



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 10, 2009

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY D. WEINER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Dr. Alan N. Keiran, Office of the Senate Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Father God, as the challenging winds of change blow across our beloved Nation, we ask You to empower and encourage our leaders. Release in them vibrant faith in Your word and grant them supernatural wisdom to solve the daunting problems facing our country and our world.

Lord God Almighty, only You can lead us out of darkness and into the wonderful light of Your redeeming love. Open our eyes that we may see and our ears that we may hear what Your Holy Spirit is saying in these trying times. Protect us from the spirit of fear and anoint us with power, love and sound minds. Establish within us the tenacious resolve needed to overcome any obstacles inspired by the enemy of our souls.

Father, please bless and encourage the Members of this House, their families and staff members. As they seek Your counsel, speak tender words of encouragement and direction into their hearts. As they study Your word, may they feel renewed and enlightened. And as they worship, let them experience Your transforming presence and abundant love.

All this I pray in the name of Him who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GUARANTEEING ALL AMERICANS HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic and laughable conceits of the entire health care debate is that people love their for-profit health insurance companies, so hands off the private insurers.

These are the same insurance companies whose premiums, copays and deductibles are forcing millions of Americans into poverty. Sixty percent of all U.S. bankruptcies are tied to people not being able to pay their hospital bills, and most of these people were in-

sured. But people love their insurance companies.

Now, everyone knows that insurance companies make money not providing health care. But people love their insurance companies, so we have to leave them in the game, right?

People love for-profit insurers, so government ought to give the insurance companies a bailout and subsidize private insurers, because people love their insurance companies, right?

Well, I don't think that people love for-profit insurance. I think people want a not-for-profit system that guarantees all Americans health care.

AMERICANS DESERVE A PROPER DEBATE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Democrats are beholden to the failed policies of big government. That is why they refuse to acknowledge the commonsense proposals House Republicans have provided to make this Nation stronger, energy more affordable and Americans healthier.

Rather than have the reasonable debate that the American people deserve, Democrats want to spend their time presenting false choices. But despite the tired rhetoric we hear from the other side of the aisle, House Republicans continue to offer commonsense solutions to improve the economy and create jobs through relief for families and small businesses.

We are fighting for patient-first health care solutions that will help Americans afford insurance, protect the doctor-patient relationship and keep Washington out of your private health care decision. We are standing up for the middle-class families who cannot afford a massive national energy tax.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7949

The American people deserve a debate on the ideas, not more rhetoric and false choices from this administration and their allies.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING GREG GAMBRIL AND DARYL BAILEY

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

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two very talented law enforcement officials in my district. Last week, Greg Gambril and Daryl Bailey received the highest honors in their respective fields from the Alabama District Attorney's Association.

Greg received the Brad Morris Memorial DA of the Year Award. He has served in the Covington County DA's office since 1992 and elected as district attorney in 2004.

Daryl Bailey began in the Montgomery County DA's office in 1997 and has served as Chief Deputy District Attorney since 2002. He was named Assistant District Attorney of the Year and he has prosecuted capital murders as well as the domestic violence cases in his district.

Again, congratulations to Greg, along with his wife Julie and sons, Joseph and Charlie, and to Daryl Bailey and his wife, Tracy, and children, Laura and Jake, for their achievements and dedicated service to our communities.

PRESCRIPTION OF THE DAY: ENSURING A STRONG FUTURE PHYSICIAN WORKFORCE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, "Are we running out of doctors?" was a question posed by the Texas Medical Association last year. The United States population continues to grow and there is concern that there may not be enough physicians to care for Americans.

If we do nothing to assist the training of new physicians, waiting lines will grow longer, lapses in treatment will occur, and many of our smaller and rural communities will be at risk of not having physicians.

What is the prescription? Helping doctors as they enter training in medical school and continuing assistance throughout their residency in high-need specialties and medically-underserved areas to make certain that when you need help, your doctor is in.

Two bills, H.R. 914 and H.R. 916, bipartisan bills to help offer incentives for physicians to practice in rural and underserved areas of the country, will help to ensure that health care coverage actually equals access to a doctor for all Americans.

All of the recent discussion on health care reform has been on cost and cov-

erage, but it matters not if there are not enough doctors for America's patients. Ensuring that our Nation has a strong physician workforce is critical and must be part of this national health care debate.

For more information, please visit my Website, healthcaucus.org.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE PROGRESS AND IMPORTANCE OF GHANA

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to applaud the efforts of Ghana in promoting good governance and civic participation. President Obama will wrap up the third leg of his international trip in Ghana. He will be there today.

I am reminded of the important role this democratic nation plays in the international world. Ghana is an active participant in the United Nations and the African Union. In its region, it has been extremely active in international peacekeeping.

Ghana, the first state in Sub-Saharan Africa to gain its independence, has shown that it is a stable nation whose government and people are accountable to one another. These acts are a good first step in developing future relationships between our Nation and Ghana.

One of my constituents, five-time karate and kickboxing champion, Anthony "Amp" Elmore, fulfilled his lifelong dream by visiting Ghana in 1998. The champ visited Accra, and it has changed his life.

After returning to Memphis, Amp developed his vision of educating and enlightening people about the cultural and economic importance of Africa as a continent, as well as Ghana. At his home and throughout the city, he showcased African artifacts, fabrics and arts.

This weekend, on Friday and Saturday both, he will be honoring Africa at his home and inviting the public and having a fashion show and an African dinner. I will be there. Next year, I will visit Ghana and hope to develop trade between our city, Ghana and our Nation.

COMMENDING SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of intense policy debates, we must not forget that we are here for one reason, to serve. Thankfully I have constant reminders of that spirit of service throughout my district. During the past week, I visited two amazing service organizations where I had the great honor of joining their efforts.

Interfaith Outreach and Community Partners helps people who are facing a crisis, whether it be sudden job loss or dealing with serious health care issues.

Along with operating a local food shelf, they offer emergency financial assistance to those in need.

Feed My Starving Children provides hand-packed meals formulated specifically for children suffering from malnourishment and starvation. They ship those meals to over 60 countries, partnering with like-minded organizations worldwide. They have helped children regain their health.

The spirit of service embodied by these employees and volunteers at these organizations is something we should all be proud of and something we should strive for each day.

HEALTH CARE INNOVATION ZONE PROGRAM ACT

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, finding a uniquely American solution to our Nation's health care challenges means expanding access to high quality health coverage, containing health care costs, improving the quality of care and achieving better health outcomes. To achieve these goals, we have to think in new ways about how to bridge the current system's fragmentation, encourage coordination and promote collaboration by health care providers.

Meaningful health care reform requires that we expand delivery of care models that encourage teamwork among providers, improve efficiencies, and ensure that Americans get better value for their health dollars spent. This includes patient-centered medical homes and greater access to primary care. We should also expand opportunities for doctors and hospitals, including those based in community and academic medical centers, to design, implement and evaluate such models of care delivery.

I have introduced the Health Care Innovation Zone Program Act to create and expand these innovative models of care. When we provide incentives to payers and providers to work together to improve care to communities of patients, we will undoubtedly see better health care, better health care outcomes and lower costs for all of us.

REPUBLICANS OFFER A BETTER PLAN FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, at some point every American will see a doctor or require some form of emergency care. Whether it is the birth of a child or an aging parent sick with cancer, families are praying for the best health care possible for their loved ones. But right now, Democrats are pushing for a government takeover of health care that would severely limit many patients' access to life-saving treatment.

House Republicans know that health care run by government bureaucrats doesn't work, because it has been tried and failed in other countries. Tragedies result when government controls health care and makes decisions best left to doctors and their patients.

Republicans will offer a better plan for health care reform, one that provides patients and their families with the peace of mind that comes with having the care they need when they need it.

DEVELOPING A CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE FOR MAINE

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in Maine we are witnessing the birth of an industry, a clean energy industry that will create the jobs and supply the renewable energy we will need to grow our economy. In Maine, we have the people, the technology and the resources to develop and grow this industry.

Last week, Maine hosted the International Energy Ocean Conference, where hundreds of clean energy experts from around the world gathered and saw firsthand how serious our State is about developing renewable energy.

Also last week the Maine Wind Industry Initiative went public. MWII has organized the complete wind power industry supply chain, from large organizations like Bath Iron Works to smaller companies that specialize in precision composite manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, Maine has an important role to play in Maine's clean energy future, and Maine people are ready to be part of it.

WHY ARE AMERICANS FORCED TO PAY FOR THE HEALTH CARE OF ILLEGALS?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the government control crowd is pushing for universal government takeover of health care. They say only Dr. Uncle Sam can cure the high cost of medicine.

Well, one way to keep down the high cost of health care that no one dares mention is to secure the borders. The flood of illegals coming here for free health care services costs taxpayers billions every year. California spends \$1.5 billion a year in medical costs just for illegals. No wonder they are going broke. Texas spends \$700 million a year. Virginia spends \$100 million a year, and they are not even a border state.

That doesn't count the cost to hospitals that treat illegals. Hospitals aren't allowed to check citizenship, so illegals use expensive emergency rooms to treat minor ailments. The hospital then must charge more to citizens and

legal immigrants just to stay in business. Illegals also drive up the cost of medical insurance for everybody else.

Mr. Speaker, if we stop paying for medical coverage for illegals, then citizens and legal immigrants could obtain affordable health care. Americans should not be forced and coerced to pay for the health care of people illegally in the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3082, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 622 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 622

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 58, line 6. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, except as provided in section 2, no amendment shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After disposition of the amendments specified in the first section of the resolution, the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

SEC. 3. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 3082, the Chair may reduce to two minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 622 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. After the debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, there may well be unfunded mandates in this bill, but that's not why I rise today. I rise because it's about the only mechanism we have to talk about the fact that we are bringing appropriation bills to the floor under closed or structured rules, which violates basically every precept we've had in this House about openness and transparency on appropriation bills.

For years—and decades—appropriation bills have been brought to the floor under an open rule, allowing Members to offer amendments to various sections of the bill and not be precluded from that. But these bills are being brought to the floor all year under closed or structured rules, allowing very, very few amendments. Let me tell you why that's important.

