the alarm about the damaging effects of these cuts to our national defense. I have supported several alternatives that would resolve the sequestration mess around our defense budgets and across the Federal Government. I have lain awake at night, worried about the damaging effects these cuts will have if we do not prioritize cuts and fix this problem. I hope we will see some consensus on a real fix to sequestration soon.

But the exception has already been made for the men and women who put their lives on the line every day to defend this Nation. And rightly so. My amendment simply ensures we include all of our deployable men and women in uniform in that exemption.

This legislation is supported by our enlisted and commissioned National Guard members and many other organizations. I ask that my colleagues support the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

□ 0015

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

This is a simple fix to a problem that is an oversight. And I will tell you, from the State of Florida's perception—I live in Florida—we are obviously prone to hurricanes.

Our National Guard are our first responders when it comes to a natural disaster like a hurricane. These dual status technicians are in a position to keep the men and women of the Florida Army National Guard up and flying those helicopters that are utilized across the gulf coast to rescue people.

Without these dual service technicians, without these women and men who actually repair and keep the equipment running, we are at risk, particularly in the State of Florida, but all along the gulf coast when we can't field the force to go out and protect us here at home, much less out in the world.

And our National Guard, and particularly the aviation unit in my hometown, that's affected, they're currently deployed in Europe. But the fact that they have the inability to keep their equipment maintained, and we're furloughing these dual service technicians, it puts us at risk. It hurts our readiness.

And so from a Florida perspective, I will tell you that it is imperative that we pass this. I really appreciate Representative PALAZZO from the great State of Mississippi bringing this forward.

Mr. PALAZZO. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the Representative from Florida. He brought up a good point: it's not just our dual-purpose technicians, our MILTECHs making sure our equipment that our warfighters need is operating. And many times they deploy with them to Iraq and to Afghanistan on multiple deployments and hot spots all around the world.

But there's another purpose of our National Guard, and that's helping us here in the homeland. We're in the middle of hurricane season, and I know that Congressman NUGENT's Governor, my Governor, Phil Bryant, the Governor of Louisiana, have all sent a letter to the President of the United States asking for this exemption as well, because those are the first responders.

They're there before the storm, during the storm, and after the storm. So I thank him for bringing that important point up.

And I'd like to close by saying, again, in times of bitter partisanship and

gridlock, the one unifying trait of this Congress is that we keep our promises to the young men and women who tirelessly defend this Nation at home and abroad at great personal sacrifice.

A vote against this amendment is a vote to break faith with our military and their families. A vote for this amendment is a vote to uphold our promise to our military and their loved ones. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would, first of all, want to suggest that I appreciate the gentleman from Mississippi raising the issue relative to the Guard, as well as my colleague from the State of Florida, the Guard that protects us internationally as far as our military and international threats, as well as takes care of us at home.

The gentleman mentioned, given their portion of the country, that it is hurricane season. It is tornado season in the Midwest. It is flood season in the Midwest. It is earthquake season every day in the State of California, and we have wildfires out west. The Guard does terrific work.

I am very proud of the fact that, although Indiana has continued to decline relative to other States, and is now only the 16th largest State by population in this great Republic, the Indiana National Guard is the fourth largest Guard unit in the United States of America. And it's not just numerical; it is the quality of the men and women who serve, just as in the States of Mississippi, Florida, and throughout our country.

But I would, again, reference back to the observations I've made on all of the furlough amendments that have been made tonight. Everyone who does civilian work, whether it be at the Department of Defense or any other agency of this government, does important work; and we ought not to make that distinction.

The gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this did vote for the Budget Control Act that did create sequestration, that did create this problem.

I would suggest that what we ought to do is comprehensively begin to solve this problem and not move chairs around on this particular deck.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out reductions to the nuclear forces of the United States to implement the New START Treaty (as defined in section 495(e) of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in light of the late hour, I'm going to synopsise my more full statement, if that's okay with everybody.

Recently, the House passed the FY14 NDAA, and in that document we included a provision that, before the \$75 million that the White House had requested for implementation of the New START Treaty, they have to provide to the Congress the 1042 report, which was due 18 months ago, by law, that outlines how they're going to spend the money.

The White House has refused to submit that report to date. We put in the authorization language saying, give us the report and we'll give you the money. I went to Chairman YOUNG and asked him to include this in his appropriations bill. He said he would welcome the amendment. I hope that's still the case tonight, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and it's similar to one that the House has already approved on a different bill, specifically, the FY14 National Defense Authorization Act.

I wish this amendment wasn't necessary, but, the President's actions compel it.

Too often, this President acts as if he is above the law.

He ignores the law when it comes to his healthcare law, he ignores the enforcement of immigration laws, and he violates the Constitution to bypass the Senate to appoint unqualified or ideological individuals to important government positions.

Now he is applying this approach to defense policy.

The President's priority appears to be tearing down our nuclear deterrent, which is America's ultimate security guarantee.

And he is ignoring Congress and the law in doing so.

A clear example is his implementation of the New START treaty with Russia.

The President, in his budget request for fiscal year 2014, is asking for a blank check from Congress to implement the treaty with no questions asked.

This is not the way our Constitutional government was set up to work.

This amendment will force the President to follow the law and hold him accountable if he expects one dime of the American people's money to be appropriated.

The House, through the appropriation power, must have a chance to evaluate whether the implementation of a treaty, and the manner in which an Administration intends

to implement a treaty, is in the US national security interest.

That is the reason the 1042 report was required in the FY12 NDAA in the first place.

I remind the House, this report is mandated by law.

Are we really comfortable in this House with letting the President ignore the law of the land as he sees fit?

Recently, the President announced a major new nuclear weapons policy before a modest crowd of Europeans.

He stated he will seek to reduce our deployed nuclear forces by a third—beyond the New START reductions we haven't yet put in place.

We need to put the brakes on this rush to zero.

This President is proposing dangerous and irreversible changes to our nuclear forces.

Congress must ensure we use caution when tinkering with the nation's ultimate insurance policy—our nuclear deterrent.

We know the President has been itching to announce further nuclear force cuts.

Based on the most recent arms control compliance report, it appears, yet another year is passing while the President will ignore significant Russian cheating—let me say that again, Russia is cheating on a major treaty with the United States—so that he can propose further reductions with Vladimir Putin.

And the President appears to have so little confidence in his proposal, he refuses to affirm that his reductions will follow the established precedent—what some call the Biden-Helms standard—of proceeding through a treaty or affirmative Act of Congress.

We must be wary; the Appropriations Power was never intended to be a blank check.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for his support and I urge the House to pass the Rogers amendment and send a signal to the President that we won't cut him blank checks while he tries to circumvent the Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment and would state my opposition to it.

We have a handful of amendments that have been made in order on the bill regarding our Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. This is one that urges maintaining the status quo, and others have pushed for a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons.

I firmly believe that a further reduction in the number of nuclear weapons in our inventory will not negatively impact our deterrence goal. Even under the recently ratified New START Treaty, both the United States and Russia will have more than 1,500 deployed warheads each.

Additionally, the treaty contains no limits on nonstrategic nuclear weapons or nondeployed nuclear warheads.

With regard to the amendment, I don't think it's responsible to prohibit the United States from carrying out the reductions prescribed by the New START Treaty. That bilateral strategic arms reduction treaty was passed

by a wide margin in the United States Senate, according to the Constitution, and it remains in force.

I think it is very bad policy to go back on an international treaty obligation that would, in fact, reduce the number of nuclear weapons in this world and would, again, reference back a quote that I read in my opening statement because, again, the gentleman is essentially saying let us maintain the status quo.

Over the last 12 years, it has gotten us a more expensive military that has grown more expensive, but has not gotten any larger. The reality that we face today gives us very difficult choices that we are going to have to make looking forward.

Our military is at a familiar crossroads, one they have been at before at the end of combat operations. The additions and subtractions to funding that we make today must be carried out with an eye to the future. The status quo will no longer get the job done, one, as far as our national security, the security of this world, or a responsible budget that does truly, looking forward, provide us with an affordable defense. And for those reasons, I do object to the gentleman's amendment and oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's observations. And while I may not agree with the New START Treaty, I am in no way trying to prohibit it being implemented. It is the law of the land.

However, we do have a constitutional obligation in this House to be responsible with taxpayers' dollars. And under the new treaty law that was signed by the President, he had 90 days to provide the Congress a report on how he was going to spend the money to implement it.

That's all we're saying in this amendment, is when he gives us the report by law that was due 18 months ago, we'll give him the money, but not until then.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR.
ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman

from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I will consume.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment, which would eliminate all American military aid to Pakistan.