Here, in the past, when Republicans were in the majority, we were lacking a lot of transparency on earmarks. I would come to the floor and offer sometimes a dozen earmark amendments on the floor to strike earmarks, and I had no idea most times when I would come to the floor whose earmark I was challenging. I would simply come and challenge it. And sometimes the sponsor of the earmark would come down to the

floor to defend it, sometimes they wouldn't; but at least I had the opportunity to come down and challenge the earmark and there was some type of back and forth and discussion of it. Now we have some transparency rules, which is good. Some of us have pushed for these transparency rules for a while. Now we know whose earmark we're challenging on the floor. Now we know because there is a name next to it, and Members are required to fill out a certification letter stating that they have no financial interest in the earmark that they are sponsoring.

Those are good reforms; I'm glad we have them. The Speaker of the House said during the campaign a couple of years ago that we were going to drain the swamp, referring to some of the corruption that had gone on, much of it due to earmarking. And I am pleased that some of these transparency rules have come into being. It's a good thing. The problem is we have not drained the swamp; we simply know how deep the mud is. We know that we have a problem, but we have not done much to correct that problem. Let me give you an example. And this is the case here with this rule and the rules on other appropriation bills this year.

Now we know whose earmarks are in the bills, and we know that some of them raise questions, particularly in the Defense bill that is upcoming later this month. There are numerous investigations going on by the Department of Justice right now examining the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. Our own Ethics Committee issues guidance that says if you receive a campaign contribution in close proximity to an earmark that you've sponsored, that doesn't necessarily constitute financial interest; in other words, go ahead and do it. And we have many examples of earmarks going out and campaign contributions flowing in to the sponsor of the earmark. We may not see that as a problem here, but clearly the Justice Department seems to see there is a problem with that.

And so what do we do here in the House? Instead of allowing Members to come to the floor during debate and saying, what about this earmark, what about the campaign contributions that seem to have been received as soon as that earmark was sponsored, as soon as that report came to the floor saying that that earmark was in the bill, why did campaign contributions flow in response to that—instead of being able to examine those things, we've decided to cut off debate.

And so we have transparency rules where we now know whose earmark is in the bill, but we've prohibited Members from actually coming to the floor to examine that. So you have some more transparency, but you've cut out accountability.

Now, we've done a number of appropriation bills, and some amendments have been allowed—very few. I think in one bill there were more than 100

amendments that were prefiled and only maybe 20 or so were allowed. I myself have submitted, in one of the latest bills, about a dozen amendments and was only allowed to offer three on the floor. My guess is that these are going to be narrowed further and further until we get to the Defense bill later this month, which we have allowed only one day of debate for. Keep in mind, this is going to be a bill that will have, likely, if tradition holds, more than 1,000 House earmarks in it, several hundred of which will constitute no-bid contracts for private companies, nearly all of which there will be a pattern of campaign contributions flowing back to the Member who sponsored that earmark.

Now, I am not a fan of public funding of campaigns. That's not the direction we should go. And campaign contributions typically flow to Members who share the philosophy of the person who is making the contribution. But when you have a pattern, as the press has duly noted, accurately noted, that as soon as an earmark is sponsored, often there are campaign checks that come directly to that Member who sponsored the earmarks. There is an appearance of impropriety that we simply have to take account of here in the House.

Our role here in the House and the role of the Ethics Committee is to make sure that we uphold the dignity of this institution, and we simply can't do that when you have the appearance of impropriety. And when you give a no-bid contract to a private company whose executives turn around and make large campaign contributions back to that Member who sponsored the no-bid contract to them, you have the appearance of impropriety. And it is simply wrong for us now to shut down debate on that and to say, all right, now we used to allow Members to challenge these things on the floor, but now that we know that there's an appearance of impropriety, we're simply going to shut down debate, we're not going to talk about it, we're not going to allow that debate to occur on the House floor.

Now, I would hope that these earmarks would be talked about and discussed and vetted in the Appropriations Committee, but clearly that is not the case. If it were the case, if these were properly vetted in the Appropriations Committee, we wouldn't see the scandals that we've seen. We wouldn't have Members of Congress behind bars right now for sponsoring earmarks and taking money for them.

Now, I'm not saying that that's occurring now, but that has in the past. And when we clearly haven't vetted these properly—and we don't do this body any service by cutting off debate on the House floor and saying we're just going to turn a blind eye because there might be a problem, and if we stand on the floor and debate these things, then people might see that there is a problem.

So it's good to have transparency rules. That's wonderful. But once you

do have transparency, you need accountability. And when you cut off debate and cut off amendments coming to the floor and bring appropriation bills under closed rules in violation of every tradition we've had in this House, then we've got a problem.

It is said that people outside of the beltway don't care about process, and that may be true. It's tough to make political points about process because it's tough to understand the process of this institution. But bad process always yields bad results and bad policy. It happened when we were in the majority, when we held votes open for 3 hours to allow leadership and others to twist arms. That violated every tradition of the House where you're supposed to only hold votes open for 15 minutes or slightly longer. There's a problem with that. People may not understand that outside, but it leads to bad results. And I would submit that if you shut down appropriation bills, if you shut down the process allowing Members to offer amendments on the floor and just turn a blind eye to what might be occurring, then you're going to have a problem, and you're going to increase the cynicism, rightfully, that people have about this institution.

I have served in the House of Representatives for 9 years. This is a wonderful institution, it really is; and we owe this body much more than we're giving it. And I would hope that the leadership here would exhibit maybe more of a vested interest in upholding the dignity of this institution instead of sweeping these things under the rug and saying let's just not have debate on the House floor because people might see what is occurring.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that, particularly when we get to the Defense bill later, where there are going to be hundreds and hundreds of earmarks that represent no-bid contracts to private companies, that we allow amendments to come to the floor to examine some of these instead of sweeping the process under the rug and hoping that nobody pays attention.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized in opposition.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Arizona has made some eloquent points this morning. And I certainly hope if he really wants to resolve this issue, he will join me in supporting the bill that is in the House right now on public financing. Since both he and I come from States, Arizona and Maine, that have had great success with this system in removing some of the corruption from the process, I think that we could make a good team on that issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that this point of order is not about unfunded mandates, as he mentioned—or, in fact,

even about earmarks. It's about delaying consideration of this bill and ultimately stopping it altogether.

□ 0930

Since I do come from the State of Maine, where nearly one-fifth of our residents are veterans or active-duty members of our armed services, I know that this bill we are about to talk about today is extremely important, and passing this rule to allow for consideration of this bill and move forward on these issues around access to health care, making sure our veterans get the benefits that they deserve, is extremely important to the residents of my State and certainly people across this country.

I hope my colleagues will see through this attempt and will vote "yes" so that we can consider this legislation on its merits and not stop it with a procedural motion. The last thing that people want to see happening in the House of Representatives is endless conversation about things that have nothing to do with the issues before us but not moving forward with the things that we care about.

Those who oppose this bill can vote against it on the final passage. We must consider this rule. We must pass this legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to consider this rule.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I will.

Mr. FLAKE. I appreciate that. I'm not going to call a vote on this. I'm not trying to delay the process. We're just given so little time to speak because we're not allowed to bring amendments to the floor that we have to take every opportunity that we can.

I appreciate your yielding.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to consider so that we can debate and pass this important legislation today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 622.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 622 provides for consideration of H.R. 3082, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2010, under a structured rule.

For the past 8 years, our country has been engaged in two conflicts halfway around the world. The number of wounded military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan has put a financial strain on the Department of Veterans Affairs. The Veterans Health Administration estimates that they will treat more than 6 million patients in 2010, including over 400,000 veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, the consistent training, deployment, and redeployment of our troops have put a significant burden on our military.

H.R. 3082 appropriates over \$133 billion in fiscal year 2010 for military construction, veterans programs, and four related agencies. The bill provides \$24.6 billion for construction and improvements to military bases, facilities, and housing units. The bill provides \$450 million to accelerate the modernization of trainee housing and \$2 billion to construct and maintain houses for military families.

The bill also provides \$200 million in additional funding for the Guard and Reserves to address critical unfunded requirements as a result of prolonged and repeated deployments. Maine is home to thousands of Guard and Reservists who have made an invaluable contribution to our national defense, and I am proud to see funding included in this bill for them.

H.R. 3082 also renews our commitment to redevelop closed military bases and their surrounding communities. The bill provides \$7.5 billion to implement the 2005 BRAC and \$537 million to address an enormous backlog of environmental cleanup projects from the previous BRAC rounds. This funding is essential to communities across the country, including the town of Brunswick in my district, which is already experiencing economic difficulties from the closing of Naval Air Station Brunswick.

While the investments in military construction are vital, they are only a small portion of this bill. More than 80 percent of the bill's funding in this legislation is devoted to veterans programs. The bill provides over \$108 billion for veterans' medical care, claims processors, and facility improvements. H.R. 3082 increases appropriations by 14 percent or \$12.9 billion over the current level. This bill includes \$45 billion for the Veterans Health Administration, with increased funding for mental health services, assistance programs for homeless veterans, and innovative services for veterans in rural areas.

The bill also provides \$85 million for States to build and renovate extended care facilities and \$3 billion to fund new technological initiatives which

will increase processing time and improve electronic record keeping.

Perhaps most importantly, the bill provides for a significant and historic change in the way we fund health care of our veterans. H.R. 3082 provides \$48.2 billion in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for the medical services, medical facilities, and medical administration accounts.

While the Congress has always taken on the challenges of this country, these issues have not always been shielded from partisan battles and political delays. This Congress in the past few weeks has been no exception, but there are some issues which should not be subject to politics and doubt. There is no doubt that the men and women of the armed services have bravely served our country. They have fought without question and without debate, and in doing so, they have sacrificed time with their families, risked their own well-being, and all too often they have sacrificed their lives. By providing advance appropriations for the health care of our veterans, we can take the steps to ensure that these benefits are not subject to politics as usual.

I strongly support this rule, which provides for consideration of this essential and important bill.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a structured rule, a structured appropriations rule, and also I am opposed to how my Democrat colleagues continue to shut out the minority voice with this structured rule.

Before taking control of the House of Representatives in 2007, our Democrat friends promised the American public that this would be the most open, honest, and most ethical Congress in history. Yet that is not the case for the past 2½ years. You heard my colleague, the gentleman Mr. FLAKE, talking about the process, the process that's happening not just today but has been happening for now 2½ years on this floor.

For the last few weeks, this Democrat majority has been forcing spending bills through the House of Representatives. My friends on the other side of the aisle have been using extremely restrictive rules to accomplish this legislative business.

During the Republican majority, the most appropriations bills considered under a restrictive rule in any single season was four, and that was back in 1997.

This majority has set a new record forcing every appropriations bill under a strict structured rule. So far the Democrat majority has limited debate on the six spending bills that the House has already passed, and today's bill is the seventh. Mr. Speaker, that is not open, honest, or ethical. Chairman OBEY set an arbitrary timeline to finish the fiscal year 2010 spending bills,

which has forced this Democrat-run Rules Committee to limit every single Republican and Democrat's chances to offer amendments on this floor. Hundreds of amendments have been offered by all of my colleagues, and they have been rejected also, rejected in an unprecedented fashion.

What the heck is the majority afraid of? Why don't they want to take the normal time, the normal process? Why won't they allow for an open and honest debate, the one that they called for?

Mr. Speaker, with that said, I would like to thank the majority in the Rules Committee for allowing at least my amendment to be made in order on the floor today. The care of our Nation's troops and veterans is extremely important to me and every single Member, I believe, of this body, and it's my hope that my amendment will pass on the House floor today. But, Mr. Speaker, every single Member should have had that opportunity. The opportunity to be able to come to this floor under an open rule to talk about the things that are important to them.

Today we are here to discuss the rule for the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act of 2010, and I note that my dear friend the young gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP, is the Republican lead on this bill. And I am very pleased with the work that not only Mr. WAMP has done but how he has led in such a way to make sure that the men and women of the military understand his dedication and devotion to this process.

It's my intent to discuss the importance of the underlying bill as well as some of the concerns in the legislation, and I would also like to highlight the Democrat majority's large increase in spending across the board for appropriations bills. This is unacceptable, especially in a time of huge deficits and exceptionally high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should aim for a balanced budget, not unlimited spending. I think this body should have to make tough decisions and set priorities, not set the bar so high, or in this case so low, for just spending so much money that we cannot and do not have to make tougher decisions.

This bill provides crucial funding needed for military construction and housing funding for our troops and their families and other quality-of-life projects, and the Congress should have to go through those projects one by one and make a determination about what is in the best interest not only for the country but also for our military.

I know that the funding priorities for all essential programs the Department of Veterans Affairs and related agencies have asked for in their budgets are important. And I also know that this bill honors our Nation's heroes who are serving in our volunteer military, those who have served, and also honors those who are fallen victims as well. This bill illustrates the deep commitment that Congress has to our military

and to our veterans. And I do recognize that the gentleman Mr. WAMP and the gentleman Mr. EDWARDS from Texas as they spoke to the Rules Committee yesterday not only told that story but also a source of pride about how this Congress needs to make sure that we're paying attention to those members of our military.

I join Ranking Member LEWIS in his concern regarding the ability for the VA, however, to effectively absorb large funding increases provided by this bill. The Appropriations Committee report was critical of the slow rate of the multibillion dollar major construction account for the VA, and points out that the spending rates are "woefully slow," having only spent \$1.9 billion of the \$4.4 billion that was appropriated between the fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2008. When you add fiscal year 2009 and this bill, that account then grows to \$6.5 billion. I believe that the current funding project should be exhausted before receiving additional moneys. Mr. LEWIS agreed also and so did all the Republicans on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today includes over a 15 percent increase from fiscal year 2009 spending, which assists with TRICARE, mortgage assistance, child care, and other necessary personnel-related accounts. Yet it is important to note that a couple weeks ago, Congress passed the Defense Authorization bill, increasing defense-related funding by only 4 percent. This Nation is at war, and my Democrat colleagues only modestly increased our defense and strategic capacities, while all other appropriations bills are increasing 10, 15, 19, and even 33 percent more than last year's levels. Mr. Speaker, this disparity sends a dangerous message to our enemies and one to our troops that are in the field.

To help curb some out-of-control Democrat spending, Ranking Member JERRY LEWIS offered an amendment in the full committee that would prioritize funding increases for defense, military construction, and our veterans by providing a 6 percent increase for these programs, a 4 percent increase for homeland security, and holding all other subcommittees to a very reasonable 2 percent increase.

□ 0945

Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated. Out of the 12 appropriations bills, this amendment would have reduced the burden on the American public by \$35 billion. The American people know that you shouldn't spend what you don't have, and that is exactly what this Democrat majority is doing and continues to do. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Obama administration is on its way to doubling the national debt in 5 years. In doing so, it would drive the debt-to-GDP ratio from 41 percent today to a staggering 71 percent in the near future, 2014.

The Congressional Budget Office on Wednesday of just this week released a

monthly budget review that states that the Federal budget deficit was \$1.1 trillion for the first 9 months of this fiscal year. CBO states that this is more than \$800 billion greater than the deficit record in June of 2008. The United States is looking at a record \$1.8 trillion deficit this year alone.

Congress should be promoting policies that reduce spending and grow job growth in this country. Unemployment continues to rise while our friends on the other side of the aisle continue to tax, borrow and spend their way into record deficits. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the unemployment benefits spending is now more than 2½ times what it was at this point last year. The current unemployment rate is over 9.5 percent for the first time since 1983.

Where are the jobs? It's a question that should continue to be asked on this floor. Where are the jobs that were promised from this economic stimulus from this President and our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time when the economy should be bouncing back. But this is a time when the Democrat Congress is forcing Americans to pay for a failed trillion dollar stimulus package, a bailout for those who defaulted on their mortgages, a bailout for those who abuse their credit cards, a bailout for credit and America's bad decisionmaking from corporate offices, a new national energy tax and a possible \$1.5 trillion health care reform package that will force 120 million Americans off their current health care coverage. When does the spending stop? Not today in this House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body understands the importance of adequate and appropriate funding for our Nation's military and our veterans, and we give thanks to them. This bill provides the necessary benefits to our service men and women, their families and our veterans, and I am proud of that. But I would continue to point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle that we cannot tax, spend and borrow our way out of this recession. This recession is a national crisis and puts all of us at risk.

Rising unemployment and record deficits cannot be remedied with massive increases in spending. Americans back home are tightening their belts, and the United States Congress would be well advised to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "no" vote on the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank Ms. PINGREE for the opportunity to speak on this rule, and I just want to thank my friends CHET EDWARDS and ZACH WAMP for their leadership and hard work in crafting this bill and their unfailing support of American servicemembers and veterans. With wars in Iraq and Afghanistan ongoing and an increasingly

high volume of men and women servicemembers returning home, funding their needs remains a top priority.

As much now as ever, Congress needs to be making critical investments in construction projects which support servicemembers, safety and quality of life at home and on the battlefield. We must also make good our promise to our soldiers returning home from war, by improving their health care facilities and services and by providing them with the best care possible. We also need to aid them in their transition to civilian life by fully funding the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Our veterans deserve a bill which honors their remarkable service in the protection of our country. That's what this bill does that we are going to hear here today. The bill increases funding for the Veterans Health Administration by \$4.4 billion over last year. This improves access to medical services for veterans for key programs in treating mental health issues, assistance for homeless veterans, and measures to improve access to health care for many veterans who live in rural areas such as those in Colorado.

The bill also expands funding for essential investments in information technology which speed processing of benefits, claims, and makes needed improvements in the accuracy and efficiency with the expanded use of electronic health records. I especially want to thank the Veterans' Committee, the Appropriations Committee in taking a good look and a hard look at processing claims, which for a long time were lagging and people were not getting their claims heard. There has been a tremendous effort and focus over the last couple of years to make the claims process much quicker, much faster, much more accurate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would also like to thank my friends for their assistance in creating what will be a state-of-the-art health care facility in Colorado.

The veterans in Colorado have been promised for years and years and years that they would get a facility that was equal to the service they gave to this country. And with the hard work of the committee, the hard work of the Colorado delegation, assistance from both sides of the aisle, we are going to get that facility built in Colorado.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished young gentleman from Miami, a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I want to thank my dear friend from Texas, a great leader in this House, Mr. SESSIONS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because this legislation that we are bringing to the floor today includes the last installment in a project that is very important to the

community that I represent. The Southern Command is in the congressional district that I represent, and it is receiving in this legislation \$55.4 million that completes the \$237 million required for the new headquarters of the Southern Command, which is extremely important to the national security of the Nation and of the hemisphere, the defense of the hemisphere, and obviously to the community that I am honored to represent.

SOUTHCOM personnel and supporting services have contributed over \$1.2 billion and over 20,000 jobs to south Florida, and south Florida is the right place for SOUTHCOM. And we have been, for many years, working to make sure that it stays in south Florida.

I want to thank Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP and really all of the members of the Florida delegation and others who have worked so hard in a united fashion to make this a reality, a permanent facility for SOUTHCOM.

It's in a location that is leased from the State of Florida for the great total of \$1 a year, long-term lease, \$1 a year. That's what it is going to be costing the taxpayer.

So I want to thank former Governor Bush, Jeb Bush, for his help, in making this a reality, as well as Governor Charlie Crist, who has also demonstrated great leadership in making this project a reality.

We have worked with the county. We have worked with Mayor Bermudez of the City of Doral. The City of Doral has been marvelous in its cooperation with the men and women of SOUTHCOM; so, too, General Craddock, with whom we began working on this important project; and then Admiral Stavridis, who has done a tremendous job as the head of SOUTHCOM, and now he is leaving us to go to Europe and defend that continent; and now General Fraser, who has joined SOUTHCOM as the new head. All of them have done a tremendous job, along with all of the men and women there at the Southern Command.

So I thank all who have had an important role in this development and wish the men and women of SOUTHCOM well as I congratulate them, because Congress has done its job in funding the new headquarters.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, and I thank Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP for their work in crafting this legislation.

As someone who represents tens of thousands of military veterans and their families, I believe that we have an obligation to provide them with the

benefits and treatment they deserve for their years of service. This legislation accomplishes that by providing \$109 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, a \$14.5 billion increase over 2009, when not factoring stimulus or supplemental funding.