Since 9/11, the United States has given Pakistan over \$25 billion, with over \$17 billion going to their security forces. These funds have been, and continue to be, used to fight an internal war of suppression against the Sindi, the Baluch, and others who reject their corrupt and brutal domination by Pakistan.

Sadly, Pakistan also uses billions of American military aid to support terrorist attacks on its neighbors, including Afghanistan. And in this last decade, our generous gifts to Pakistan have been used to finance the killing of Americans, both military and diplomatic personnel.

We've been acting like suckers. No shame on Pakistan for being two-faced and murderous. Shame on us for being so stupid in financing a regime that obviously despises us and considers us its enemy.

It is a charade to believe that our aid is buying Pakistan's cooperation and hunting down terrorists when the Pakistani establishment not only gave safe haven to Osama bin Laden for 10 years, but jailed Dr. Afridi, the courageous man who pinpointed bin Laden and was instrumental in bringing justice to him for the mass murder of our fellow Americans on 9/11.

Dr. Afridi is an American hero; yet we have left Dr. Afridi to rot in a Pakistani dungeon. Shame on us for letting Dr. Afridi languish in misery and pain for helping us bring justice to Osama bin Laden and those he murdered on 9/11.

Pakistan is not a government to which we should be giving billions of dollars of aid. My amendment would cut off all aid because Pakistan has betrayed our friendship time and again. Any money we send them only strengthens their ability to act against us, to murder Baluch and Sindi and Sikhs, and to undermine moderate Muslims in Afghanistan, even as we withdraw in 2014.

At a time of tight budgets, we should reserve our aid for our friends and our allies and end assistance to a government that targets and kills Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Section 9114 of the bill specifies the certification required of the Secretary of Defense in order to execute the coalition support funds re-

imbursement to Pakistan. The Secretary of Defense must certify that Pakistan is cooperating with U.S. counterterrorism operations, not supporting terrorist activities against the U.S. or Afghanistan, taking measures to curb the export of IED materials, and preventing the proliferation of nuclear materials.

□ 0030

As mentioned earlier this evening, the relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult. It is a gray world. But maintaining that relationship is essential. It has helped the United States make progress against terrorism. And Pakistan has allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to the counterterrorism mission.

In June of 2012, Pakistan demonstrated its commitment to a stable and secure Afghanistan by reopening the ground lines of communications. I certainly regret that previously they had been closed. But this has eased tensions with the U.S. and improved logistical support for our troops.

I do think withdrawal of assistance at this time is likely to polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts within their military and their government, generally, and I don't think we need to aggravate a very sensitive relationship that can, in the future, be more productive to the United States.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment but understand, because we're good friends, his passion and his very, very strong feelings which he expresses on any number of occasions and has done so eloquently tonight.

Some would argue this isn't true, but I believe Pakistan does remain a key U.S. counterterrorism partner. Their cooperation is essential. As we did during the war in Afghanistan, we're going to have to use air routes over Pakistan. We're going to have to use their maritime capabilities. We're going to have to use the land routes to get our troops and material out; otherwise, we're going to depend on Kyrgyzstan and Russia. It's going to be expensive. It will probably be \$20 billion worth of expense to withdraw from Afghanistan if we don't have the cooperation of the Pakistanis.

The other issue is Pakistan is a nuclear power. I think we need to have a close working relationship with them to make sure that those weapons in the future never fall into the wrong hands.

So I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I associate myself with them. I strongly oppose this amendment but obviously respect the sponsor for his strong views as well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. As he mentioned, I do appreciate the passion that the author of this amendment has brought to this. Obviously,

there have been problems, and it is incumbent upon this country to make sure that this is an arm's-length and adult relationship that is, in the end, beneficial to our Nation.

So I certainly appreciate his objective but am opposed to his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman noted that this is a gray world. It is not a gray world in so many cases. This is not a gray world when people are killing Americans. This is not a gray world when someone organizes the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11 and then is given safe haven by someone who's claiming to be our friend. No, that's not gray at all.