It is estimated that the VA will treat more than 6.1 million patients in 2010, including more than 419,000 veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. To meet this demand, the bill provides important funding for mental health programs, assistance to homeless veterans, and to improve access for veterans in rural areas.

The bill also provides vital funding to hire additional claims processors to support the Department's continued efforts to reduce the backlog of benefits claims. I believe these are two of the most important issues that we deal with, making sure that we deal with the PTSD issues which continue to be a significant problem and also to make sure that we have the services available to provide for the large number of wounded veterans who are coming back from our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I was also pleased to see that the committee included a provision to provide advanced budget authority and funding for fiscal year 2011 for medical-related accounts. This is a step to ensure that the VA health care system continues to receive a timely and predictable stream of funding without subjecting it to the delays that can arise due to the larger annual budget debates.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this important legislation and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of members of the Republican conference who want to come down and speak about this bill, but we are joined today by the gentleman, from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I stand to strongly oppose this rule on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act of 2010.

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable, what the Democrat majority is doing regarding these appropriations bills. I think this is about the fourth or fifth appropriation bill that we brought to the floor with a structured rule, and this has never happened, to my knowledge, in the history of this Congress.

These should be open rules so that every Member, not just members of the Appropriations Committee, the 40 or 50 members that study these bills, but every single Member of this body who represent 675,000 people across this country and these 50 States should have an opportunity to offer amendments.

I have offered 10 amendments to these five bills. Not one, not one, Mr. Speaker, has been made in order, and not one of these amendments are dilatory.

As an example, on this particular bill, the Veterans Administration Appropriation, I have an amendment that says no party, no Republican or Democratic majority should hold that bill hostage once it passes to put it in the form of a minibus, combine it with some other legislation to pass something that we don't want to pass, and hold our veterans hostage so that they don't get the pay raise they need, they don't get the benefits they need, they don't get the health care they need.

That, Mr. Speaker, is unconscionable.

□ 1000

For that reason I stand strongly opposed to this rule. The rule should be open, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows that, and I challenge him to bring these bills to the floor in an open fashion, which we have always done on both sides of the aisle.

It is time to end this mendacity and this unconscionable activity. Let's all vote against this rule. Let's send it back. Let's bring forward an open rule and a fair process so that veterans in every congressional district across these 50 States will have an opportunity to be heard.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I'm very pleased to yield 5 minutes of my time to the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for the time. I would like to respond to the fiction that I just heard from the previous speaker. The previous speaker indicated that never in the history of the Congress have we had structured rules for appropriation bills. I would like to suggest that he ought to read a little history.

We have 12 appropriations bills we have to bring to the floor each year. He will find that during the Republican control of this House, at least 6 of the 12 bills were brought to this floor under structured rules. He will find that almost 20 times that is the case.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No, I would not. I have 5 minutes. You attacked me. I will respond without interruption. I would ask the Chair to prevent further interruptions.

The fact is that I would like to ask the House a question: Why is it that some Members of this House believe that the Appropriations Committee must bring bills to the floor that are totally open when the Ways and Means Committee, when it brings tax bills to the floor, is entitled to have a totally closed rule?

Now, there is no inherent difference between the two, but there is one historical difference, and that is that the Ways and Means Committee used to be the committee that handed out committee assignments to Members of the House. And so the message went out: "Don't mess with the Ways and Means

Committee because they determine your career path in this institution."

There is no great historical or moral or substantive reason to have that differentiation. It is simply a question of power relationships in the House that determined that.

I would also like to point out the Appropriations Committee has the right to bring to the floor its appropriation bills without ever going to the Rules Committee, and in fact we have had subcommittee Chairs who have done that. The advantage to the Appropriations Committee in doing that is that when the bills come to the floor without going to the Rules Committee, what happens is that any legislation on an appropriation bill—which under the House Rules is off limits—any legislation will be stricken on a point of order.

I remember when Neal Smith used to bring his bill to the floor, and within about 20 minutes the bill was shredded. There were a few paragraphs left in the bill. It took about an hour to finish the bill and then Neal could go off and have a conference with the Senate and do anything he wanted to do because there were no limitations.

So it has been an advantage to individual House Members for the Appropriations Committee to go to the Rules Committee, whether or not there's a totally open rule or whether there's a structured rule, because at least then individual Members have some capacity to influence the results.

Now, we have made quite clear to the minority side we would like to proceed in as open a fashion as possible. Mr. HOYER, the majority leader, and I went to the Republican leadership weeks and weeks ago and asked them if there was some way that we could work out time agreements so that we can finish these 12 bills before we go home for the August recess.

The minority says they want us to do all of these bills individually. Not wrap them up in a CR. But then they proceeded to demand a procedure which will, in the end, result in bills going into a CR.

And so we asked the minority leadership, "Will you agree to time limits?" And the response was, "Well, if we did that, our caucus would elect somebody else."

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. No, I will not yield. We asked the leadership, "Would you be willing to go by a process in which we'll give you the opportunity to offer 10 or 15 amendments, the majority party will offer 5 or 6? You pick the amendments." And they said, "No." They didn't want to do that.

There are a limited number of hours between now and the time we recess. If we want to get our work done, we have to limit the debate time that we spend on these bills.

So there is nothing radically new about this. We're simply trying to get the job done. And we're going to do that if it takes all summer.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted today to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished young gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I'm happy to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations. I'll look forward enthusiastically to yielding to him after I make a couple of points.

First, the gentleman has ended his remarks by talking about the need for some kind of outside time limit. In fact, just yesterday I pulled out of my coat pocket the schedule that we have seen. We all understand that getting the appropriations work done is important. It's a priority for Democrats and Republicans alike.

The fact of the matter is the Rules Committee, with a great deal of ease, could in fact simply report out a special rule which would establish an outside time limit on the amendment process at all and we could proceed, as has been the case for the last 220 years, with an open amendment process.

Now my friend also referred to the fact, and I know that my friend from Marietta didn't say that it was unprecedented to have unstructured rules when we deal with appropriations bills, but it is unusual.

And I will remind my friend who talked about the history that back in 1997, when we did in fact have five appropriations bills considered under structured rules, it was done so after, in the case of one, it came to the floor. As our late colleague, the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Natcher, used to always say, bills should be considered as privileged.

The disparity between a measure emerging from the Ways and Means Committee and the privileged structure for consideration of appropriations bills is something that is very easily understood in the rules of the House of Representatives.

And so I'd be happy to yield to my friend if he would like to respond to the notion of the fact that we began those measures that ultimately were considered under structured rules, we began them, one, under a privileged structure, which meant that the Rules Committee did not even need to act because points of order could be raised against the work product of the measure itself and also to the point of time limits.

The Rules Committee could easily report out a rule that would establish an outside time limit. That's all we'd need to do. And then we could consider the measure under an open amendment process.

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say to the gentleman, I don't see any need to continue chewing this cud over and over and over again. We've made our points.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time.

Mr. OBEY. I didn't ask for the time. You offered it to me and I'm accepting it.

Mr. DREIER. I would simply say to my friend, I was downstairs in the meeting and my friend stood up and began talking about the fact that we considered measures under structured rules in the past, and it's frankly important for us in the name of Democrats and Republicans alike who are denied amendments and the American people whose Representatives are not able to participate in the very important constitutional article I section 9 responsibility of appropriations here. That's why there is in fact bipartisan concern on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to a young man who serves as coach of our baseball team, but perhaps even better than that, just showing his acumen really as an all-American, a dedicated veteran of the first gulf war and served as a colonel in the United States Army Reserves and he's the ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. I rise today in opposition to this rule because H.R. 3082 represents a dramatic shift in the way that we provide funding for VA medical care by providing advance appropriations for medical services, medical facilities, and medical supports and compliance accounts.

Now I have some great concerns because the stress placed on the budget model could place us in the VA supplemental business. It also leaves out the IT and medical research accounts.

So my amendment that was not made in order under this rule tried to correct what I viewed as a flawed process. The amendment would have added the VA information technology systems and the VA medical and prosthetic research accounts to the other VA medical care accounts that are included in the advance appropriations section.

Now many issues were raised about the potential legislative proposals that authorize advance appropriations for certain Veterans Health Administration accounts at the Committee on Veterans Affairs' oversight hearing on the future funding of the VA, including the following: funding some accounts under an advanced appropriation and some accounts under regular fiscal appropriation could potentially create accounting complexities.

Secretary Shinseki expressed concern that the VA's information technology is very much integrated into the medical care accounts and should be considered for advance appropriation.

The Congressional Research Service observed that not including IT in advance appropriations could "create a situation whereby, for example, VHA could not purchase computer software although it has procured medical equipment that needs the IT software," or would not be able to provide the nec-

essary IT infrastructure for new Community-Based Outpatient Clinics.

CRS also pointed out the failure to include medical and prosthetic research could potentially raise an issue with regard to the timing of funding research projects and research support such as personnel costs and administrative support.

When I offered a similar amendment at the full committee markup of H.R. 1016, as amended, which is the bill that authorized the advanced appropriations proposal, it received broad bipartisan support and passed the Veterans' Affairs authorizing committee 17-8.

Since the language of my amendment was also part of the final version of the bill when it passed the House, all I was trying to do was bring consistency between H.R. 1016, as amended, and the bill before us today.

Every member of the Rules Committee voted in favor of H.R. 1016, so I'm disappointed to see that the very same provision was not made in order. The American people—in particular, our veterans—deserve a fair and open process of debate on this issue, and it's unfortunate that this opportunity has been blocked by the Rules Committee for partisan reasons.

Since open debate on this issue was disallowed, it's my hope to continue to work with Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP to include these accounts in next year's budget resolution and then in the 2011 appropriations bill. That's the only choice that I now have.

So I will attempt to work with you if you want to work with me. What I've learned around this place is bipartisanship is a choice. It's a choice. And I have been here now for 17 years and I've listened to Chairman OBEY not only in the majority, in the minority, and now back in the majority, and being consistent—to my good friend—is really important.

So if you can remember what you were like in the minority, be consistent to how you're like in the majority. And that's how you endure respect from all of us. And that's just my good counsel to my good friend.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I rise today in support of H.R. 3082, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriation Act for fiscal year 2010, and the rule. I'd like to thank Chairman EDWARDS of the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs Appropriation Committee as well as Chairman OBEY for their hard work and as well the dedicated work of their staff in bringing this bill before us.

This legislation truly reflects our commitment to improving the quality of life for our service men and women as well as our veterans, who have given so much to defend the freedoms that we enjoy every day.

□ 1015

In the midst of an economic crisis and a war on two fronts, fully funding the Veterans Affairs bill is critical to our country's ability to address the needs of our veterans and our military families. This bill authorizes funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs to fund a number of worthy projects, such as building housing for our troops, mental health services and grants for the construction of extended care facilities and veterans' cemeteries.

As a Coloradan, I am particularly pleased to see that the Fitzsimons Veterans Affairs Hospital in Aurora, Colorado, will receive \$119 million as part of the Military Construction bill. It is absolutely crucial for the State of Colorado and for the veterans in my district to have access to quality care close to their homes.

I am very grateful to Secretary Shinseki and his staff, who invited those of us from the Colorado delegation to the Department of Veterans Affairs to make this announcement last month. They have truly recognized the urgency of completing a project that has been torn by uncertainty and going back to the drawing board for many, many years and finally moved forward in funding this Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Act. This bill will help ensure that the Obama administration continues to move quickly forward. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and vote "yes" on final passage of H.R. 3082.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnetonka, Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. As Congress moves forward in the debate on health care, we should ensure that any national health care reform plan preserves the unique needs of our veterans and servicemembers as well as protects the unique identity and role of the successful programs and insurance that they depend on. If we subject these benefits to new taxation or if we foolishly fold them into a large government-run program, the quality and the availability of care for our Nation's veterans will suffer, and an erosion of the quality of these benefits could undermine recruiting, retention and, ultimately, national security.

I had hoped today to offer an amendment to make sure that any new health care program would not undercut the services currently available for our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately I was not allowed to do so today because of the closed rule. It is frustrating when good ideas cannot move forward.

Mr. Speaker, the servicemembers and veterans in our country who have served our Nation have unique health care needs that we fulfill through specific mechanisms, such as the VA, TRICARE and others. These entities are essential to ensuring that we meet our Nation's obligations to those who serve in uniform and that we do so in a

most personal and effective way. Military health benefits provide specific needed coverage that recognizes the extraordinary sacrifices that are inherent to those who serve in our military. Similarly, there are unique and specialized VA programs that recognize the government responsibilities to those who incur injuries and illness as a result of their service. Moreover, specific services and programs for families of those who have served help ensure that our grateful Nation gives back to those who have sacrificed so much for all of us. It's too bad that we are unable to move forward on my amendment because it would have recognized and protected the government's special responsibilities to our servicemembers and veterans in any health care package moving through Congress.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am the last speaker on my side, so I'm going to reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman closes for his side.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are down on the floor today talking a lot about process. But I think it's real interesting that two of our newest Members, who are from Colorado and Maine, have never even seen an open rule. They've only served for 6 months, but they could have served for almost 2 years and never would have seen an open rule on this floor. And that's really the measure of what Republicans are trying to talk about. We're teaching our newest Members what things should not look like. We need open rules.

As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow for an open rule because that's the way we should teach, especially new Members, that open rules should be a part of regular process. There's no question that the rule the majority brings forth today will only cement the dangerous precedent that the majority has been setting now for over 2 years. It will only damage bipartisanship, and it harms us in our committees. It's a part of most conversations in committees about what this Speaker is doing.

I urge my colleagues to consider what we're about to do and to vote "no" to say no to this so we can allow free and open debate on appropriations bills and uphold the rights of millions of Americans—and not just for Republicans but for Democrats also because they are also being shut out by their own party. This is not open; it's not honest; and I believe the majority will come to regret this decision to close down this deliberative process here on the floor during appropriations sessions.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for listening to Republicans today. We believe it's not just our right but the right thing to do to come and speak forthrightly about our ideas about members of the military, about VA hospitals that are in our districts and about Veterans Affairs Centers that need to operate in a more efficient way. We're proud of the men and women who serve our military. I was proud today to have the gentleman, Mr. BUYER, a Gulf War veteran, come and speak forthrightly about what we think ought to happen. We're proud of this country. We're proud of our military. But we think we also ought to make more deliberate decisions in this House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out as we're closing that there has been a tremendous amount of conversation on the floor today about the open rule, about the process here. And I want to point out to the Members that even under an open rule, nearly two-thirds of the amendments that were submitted to the Rules Committee were in violation of House rules and would have been subject to points of order. They wouldn't have been able to proceed on the House floor. In fact, the majority of amendments you have heard about this morning from my good friend from Minnesota, from my colleague from Georgia, those are amendments that would have been in violation of House rules, would have been subject to a point of order. And while they made good points about why they wanted to have their amendments moved forward, the fact is, that wouldn't have happened today anyway, even if we had been under an open rule.

Let me say one last thing. My colleague from Texas mentioned that a few of us who are new here, who haven't been through the appropriations process under open rules—and I will say as a new Member of this body, most of the bills that come to the floor come under structured rules. There may have been a tradition in the past of appropriations bills coming under more of an open rule, but I balance that with the remarks of our colleague from the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, who talked to us this morning about the tremendous amount of work we're expected to get done. I can tell you, from my constituents back in the State of Maine, they say to me, you know, you've got a lot of work to do on renewable energy, on health care. We want to see you move forward on those issues. We want to see appropriations bills, like the one we're talking about today, that are going to provide vital services for our veterans. We want to see those get done. We want to see the Members of Congress get their work done. We don't want to listen to you with hours of endless debate, par-

ticularly on things that would be subject to points of order and wouldn't even be allowed to be discussed. We want to see you get your work done.

As a very proud member of the Rules Committee, I have the opportunity to listen to a tremendous number of the amendments that come before us; and I feel very good about the way we're moving forward with our work and about the challenges that we are facing for the American public and all that is before us and the importance of getting our work done.

I do want to remind us today that in spite of all the other conversation that has gone on, this particular rule is a vital step forward towards improving our military infrastructure and ensuring the quality care of our veterans and their families, making sure it is worthy of their sacrifice. That is why we are here on the floor this morning to talk about our veterans, to talk about military construction, to talk about making sure that we are there for them.

My home State of Maine has one of the highest populations of veterans in the country. In a State of not even 2 million people, Maine is home to over 155,000 veterans, nearly one-fifth of our population. These men and women have served without question, without politics and certainly without delay. We must make a promise to them and to all of our veterans that we will do the same. We must provide them with health care and the benefits they deserve without question, without politics and without delay. Passing H.R. 3082, we will begin to keep that promise. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 662 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

Strike the resolved clause and all that follows and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the house resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises

and reports the bill back to the house with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution—The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information form Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time,

and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 174, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—244

Abercrombie	Fattah	McDermott
Ackerman	Filner	McGovern
Adler (NJ)	Foster	McIntyre
Altmire	Frank (MA)	McMahon
Andrews	Giffords	McNerney
Arcuri	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Baca	Gordon (TN)	Meeks (NY)
Baird	Grayson	Michaud
Baldwin	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Barrow	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bean	Griffith	Mitchell
Becerra	Grijalva	Mollohan
Berkley	Gutierrez	Moore (WI)
Berman	Hall (NY)	Moran (VA)
Berry	Halvorson	Murphy (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Hare	Murphy (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Harman	Murtha
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Nadler (NY)
Bocchieri	Heinrich	Napolitano
Boren	Hereth Sandlin	Neal (MA)
Boswell	Higgins	Nye
Boyd	Himes	Oberstar
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Obey
Bralley (IA)	Hinojosa	Olver
Bright	Hirono	Ortiz
Brown, Corrine	Hodes	Pallone
Butterfield	Holden	Pascarell
Capps	Holt	Pastor (AZ)
Capuano	Honda	Payne
Cardoza	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Carnahan	Inslee	Perriello
Carney	Israel	Peters
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Castor (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pingree (ME)
Chandler	(TX)	Polis (CO)
Childers	Johnson (GA)	Pomeroy
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Clay	Kagen	Quigley
Cleaver	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rangel
Cohen	Kennedy	Reyes
Connolly (VA)	Kildee	Richardson
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rodriguez
Cooper	Kilroy	Ross
Costa	Kind	Rothman (NJ)
Costello	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kosmas	Rush
Cuellar	Kratovil	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kucinich	Salazar
Dahlkemper	Langevin	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Davis (TN)	Levin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schauer
DeGette	Lipinski	Schiff
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Schrader
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz
Dingell	Lowe y	Scott (GA)
Doggett	Lujan	Scott (VA)
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Serrano
Doyle	Maffei	Sestak
Driehaus	Maloney	Shea-Porter
Edwards (MD)	Markey (CO)	Sherman
Edwards (TX)	Markey (MA)	Sires
Ellison	Marshall	Skelton
Ellsworth	Massa	Slaughter
Engel	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	Matsui	Snyder
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Space
Farr	McCollum	Speier

Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus

Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—174

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Moore (KS)
Akin	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Austria	Gerlach	Myrick
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gohmert	Nunes
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Olson
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Paulsen
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Pence
Bilbray	Harper	Petri
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Blackburn	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Herger	Posey
Boehner	Hill	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hunter	Putnam
Bono Mack	Inglis	Radanovich
Boozman	Issa	Rehberg
Boustany	Jenkins	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	King (IA)	Rooney
Buchanan	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Kingston	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Kirk	Royce
Buyer	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Lamborn	Scalise
Camp	Lance	Schmidt
Campbell	Latham	Schock
Cantor	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Cao	Latta	Sessions
Capito	Lee (NY)	Shadegg
Carter	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Cassidy	Linder	Shuler
Castle	LoBiondo	Shuster
Chaffetz	Lucas	Simpson
Coble	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Coffman (CO)	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Conaway	E.	Souder
Crenshaw	Mack	Stearns
Culberson	Manzullo	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Marchant	Terry
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Dent	McCauley	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	McClintock	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Tiberi
Dreier	McHenry	Turner
Duncan	McHugh	Upton
Ehlers	McKeon	Walden
Emerson	McMorris	Wamp
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Flake	Melancon	Whitfield
Fleming	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Fox	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Minnick	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Barrett (SC)	Granger	Murphy, Patrick
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Paul
Boucher	Heller	Platts
Delahunt	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Fudge	Klein (FL)	