The Pakistanis decided a long time ago that they consider us their enemy. When they took Osama bin Laden and gave him safe haven from us and took our money while they were doing it and used it to finance terrorist groups that have murdered American soldiers in Afghanistan, no, that's not a gray world. That's black and white. And we should stand up for the principle that people who are killing Americans will not receive American military aid, and we can proclaim this tonight in this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to join me in standing up to make sure that the world knows that when they kill Americans, they're not going to be treated like they're our friends. We're not that stupid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act may be used for United States military exercises which include any participation by the People's Republic of China.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

This is an important amendment in that the Chinese have demonstrated time and time again that they're willing to take our tactics and our technology. Coming up in 2014, President Obama has invited the Chinese to par-

ticipate in a RIMPAC exercise, the world's largest international maritime exercise. Right now, the Chinese plan to use these exercises to increase their knowledge about our tactics.

The participation in these military exercises is particularly concerning at this time when China is hacking our computers, stealing our weapons plans, and escalating the pressure in the South Sea of China. China's behavior does not appear to be even on the radar of the administration. I'm really concerned now that they're becoming belligerent in the Pacific area of the rim. They're declaring rights to land. And we're going to, by participating with the Chinese, make it look like we're siding with the Chinese in helping the Chinese allies and against the United States.

At this time, I yield to my friend, the cosponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by my good friend from Texas.

The Chinese Communist Party is a gangster regime that rules over a billion subjects. It is the world's worst human rights abuser and does not deserve the recognition nor the legitimacy that comes with participating in military exercises with the Armed Forces of the United States.

As the greatest threat to world peace and stability, the last thing we should be doing is helping them fine-tune their military and their familiarization with the strengths and weaknesses of America's Armed Forces.

The Chinese military is the armed wing of the Communist Party in that country. For decades, China has occupied Tibet, East Turkistan, and threatened the democratic nation of Taiwan with total annihilation. The Communist Party uses force to control its population. Thousands of Falun Gong practitioners who do nothing more than promote yoga and meditation have had their organs ghoulishly ripped from their bodies before they were executed so that those organs could be sold. The moral depravity of the Chinese Communist Party cannot be overstated.

China is aggressively using military expansion to back up territorial claims against India, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, and other countries. The Chinese military is guilty of even more aggression in cyberspace, as we have just heard from my colleague from Texas. They have stolen dozens of our defense systems. They have vast amounts of intellectual property they've stolen, as well as the business records for many of our companies. The damage has been estimated in the trillions of dollars.

Any cooperation with the Chinese military only weakens our own moral credibility and discourages our allies in the face of threats from Communist China. We should be drawing a clear distinction between us and the Chinese military, not helping them train to become even more efficient.

I call on my colleagues to vote for Congressman STOCKMAN's terrific amendment, again, making sure that we stand up and are counted when there is a threat to the freedom and stability of the world.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment seeks to block funds for our military to participate in any exercise in which China participates as well. The Chinese President confirmed last month in meetings with President Obama his navy's attendance to participate in the rim of the Pacific, known as RIMPAC, in 2014. An invitation to participate had been extended to China during then-Secretary of Defense Panetta's visit to that country in September of 2012.

RIMPAC is the world's largest international maritime exercise, where 28 countries and more than 40 ships and submarines work together. In 2012, not all participants were our traditional allies. Russia and India, for example, were participants.

I believe the amendment is shortsighted and attempts to place an unneeded stumbling block in the path of a relationship that is tenuous. I would suggest that the Secretary would not have extended the invitation if the Department and the United States Navy did not feel that there would be a benefit to be gained by these exercises with Chinese participation. I refuse to believe, as a Member of the United States Congress, that the Department would take such a position.

The United States gains maritime knowledge and renewed relationships with other navies of the world and considers participation in this exercise as crucial to their mission. RIMPAC participation has gained an ever-greater meaning with the Defense Department's rebalance to the Asia Pacific, and I do think that this amendment should not be adopted by the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the military works for Congress, not the other way around. So if we direct the military to do something, they do it. If they object, they're not going to object and say, We're not going to do it. We're the body that controls the military, and we're responsible for this Nation's future.

It's so obvious what we're doing is giving away our secrets. I can tell you right now that they've stolen the plans to the F-22. They're building more F-22s than we are.

They're not part of the negotiation for nuclear weapons right now. We only negotiate with Russia. We have no idea how many weapons they have. We have

no idea how many nuclear weapons they have. We are blindsided by what they're doing. They're shooting down satellites, and they could blind us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and would agree with his assertion that we do have civilian command of the Department of Defense and the United States Navy; and, God bless the United States Navy, they follow orders. But also having dealt with the Navy for some number of years as a member of this subcommittee, I would suggest to my colleagues, if the Navy had reservations or had some concerns, we would have had a whiff of that objection and concern wafting from the Potomac to this particular building, and I have not sensed that myself.