□ 1050

Mr. SIREs changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 526, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—241

Abercrombie Griffith Nye
Ackerman Grijalva Oberstar
Adler (NJ) Gutierrez Obey
Altmire Hall (NY) Oliver
Andrews Halvorson Ortiz
Arcuri Hare Pallone
Baca Harman Pascarell
Baird Hastings (FL) Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin Heinrich Payne
Barrow Herseth Sandlin Perlmutter
Bean Higgins Perriello
Becerra Himes Peters
Berkley Hinchev Peterson
Berman Hinojosa Pingree (ME)
Berry Hirono Polis (CO)
Bishop (GA) Hodes Pomeroy
Bishop (NY) Holden Price (NC)
Blumenauer Holt Raigley
Bocchieri Honda Rahall
Boren Hoyer Reyes
Boswell Inslee Richardson
Boucher Israel Rodriguez
Boyd Jackson (IL) Ross
Brady (PA) Jackson-Lee Rothman (NJ)
Braley (IA) (TX) Cole
Brown, Corrine Johnson (GA) Roybal-Allard
Butterfield Johnson, E. B. Ruppersberger
Capps Kagen Ryan (OH)
Capuano Kanjorski Salazar
Cardoza Kaptur Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan Kennedy T.
Carney Kildee Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN) Kilpatrick (MI) Sarbanes
Castor (FL) Kilroy Schakowsky
Chandler Kind Schauer
Childers Kirkpatrick (AZ) Schiff
Clarke Kissell Schrader
Clay Kosmas Schwartz
Cleaver Kratovil Scott (GA)
Clyburn Kucinich Scott (VA)
Cohen Langevin Serrano
Connolly (VA) Larsen (WA) Fortenberry
Conyers Larson (CT) Foxx
Cooper Lee (CA) Sherman
Costa Levin Sires
Costello Lewis (GA) Skelton
Courtney Lipinski Slaughter
Crowley Loeb sack Smith (WA)
Cueellar Lofgren, Zoe Space
Cummings Lowey Speier
Dahlkemper Luján Spratt
Davis (AL) Lynch Stark
Davis (CA) Maffei Stupak
Davis (IL) Maloney Sutton
Davis (TN) Markey (CO) Tanner
DeFazio Markey (MA) Taylor
DeGette Marshall Teague
Delahunt Massa Thompson (CA)
DeLauro Matheson Thompson (MS)
Dicks Matsui Tierney
Dingell McCarthy (NY) Titus
Doggett McCollum Tonko
Donnelly (IN) McDermott Towns
Doyle McGovern Tsongas
Driehaus McIntyre Van Hollen
Edwards (MD) McMahan Velázquez
Edwards (TX) McNeerney Velásquez
Ellison Meek (FL) Vislosky
Ellsworth Meeks (NY) Walz
Engel Michaud Wasserman
Eshoo Miller (NC) Schultz
Etheridge Miller, George Waters
Fattah Minnick Watson
Filner Mitchell Watt
Foster Mollohan Waxman
Frank (MA) Moore (WI) Weiner
Giffords Moran (VA) Welch
Gonzalez Murphy (CT) Waxler
Gordon (TN) Murtha Wilson (OH)
Grayson Nadler (NY) Woolsey
Green, Al Napolitano Wu
Green, Gene Neal (MA) Yarmuth

NOES—179

Aderholt Gallegly Myrick
Akin Garrett (NJ) Neugebauer
Alexander Gerlach Nunes
Austria Gingrey (GA) Olson
Bachmann Gohmert Paulsen
Bachus Goodlatte Pence
Bartlett Guthrie Petri
Barton (TX) Hall (TX) Pitts
Biggart Harper Platts
Bilbray Hastings (WA) Poe (TX)
Bilirakis Hensarling Posey
Bishop (UT) Herger Price (GA)
Blackburn Hill Putnam
Blunt Hunter Radanovich
Boehner Inglis Rehberg
Bonner Issa Reichert
Bono Mack Jenkins Roe (TN)
Boozman Johnson (IL) Rogers (AL)
Boustany Johnson, Sam Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX) Jones Rogers (MI)
Bright Jordan (OH) Rohrabacher
Broun (GA) King (IA) Rooney
Brown (SC) King (NY) Ros-Lehtinen
Brown-Waite, Kingston Roskam
Ginny Kirk Royce
Buchanan Kline (MN) Rush
Burgess Lamborn Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN) Lance Scalise
Calvert Latham Schmidt
Camp LaTourette Schock
Campbell Latta Sensenbrenner
Cantor Lee (NY) Sessions
Cao Lewis (CA) Shadegg
Capito Linder Shimkus
Carter LoBiondo Shuler
Cassidy Lucas Shuster
Castle Luetkemeyer Simpson
Chaffetz Lummis Smith (NE)
Coble Lungren, Daniel Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO) E. Smith (TX)
Cole Mack Smith (TX)
Conaway Manzullo Snyder
Crenshaw Marchant Souder
Culberson McCarthy (CA) Stearns
Davis (KY) McCaul Sullivan
Deal (GA) McClintock Terry
Dent McCotter Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L. McHenry Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M. McHugh Tiahrt
Dreier McKeon Tiberi
Duncan McMorris Turner
Ehlers Rodgers Upton
Emerson Melancon Walden
Fallin Mica Wamp
Flake Miller (FL) Westmoreland
Fleming Miller (MI) Whitfield
Forbes Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry Moore (KS) Wittman
Foxx Moran (KS) Wolf
Franks (AZ) Murphy (NY) Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen Murphy, Tim Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Barrett (SC) Granger Klein (FL)
Buyer Graves Murphy, Patrick
Farr Heller Paul
Fudge Hoekstra Rangel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1058

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 527, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extra-neous material on H.R. 3082.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 622 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3082.

□ 1058

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, with Ms. BALDWIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1100

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, Members, on behalf of America's service men and women, our veterans, and their families, it is a privilege for me to present the Fiscal Year 2010 Military Construction/Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill.

I believe this bill and the work we have done since January of 2007 is work that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, can be very proud of. In this time of war, we have continued our tradition of a bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill, a bill that honors in a meaningful way the service and sacrifice of our service men and women, our veterans, and their families.

In the past 2½ years, along with the passage of this bill, the Congress will have increased veterans health care and benefits funding by 58 percent. That is unprecedented in the history of this country, and I believe our veterans and their families have earned every dime of that funding.

In addition, we have a new 21st-century GI Education bill. And, recently, President Obama signed into law a provision amending that bill that will provide a college scholarship to every child who has lost a mother or father in military service to our country since September 11, 2001.

In 2½ years, this Congress will have done a number of things on behalf of our veterans and troops, including adding 8,300 VA processors to reduce the

unconscionable backlog that veterans are having to stand in order to receive their earned benefits.

We will have provided funding for an additional 115 VA community-based outpatient clinics, and this bill adds 30 more. We will have provided an additional 42 vet centers, and this bill adds 28 more.

We have allowed the Veterans Health Administration to hire an additional 2,657 doctors, 11,509 nurses, and other critical additional staff. We will increase the travel reimbursement rate, the per-mileage reimbursement rate for veterans having to travel, in some cases, hundreds of miles to VA hospitals—which has not been increased since 1979—we will increase that from 11 cents per mile to 41.5 cents per mile. To many in America, that extra 30 cents may not sound like much. To many of America's finest, our veterans, it's the difference between them being able to afford to drive to get the VA health care they need and deserve, or not.

Our increased funding for veterans in this bill and over the past 2½ years means our veterans have better access to health care they need and deserve and have earned. It means improved access to health care for veterans in rural areas. And it means the opening of the doors of our VA hospitals and clinics to many middle- and low-income veterans that have not been allowed the opportunity that they've earned through their military service. Additionally, these resources ensure that our veterans will have shorter waiting times for doctor appointments.

We have also worked hard to make sure that our service men and women know that Congress deeply respects the sacrifices that they and the unsung heroes of America's defense—their families—have made each and every day to keep our Nation safe. We've heard time and again in testimony that the best support we can give our military when they're deployed overseas is the knowledge that their families are cared for here at home. We have listened to that voice and have tried to fund a number of key initiatives for our troops.

For example, in the past year, this subcommittee will have added \$2.8 billion for new military hospitals so that our service men and women know that their families will get the best possible health care in high-quality facilities while they are serving overseas. We've added \$1 billion for new child care centers to serve 20,000 additional military children, and \$570 million in additional funding for barracks because Congress needs to show our volunteer forces from day one that we appreciate their decision to serve.

The Subcommittee for Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs did not accomplish this alone. There are several key leaders that worked tirelessly behind the scenes to support these efforts. I want to especially commend Speaker PELOSI, who promised over 3 years ago that if she became Speaker

she would make supporting our veterans and their families one of Congress' highest priorities. Speaker PELOSI has kept that promise to those who have kept their promise to serve our Nation, and I salute her for that.

I want to salute Chairman OBEY, another one of the unsung heroes in supporting America's veterans, our military, the service men and women, and their families. While Mr. WAMP and I, as ranking member and chairman of the subcommittee, have often been out front on this, Chairman OBEY has provided the allocations, the unprecedented historic increased allocations for our subcommittee that has allowed us to accomplish many of the goals and achievements that I have mentioned in the last few minutes.

In particular, above all other things that he has done, I want to thank Chairman OBEY for providing a green light and encouraging and supporting and facilitating a historic initiative in this bill, which is, for the first time ever we will provide forward funding for veterans health care funding. That would not have happened without Mr. OBEY's support.

In addition, Chairman SPRATT—not a member of our subcommittee, but the chairman of the House Budget Committee—has played a key role, along with Chairman FILNER, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

And, finally, but absolutely not least, I want to thank my colleague, my friend, and the ranking member of this committee, Mr. WAMP of Tennessee. He has been a partner and a leader at every step of the way in supporting our troops and our veterans and their families. His commitment to our military and our veterans is deep, is genuine, and he puts it to work every day by working hard on their behalf. I want to thank him for his vital role in not only shaping this bill, but our bill last year as well.

Madam Chair, let me try to focus, rather than on a long list of numbers, on some of the major initiatives in this bill.

As I referenced, for the first time in history we provide an advanced appropriation for VA medical care. This will allow the VA to invest taxpayer dollars more efficiently and more effectively. And I want to thank Mr. OBEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WAMP and Speaker PELOSI for making this possible. I want to salute America's veteran service organizations, leaders of our veterans organizations who have made this one of their highest priorities.

Second, we provide \$450 million to build new troop housing for Army trainees, over 60,000 of whom are presently living in barracks that don't even meet minimum DOD standards. You know, 18- and 19-year-old military recruits don't have many lobbyists running around Capitol Hill on their behalf, but they deserve our Nation's respect and support for their decision to serve in the military.

Third, we provide \$200 million for the Guard and Reserve Construction Initia-

tive, recognizing the vital role these troops are playing in Iraq and Afghanistan and in our Nation's defense. And particularly, in addition to his other efforts, I want to thank Mr. WAMP for taking a leadership role on this Guard and Reserve Initiative.

Fourth, this bill begins a process of funding our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through the regular appropriations process, and we include \$1.4 billion for vital military construction to support our troops in Afghanistan.

Fifth, recognizing that the mental wounds of war can sometimes be as painful and long lasting as the physical wounds of war, we provide \$4.6 billion for the VA to continue its improvements in PTSD and mental health care for America's vets.

Six, this bill includes funding for the 1,200 new claims processors to reduce the backlog of veterans receiving the benefits they've earned.

Seven, this bill also continues to open up, as I referenced briefly, VA medical care to more middle- and low-income veterans, many of whom have been locked out since a cap was placed on income thresholds back in 2003.

Finally, and this is important, we want to ensure that the historic increases for VA health care and benefits, that those dollars are spent wisely. And I know Mr. WAMP and I share a strong commitment to this; we want to see that every dime of that is spent for the highest priority needs of our veterans, so together we supported increasing the VA Office of Inspector General by \$19.2 million. And we have every intention, through our subcommittee, of exercising increased oversight of the VA to see that these tax dollars are spent effectively and efficiently.

Just a few basic numbers: overall, this bill totals \$77.9 billion in discretionary funding for fiscal year 2010. This is \$239 million above President Obama's request and \$5 billion more than fiscal year 2009. The bill will include \$48.2 billion in fiscal year 2011 advanced funding for VA medical services, medical support and compliance, and medical facilities, an 8.3 percent increase over the historic funding level of 2010.

In military construction, family housing, and BRAC, the bill provides \$24.6 billion and fully funds BRAC 05 at \$7.5 billion. For the VA in fiscal year 2010, the bill provides \$53 billion in discretionary funding. This is \$5.4 billion above the 2009 funding and matches President Obama's VA request, which I should point out was the largest increase requested by any President in over three decades. The fiscal year 2010 increase for the Veterans Health Administration is \$4.4 billion, which is 11 percent over fiscal year 2009.

Finally, I want to thank the people who work every day—in fact, day and night—behind the scenes without public applause for our veterans and our troops and their families. These are the people who make up the staff of the

Military Construction and VA Appropriations Subcommittee, and I want to thank them by name: the minority staff, led by Martin Delgado, Liz Dawson and Kelly Shea, and Erin Fogelman and Juan Alvarez from Mr. WAMP's staff. The majority staff: led by my subcommittee clerk Carol Murphy,

Tim Peterson, Mary Arnold, Walter Hearne, and Donna Shahbaz, and Lindsey Davis on my staff.

I would also like to add a special thanks to John Conger, who has recently left my staff to work for the military as an employee of the Pentagon. All of these people have helped

continue the long, proud tradition and legacy of this subcommittee to work on a bipartisan—frankly, a non-partisan—basis, always putting our troops and veterans first. And as I say that, I once again thank our ranking member for always fighting and putting first our troops and our veterans.

Military Construction - Veterans Affairs - and Related Agencies Appropriations Act - FY 2010 (H.R. 3082)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Military construction, Army.....	4,692,648	3,660,779	3,630,422	-1,062,226	-30,357
Rescission.....	-51,320	---	-59,500	-8,180	-59,500
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	180,000	---	---	-180,000	---
Overseas contingency operations.....	---	923,884	924,484	+924,484	+600
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	1,182,989	---	---	-1,182,989	---
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32) (emergency).....	143,242	---	---	-143,242	---
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32) (rescission) (emergency).....	-143,242	---	---	+143,242	---
Total.....	6,004,317	4,584,663	4,495,406	-1,508,911	-89,257
Military construction, Navy and Marine Corps.....	3,333,369	3,763,264	3,757,330	+423,961	-5,934
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	280,000	---	---	-280,000	---
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	235,881	---	---	-235,881	---
Total.....	3,849,250	3,763,264	3,757,330	-91,920	-5,934
Military construction, Air Force.....	1,117,746	1,145,434	1,359,171	+241,425	+213,737
Rescission.....	-20,821	---	---	+20,821	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	180,000	---	---	-180,000	---
Overseas contingency operations.....	---	474,500	474,500	+474,500	---
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	281,620	---	---	-281,620	---
Total.....	1,558,545	1,619,934	1,833,671	+275,126	+213,737
Military construction, Defense-Wide.....	1,695,204	3,097,526	2,743,526	+1,048,322	-354,000
Rescission.....	-3,589	---	-25,800	-22,211	-25,800
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	1,450,000	---	---	-1,450,000	---
Overseas contingency operations.....	---	6,600	---	---	-6,600
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	661,552	---	---	-661,552	---
Total.....	3,803,167	3,104,126	2,717,726	-1,085,441	-386,400
===== Total, Active components.....	15,215,279	13,071,987	12,804,133	-2,411,146	-267,854
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	736,317	426,491	529,129	-207,188	+102,638
Rescission.....	-1,400	---	---	+1,400	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total.....	784,917	426,491	529,129	-255,788	+102,638
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	242,924	128,261	226,126	-16,798	+97,865
Emergency appropriations (111-5).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total.....	292,924	128,261	226,126	-66,798	+97,865
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	282,607	374,862	432,516	+149,909	+57,654
Military construction, Navy Reserve.....	57,045	64,124	125,874	+68,829	+61,750
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	36,958	27,476	103,169	+66,211	+75,693
===== Total, Reserve components.....	1,454,451	1,021,214	1,416,814	-37,637	+395,600
===== Total, Military construction.....	16,669,730	14,093,201	14,220,947	-2,448,783	+127,746
Appropriations.....	(12,194,818)	(12,688,217)	(12,907,263)	(+712,445)	(+219,046)
Rescissions.....	(-77,130)	---	(-85,300)	(-8,170)	(-85,300)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,190,000)	---	---	(-2,190,000)	---
Overseas contingency operations.....	(2,362,042)	(1,404,984)	(1,398,984)	(-963,058)	(-6,000)
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.....	230,867	276,314	234,914	+4,047	-41,400
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32)...	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Total.....	330,867	276,314	234,914	-95,953	-41,400

Military Construction - Veterans Affairs - and Related Agencies Appropriations Act - FY 2010 (H.R. 3082)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Family housing construction, Army.....	646,580	273,236	273,236	-373,344	---
Emergency appropriations (111-5).....	34,507	---	---	-34,507	---
Total.....	681,087	273,236	273,236	-407,851	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army.....	716,110	523,418	523,418	-192,692	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	3,932	---	---	-3,932	---
Total.....	720,042	523,418	523,418	-196,624	---
Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps....	380,123	146,569	146,569	-233,554	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps.....	376,062	368,540	368,540	-7,522	---
Family housing construction, Air Force.....	395,879	66,101	66,101	-329,778	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	80,100	---	---	-80,100	---
Total.....	475,979	66,101	66,101	-409,878	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force...	594,465	502,936	502,936	-91,529	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	16,461	---	---	-16,461	---
Total.....	610,926	502,936	502,936	-107,990	---
Family housing construction, Defense-Wide.....	---	2,859	2,859	+2,859	---
Rescission.....	-6,040	---	---	+6,040	---
Total.....	-6,040	2,859	2,859	+8,899	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-Wide	49,231	49,214	49,214	-17	---
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	850	2,600	2,600	+1,750	---
Homeowners assistance fund.....	4,500	23,225	23,225	+18,725	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	555,000	---	---	-555,000	---
Total.....	559,500	23,225	23,225	-536,275	---
Total, Family housing.....	3,847,760	1,958,698	1,958,698	-1,889,062	---
Appropriations.....	(3,163,800)	(1,958,698)	(1,958,698)	(-1,205,102)	---
Rescissions.....	(-6,040)	---	---	(+6,040)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(690,000)	---	---	(-690,000)	---
Chemical demilitarization construction, Defense-Wide..	144,278	146,541	146,541	+2,263	---
Base realignment and closure:					
Base realignment and closure account, 1990.....	458,377	396,768	536,768	+78,391	+140,000
Base realignment and closure account, 2005.....	8,765,613	7,479,498	7,479,498	-1,286,115	---
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	263,300	---	---	-263,300	---
Total.....	9,028,913	7,479,498	7,479,498	-1,549,415	---
Total, Base realignment and closure.....	9,487,290	7,876,266	8,016,266	-1,471,024	+140,000
Air National Guard Fire Stations (Sec. 131).....	28,000	---	---	-28,000	---
Army National Guard Aviation and Training (Sec. 132)..	147,000	---	---	-147,000	---
Total, title I.....	30,654,925	24,351,020	24,577,366	-6,077,559	+226,346
Appropriations.....	(25,132,753)	(22,946,036)	(23,263,682)	(-1,869,071)	(+317,646)
Rescissions.....	(-83,170)	---	(-85,300)	(-2,130)	(-85,300)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,880,000)	---	---	(-2,880,000)	---
Overseas contingency operations.....	(2,725,342)	(1,404,984)	(1,398,984)	(-1,326,358)	(-6,000)