I would yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me associate myself with Mr. VISCLOSKY's remarks. I think there's some benefit for us to have a joint military exercise. They may learn something about us; we may learn something about them.

I can assure you the committee isn't in a state of denial. We know the Chinese are very aggressive, setting out a strategy for a blue navy. I think these joint exercises may be extremely beneficial to us in terms of their naval strategy, and to be part of an overall Pacific rim program gives us a pretty good opportunity to take a look at their capabilities.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the strategic delivery systems (as defined in section 495(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code) of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573(b)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restrict President Obama from unlawfully divesting our Nation's strategic delivery systems.

Since the enactment of the New START Treaty in 2010, the President has continued to jeopardize the security of the United States by unilaterally pursuing policies and international agreements that call for the drastic reduction of our Nation's nuclear deterrent. Not only are these proposed policies and agreements harmful to the United States, but also they are in violation of standing laws such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which states that international agreements cannot limit or reduce the military forces of the United States unless enacted pursuant to a treaty or congressional-executive agreement.

□ 0045

It is unfortunate that amendments such as this one have become necessary, as the President chooses to ignore the role of Congress when negotiating arms reductions.

As recently as last month, President Obama delivered a speech in Berlin in which he outlined his plan to further reduce nuclear warheads by as much as one-third. Since that time, the administration has given no indication that he would seek to negotiate or seek Senate ratification of a formal treaty as required by law. Instead, the administration continues to engage directly with the Russian Federation while averting a formal treaty process in coordination with the Senate.

These drastic reductions by the President are ill conceived and have only encouraged the further proliferation of nuclear weapons by countries like Russia, China, and North Korea, which continue to expand their nuclear weapons programs.

This amendment seeks to rein in the President's misguided policies by ensuring that none of the appropriated funds be used to reduce the strategic delivery systems of the United States in contravention of section 303(b) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. We have had a number of amendments in this vein this evening. Again, I would allude back to some of my earlier comments that we have proposals and discussions and consideration taking place, and I don't think it's our duty to stop all of that from happening.

The fact is, none of these weapons have ever been used in the United States or elsewhere on the planet

Earth. I would hope, as an institution, we would take this much time to consider the asymmetrical threats that have occurred against this country and its citizens and our allies across the country, such as the attack on the USS Cole, the U.S. embassy bombings in Tanzania and Kenya, and the events of 2001.

I think about the instability and the strategic challenges we face now in Egypt, in Syria, in Libya, in North Africa; the continuing challenge of Iran, which supports terrorist organizations with regional and global aims; the effort that we are going to have to put into the prioritization of an Asia-Pacific region focus, with a particular emphasis on China and North Korea; and the instantaneous and continual attack by cyber against our Nation and our assets.

Again, as far as deliberation and consideration, I don't think we should simply be here all evening saying no, no, no. The President obviously, if there is any further reduction according to a treaty, would have to have that ratified through the United States Senate.

So I do oppose the gentleman's amendment and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. With all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana, I won't question his historical description of the issues of the use of nuclear weapons, although I find it confusing.

I will say that this amendment and its terms are not about the issue of the use of or even the number of weapons the United States or Russia might have. This is about the Constitution and the laws of the United States. All this says is that the President has to follow the Constitution, make certain that he seeks Senate ratification of any formal treaty, or that he conform with the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which would prohibit him unilaterally taking action.

The concern and the reason why this amendment is necessary is because the President felt the need to actually leave this country and go to another country and announce his attention, perhaps, to undertake unilaterally—both as President, and unilaterally, without even getting a bilateral agreement with another nation—his intention of further reducing our nuclear weapons.

This amendment is not about numbers, it's about the law. It's about our Constitution, it's about upholding it, and requiring that the President of the United States conform to it in something certainly as important as our national security.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or release to the Republic of Yemen (or any entity within Yemen) a detainee who is or was held, detained, or otherwise in the custody of the Department of Defense on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, in May, the President declared a renewed intention to transfer detainees from Guantanamo. He also announced he was lifting his self-imposed suspension on the transfers of detainees to Yemen. I believe it's a dangerous policy, both for our troops fighting terror overseas and for our citizens living in the homeland.

The amendment I am offering prohibits any funds in the defense bill from being used to transfer Gitmo detainees to Yemen. This amendment is similar to an amendment I offered in this House past during consideration of the FY14 NDAA.

I believe this amendment is needed because detainees at Guantanamo Bay represent some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world. After Yemen was the starting point for the foiled airline bombing over Detroit, the Obama administration correctly decided not to transfer these terrorists back to this troubled nation.

Detainees at Gitmo pose a real threat to our national security. In addition, transfers to Yemen should be prohibited because the country has become a hotbed for terrorist activities. The Director of National Intelligence testified in 2011 that AQAP remains the affiliate most likely to conduct a transnational attack. AQAP remains resolute on killing as many Americans as they can if we don't stop them first.

It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S. The Christmas day Detroit bombing attempt, the ink cartridge bomb plot, the radicalization of the Fort Hood shooter all can be traced back to Yemen.

Lastly, we should not transfer detainees to Yemen because of their poor track record of securing its prisons. Let's look at the facts. A Yemeni citizen, the convicted mastermind of the USS Cole bombing who took the lives of 17 American sailors, was being held

by Yemeni authorities when he escaped from prison in 2003. Luckily, he was recaptured, but he was able to escape again from Yemeni custody in 2006 with 22 other terrorists. Why would we risk another jailbreak by people who intend to do us harm?

Just this morning I woke up to headlines describing how 500 prisoners escaped from an Iraqi prison after their comrades launched a military-style assault to free them. Many of these prisoners were senior members of al Qaeda who were convicted and received death sentences. Unfortunately, it's an example of what happens when the U.S. delegates its national security interests to other countries. This is a commonsense amendment with the purpose of protecting Americans.

I believe it's prudent that this Congress receive the Department of Defense's report on factors that contribute to re-engagement so that informed choices about future transfers can be made. That report is mandated by law and is still currently overdue.

In 2012, the DIA reported that the combined suspected and confirmed re-engagement rate of former Gitmo detainees has risen to almost 30 percent. I ask my colleagues to consider the national security implications of transferring detainees to Yemen and join me in support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. May I inquire of the balance of my time, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Walorski amendment to prohibit transfer or release of Guantanamo Bay detainees to Yemen.

Mr. Chairman, over the weekend, hundreds of convicts, including senior members of al Qaeda, broke out of Iraq's Abu Ghraib jail. The Abu Ghraib prison break perfectly demonstrates that most countries cannot credibly secure highly dangerous terrorists, including Yemen. Indeed, Yemen has a particularly bad record of prison breaks involving al Qaeda terrorists.

In December 2011, several al Qaeda militants escaped from an Aden prison. In 2006, 23 al Qaeda militants broke out of a Sanaa jail and established the core leadership of al Qaeda in Yemen, a group which has since metastasized into al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

Given Yemen's terrible track record, it seems obvious that we should not consider transferring a single detainee to Yemen. Yet President Obama is so

ideologically committed to fulfilling his misguided promise of closing Guantanamo Bay that I fear he may try.

Mr. Chairman, recidivism among the transferred Gitmo detainees is a huge problem. According to the Director of National Intelligence, the latest report, 97 of the 603 transferred Gitmo detainees have re-engaged in terrorism. A further 72 are suspected of re-engaging. Nearly one-third of all transferred Gitmo detainees are either confirmed or suspected of getting back in the fight. Clearly, Congress needs to get involved and set acceptable boundaries on the President.

As a Navy pilot with combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, I can tell you that our troops' job is already difficult enough. We don't have to fight the same people twice.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this is the first instance that my friend and colleague from Indiana and I are participating in a debate on an amendment on the House floor, which is why I respectfully and regretfully have to oppose her amendment, as well-intentioned as it is.

I do not believe that we should impose on ourselves the legal and moral problems arising from the prospect of indefinite detentions at Guantanamo. Working through civil courts since 9/11, hundreds of individuals have been convicted of terrorism or terrorism-related offenses and are now serving long sentences in Federal prison. Not one has ever escaped custody.

But we're told we cannot bring these detainees to the United States for trial or custody. And we are told in three other instances in the bill that we cannot close Guantanamo. But I think the rationale for establishing Guantanamo in the first instance was a misplaced idea that the facility could be beyond the law—a proposition rejected by the Supreme Court. As a result, continued operation of this facility creates the impression in the eyes of our allies and enemies alike that the United States selectively observes the rule of law. With this amendment, now we would have a fourth restriction within this bill, and I think that is not the best policy for this country to pursue.

For that reason, respectfully, I do oppose the gentlewoman's amendment, and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire on the balance of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Indiana has 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. With all due respect to my esteemed colleague from Indiana as well, this amendment isn't about whether Gitmo stays open or Gitmo closes. This amendment is specifically about not allowing transfers of highly dangerous terrorists to the country of Yemen because Yemen has proved it is not capable of holding these terrorists.

The job of this Congress and what we're talking about with this amendment is protecting the American people, which is what we're charged with.

I would respectfully ask our body to approve and support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 113-170.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 113-170.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, transfer, or prepare to divest, retire, or transfer, C-23 aircraft assigned to the Army.

(b) The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing and increasing the amount made available for "Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Army" by \$34,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to provide our National Guard with the aircraft it needs to perform its missions effectively and efficiently.

The National Guard relies on C-23 Sherpa aircraft for a variety of uses, and they're especially important for missions stateside. These small cargo aircraft transported relief supplies and personnel after Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina. They support special operations missions and training, and they aid the Guard in fighting wildfires.

These planes are flexible, they can be put into use quickly and—this is important, Mr. Chairman—they're less expensive to operate than other options.

□ 0100

Despite opposition from the National Guard Association of the United States and from Governors around this country, the Army now wants to eliminate use of the Sherpa. The C-130 planes they propose using instead are almost two times as expensive to operate. Plus, eliminating the Sherpa would require that the Guard rely on the Air Force for the use of planes. This would add up to a week to access planes, cutting off the Guard's ability to be responsive and flexible. Additionally, the Sherpa is extremely popular with the Special Operations community.

Last year, the House voted to prohibit the Sherpa's retirement. My amendment would uphold current law and prevent the retirement, divestment, or transfer of C-23 aircraft. It would also ensure their continued viable operation, preventing the Army from getting around the law by mothballing the Sherpa into "flyable storage."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment. Let's listen to the men and women of the National Guard and support their success to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

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

The Army has made it clear to our committee that it does not want to retain C-23s, the Sherpas, the workhorses, that have been doing some remarkable work for over 30 years, or acquire any replacement platform. In fact, the Army is already taking steps to put the aircraft out of operation while stopping short of full retirement.

At the beginning of fiscal year 2013, the Army National Guard was operating 34 of these Sherpas. As of July, 14 of those had been turned into Fort Sill, Oklahoma, where they are being maintained in semi-flyable storage. That tells you something. The remaining aircraft are scheduled to be turned into Fort Sill by the end of October of this year.

Because this amendment only applies to fiscal year 2014, the aircraft likely will be out of operation before this amendment would take effect. Unfortunately, because the C-23s will already be in storage by the time this amendment takes effect, it is unlikely it will accomplish its intent.

We do not believe that taking funds from other critical readiness programs to apply to the C-23 operations is the best use of the Army's increasingly limited resources. Thus, reluctantly, I oppose this amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the comments of the chair.

However, if we are talking about limited resources, it makes so much more sense to use planes that are less expensive. Give the men and the women of the National Guard the flexibility and the aircraft that they need.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement an enrollment fee for the TRICARE for Life program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

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

In the President's budget the past 2 years, there has been a push to phase in substantial TRICARE fee increases. Even the TRICARE For Life program, the promise of life-long health care many were given when they first joined the military, has been the subject of proposed enrollment fees.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and other Congressional defense committees, have declined to grant the authority for these fee increases.

My amendment would do nothing more than ensure that the funds in this act are not made available to implement any new enrollment fees in the TRICARE For Life program.

Year after year, we hear from the Department of Defense that health care costs of our soldiers and veterans are spiraling out of control and that TRICARE is crippling the DOD with its rise in costs. Yet, Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 fiscal years, the Pentagon has found a way to reprogram hundreds

of millions of dollars from defense health accounts to higher priorities. These reprogramming actions totaled \$708 million last year in 2012 and \$500 million in the prior year in 2011.

DOD has explained that the surplus was due to “uncertainty about medical inflation and health care use, and the impact of continual benefit changes and efficiency initiatives.” If there is uncertainty about costs, the assertion cannot be made that added fees are necessary for even our most senior veterans.

DOD’s own documents prove military health care costs are not exploding. The combined personnel and health care costs are less than one-third of DOD’s budget and the same as they’ve been for 30 years. The overestimation of cost growth that has resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars being reprogrammed by DOD the past 2 years is proof that costs are not growing as much as anticipated. In fact, they are not growing at all.

The relatively low cost of health care and strong benefits are the foundational elements and they are necessary not just to recruit, but also to sustain an all-volunteer force. Significant cuts to the critical incentive packages that sustain a top-quality career force will undermine long-term retention and readiness.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment and uphold our commitment to the brave men and women of our armed services, as well as the millions of veterans in need of health care today. Again, I reemphasize this amendment is to prohibit funds to be used to add any enrollment fees to the TRICARE For Life program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman’s amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would begin my remarks by suggesting that I deeply appreciate the gentlewoman’s concern and her commitment to make sure everyone who has taken that oath of office and put on the uniform of the United States of America receives the health care benefits they deserve and that they have earned.

But I would point out, as I have on a number of occasions this evening, that we have got to start looking ahead and begin to make some very difficult decisions.

I would quote again from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments that has noted that over the last decade, rather than getting larger and more expensive, the military has just grown more expensive. This reality makes our future choices even more difficult, and it is imperative that Congress joins with the Department in working through these decisions in an arm’s length relationship, but also as a partner.

The Department has made recommendations, one of which we are de-

bating at this moment, that are very difficult decisions to have to make. On the other hand, we have to begin to not reflectively reject these recommendations out of hand.

I understand what the gentlewoman is trying to do with her amendment, but she does rightfully describe it as saying that no funds shall be used to implement an enrollment fee. Is that enrollment fee 25 cents? Is that enrollment fee \$1? Is that enrollment fee \$2? Is that enrollment fee \$250 for an individual and \$500 for a family? We are going to have to consider the pressure that the budget is under.

The gentlewoman has indicated that the Department has reprogrammed money, and that means that, in fact, costs have not gone up. The fact is I do believe that the Department has, if you would, underexecuted and over-requested moneys in past years.

The subcommittee mark in the bill we are debating tonight cut \$400 million from the request of \$15.8 billion based on the execution history. We would not have done that if we thought we had endangered anyone’s health. And in fact, these costs are going up.

The cost of military medical care has risen almost by triple in the past 12 years, rising from \$19- to \$56 billion. If the increase continues at this rate for another decade, coupled with sequestration, military health care could consume close to 20 percent of all defense spending.

According to a report published by the Congressional Budget Office entitled “Long-Term Implications of the 2013 Future Years Defense Program,” the annual cost to the Department’s health care program could grow from \$51 billion in fiscal year ’13 to \$65 billion in 2017 and \$90 billion by 2030.

If we continue to block enrollment fees for TRICARE For Life, defense funding for this program will place other programs at risk. The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments estimates that pay and benefits for each Active Duty servicemember grew by 57 percent in real terms between 2001 and 2012, or 4.2 percent annually.

I am not suggesting our servicemembers do not deserve adequate compensation for the risks they take in the defense of this country, but we have to understand what the growth of those costs means for the overall budget and the future implications. Operation and maintenance costs per Active Duty employee grew by 34 percent.

I oppose the amendment respectfully because I am worried that if we don’t address the rising cost of health care now there will be even a smaller pool of resources to make our military ready in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the ranking member, however, the facts are as stated: DOD has reprogrammed \$708 million last year alone and \$500 million in the prior year. These have been from the health accounts.

In addition to that, we must look at the fact that the DOD budget as to personnel and health costs are less than one-third of the DOD budget, and that has been a consistent percentage for the past 30 years.

The health care fund has been the one that has been taking the hit every time. It has been the bogeyman to say that is where we are going to have to cut and that is what is rising the costs out of control, it is spiraling out of control. But that is, in fact, not true.

I think that to threaten health care or to not give our men and women in uniform, and the veterans, in particular, the security with which they joined the military for—these are one of the benefits they looked for—by not being able to ensure them that, especially health care, is the worst that we can do. When we don’t have the evidence that this is where we should cut, we should not cut and add any additional enrollment fees.

As I stated, this amendment is to prevent any funds to be used to increase any enrollment fees for the TRICARE For Life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

May 1, 2013:

H.R. 1246. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office.

H.R. 1765. An Act to provide the Secretary of Transportation with the flexibility to transfer certain funds to prevent reduced operations and staffing of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

May 17, 2013:

H.R. 1071. An Act to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.