Military Construction - Veterans Affairs - and Related Agencies Appropriations Act - FY 2010 (H.R. 3082)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions.....	43,111,681	47,218,207	47,218,207	+4,106,526	---
Readjustment benefits.....	3,832,944	8,663,624	8,663,624	+4,830,680	---
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	42,300	49,288	49,288	+6,988	---
Veterans housing benefit program fund					
(indefinite).....	2,000	23,553	23,553	+21,553	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(500)	(500)	(500)	---	---
Credit subsidy.....	-246,000	-133,000	-133,000	+113,000	---
Administrative expenses.....	157,210	165,082	165,082	+7,872	---
Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless					
Veterans.....	(750)	(750)	(750)	---	---
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	61	29	29	-32	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,180)	(2,298)	(2,298)	(-882)	---
Administrative expenses.....	320	328	328	+8	---
Native American veteran housing loan program account..	646	664	664	+18	---
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	46,901,162	55,987,775	55,987,775	+9,086,613	---
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical services.....	30,969,903	34,704,500	34,704,500	+3,734,597	---
Advance appropriation, FY 2011.....	---	---	37,136,000	+37,136,000	+37,136,000
Subtotal.....	30,969,903	34,704,500	71,840,500	+40,870,597	+37,136,000
Medical support and compliance.....	4,450,000	5,100,000	4,900,000	+450,000	-200,000
Advance appropriation, FY 2011.....	---	---	5,307,000	+5,307,000	+5,307,000
Subtotal.....	4,450,000	5,100,000	10,207,000	+5,757,000	+5,107,000
Medical facilities.....	5,029,000	4,693,000	4,893,000	-136,000	+200,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---
Advance appropriation, FY 2011.....	---	---	5,740,000	+5,740,000	+5,740,000
Subtotal.....	6,029,000	4,693,000	10,633,000	+4,604,000	+5,940,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	510,000	580,000	580,000	+70,000	---
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting collections.....	-2,544,000	-2,954,000	-2,954,000	-410,000	---
Appropriations (indefinite).....	2,544,000	2,954,000	2,954,000	+410,000	---
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	41,958,903	45,077,500	93,260,500	+51,301,597	+48,183,000
Appropriations.....	(40,958,903)	(45,077,500)	(45,077,500)	(+4,118,597)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,000,000)	---	---	(-1,000,000)	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2011.....	---	---	(48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)
National Cemetery Administration					
National Cemetery Administration.....	230,000	242,000	250,000	+20,000	+8,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total, National Cemetery Administration.....	280,000	242,000	250,000	-30,000	+8,000
Emergency appropriations.....	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)	---
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	1,801,867	2,218,500	2,083,700	+281,833	-134,800
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	150,000	---	---	-150,000	---
Subtotal.....	1,951,867	2,218,500	2,083,700	+131,833	-134,800

Military Construction - Veterans Affairs - and Related Agencies Appropriations Act - FY 2010 (H.R. 3082)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Information technology systems.....	2,489,391	3,307,000	3,307,000	+817,609	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Subtotal.....	2,539,391	3,307,000	3,307,000	+767,609	---
Office of Inspector General.....	87,818	107,000	107,000	+19,182	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Subtotal.....	88,818	107,000	107,000	+18,182	---
Construction, major projects.....	923,382	1,194,000	1,194,000	+270,618	---
Construction, minor projects.....	741,534	600,000	726,800	-14,734	+126,800
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	175,000	85,000	85,000	-90,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 111-5).....	150,000	---	---	-150,000	---
Subtotal.....	325,000	85,000	85,000	-240,000	---
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	42,000	42,000	42,000	---	---
Total, Departmental Administration.....	6,611,992	7,553,500	7,545,500	+933,508	-8,000
Appropriations.....	(6,260,992)	(7,553,500)	(7,545,500)	(+1,284,508)	(-8,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(351,000)	---	---	(-351,000)	---
Administrative Provisions					
IRS income verification.....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000	---
Sec. 160 Filipino Veterans Compensation Fund (P.L. 110-329) (emergency).....	198,000	---	---	-198,000	---
Total, title II.....	95,948,057	108,860,775	157,043,775	+61,095,718	+48,183,000
Appropriations.....	(94,349,057)	(108,860,775)	(108,860,775)	(+14,511,718)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,599,000)	---	---	(-1,599,000)	---
Rescissions (emergency appropriations).....	---	---	---	---	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2011.....	---	---	(48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,680)	(2,798)	(2,798)	(-882)	---
Discretionary.....	(49,205,132)	(53,039,103)	(101,222,103)	(+52,016,971)	(+48,183,000)
Mandatory.....	(46,742,925)	(55,821,672)	(55,821,672)	(+9,078,747)	---
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	59,470	60,300	61,800	+2,330	+1,500
(By transfer).....	(500)	---	---	(-500)	---
Foreign currency fluctuations account.....	17,100	17,100	17,100	---	---
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission.....	76,570	77,400	78,900	+2,330	+1,500
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims					
Salaries and expenses.....	30,975	27,115	27,115	-3,860	---
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses.....	36,730	37,200	42,500	+5,770	+5,300

Military Construction - Veterans Affairs - and Related Agencies Appropriations Act - FY 2010 (H.R. 3082)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Armed Forces Retirement Home					
Operation and maintenance.....	54,985	62,000	62,000	+7,015	---
Capital program.....	8,025	72,000	72,000	+63,975	---
Total, Armed Forces Retirement Home.....	63,010	134,000	134,000	+70,990	---
=====					
Total, title III.....	207,285	275,715	282,515	+75,230	+6,800
(By transfer).....	(500)	---	---	(-500)	---
=====					
Grand total.....	126,810,267	133,487,510	181,903,656	+55,093,389	+48,416,146
Appropriations.....	(119,689,095)	(132,082,526)	(132,406,972)	(+12,717,877)	(+324,446)
Rescissions.....	(-83,170)	---	(-85,300)	(-2,130)	(-85,300)
Emergency appropriations.....	(4,479,000)	---	---	(-4,479,000)	---
Advance appropriations, FY 2011.....	---	---	(48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)	(+48,183,000)
Overseas contingency operations.....	(2,725,342)	(1,404,984)	(1,398,984)	(-1,326,358)	(-6,000)
(By transfer).....	(500)	---	---	(-500)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,680)	(2,798)	(2,798)	(-882)	---
=====					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Emergency appropriation defense.....	-2,880,000	---	---	+2,880,000	---
Emergency appropriation non-defense.....	-1,599,000	---	---	+1,599,000	---
Veterans Health Administration:					
Less advance appropriations.....	---	---	-48,183,000	-48,183,000	-48,183,000
Overseas contingency operations (P.L. 111-32).....	---	---	6,000	+6,000	+6,000
Total, adjustments.....	-4,479,000	---	-48,177,000	-43,698,000	-48,177,000
=====					
Total (including adjustments).....	122,331,267	133,487,510	133,726,656	+11,395,389	+239,146

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It is, indeed, a high privilege and a great honor to stand on the floor today with Chairman EDWARDS and present the 2010 Military Construction Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Indeed, this bill is not about us, it's not about our individual districts. It's about them, those that volunteer to serve our country in the uniform of our Armed Forces, past, present, and future, their willingness to stand between a threat and our civilian population, extend freedom from this generation to the next, and join the thousands of others that have preserved our freedoms and protected our way of life.

This is a very important bill; it is worthy of our support. It is a bipartisan product. As the chairman said earlier, this bill is not pushed by lobbyists or outside interests other than the veteran service organizations and the families of those that are serving and have served.

It is our honor, and frankly our sacred duty, to make sure that we give these great Americans what they deserve and what they need. I think if you ask our men and women in harm's way today, what can we do for you, the first thing they would say is take care of our families while we're serving and, when we come home, support us. This bill does that, and I'm grateful for that.

I can't thank Chairman EDWARDS enough. He is diligent, he is fair, he is honorable, and he is totally committed to these men and women in uniform. And we are working together to guarantee the efficiencies of these resources and the investments that we're making.

This bill funds the needs for military construction and family housing for our troops, their families, the quality of life construction projects, and provides funding for all the programs that the Veterans Administration and related agencies have asked for in their budget request. This bill literally touches every soldier, sailor, aviator, marine, military spouse, child, every veteran who participates in VA programs; and it takes good care of our national cemeteries and monuments that are funded in this bill as well.

We worked together through 18 hearings. We asked a lot of questions; we had very good witnesses. So a totally cooperative effort.

I want to thank all of our subcommittees from both sides. Specifically today I want to thank Mr. FARR and Mr. CRENSHAW, who really supported the chairman and myself through this process, Mr. FARR as vice chairman, Mr. CRENSHAW when I could not be there on certain days; outstanding work by them.

□ 1115

This bill reflects bipartisan input and cooperation, and that is the tradition

of this bill, and we have honored that tradition and worked very well together, and it truly is a bipartisan bill.

I want to just talk about a couple of initiatives in the bill without going into specific numbers because Chairman EDWARDS has already highlighted many of the numbers.

The Guard and Reserve initiative is extremely important because we have been fighting terrorists since September the 11th, 2001. The op tempo of our National Guard and Reserve forces remains at a very high level. It's very likely to remain that way for the foreseeable future. The Guard and Reserve have had more than 719,000 activations since September the 11th, including the current level of 142,000. So I'm pleased to join Chairman EDWARDS in supporting the additional \$200 million in this bill to address urgent unfunded requirements for the Army and Air National Guard and for the Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

On BRAC, the BRAC 2005 account in the President's budget request is \$7.5 billion. The department and the services have testified that it's going to be absolutely critical for them to have this funding on October 1 of this year in order to meet their September 15, 2011, statutory deadline to complete BRAC 2005. I will continue to work with Chairman EDWARDS to make sure that this gets done on time. However, the House-passed defense authorization bill cuts \$350 million from this BRAC account for this year on the cost of the provision that requires prevailing wage equivalency with Hawaii for military construction on Guam related to the relocation of our Marines from Japan. The CBO has scored this provision as costing \$10 billion over the next 10 years. That's twice the amount of the entire relocation from Japan to Guam, and this is the largest Milcon investment in a generation, and it's really important that we address this issue throughout this process. I spoke at the Rules Committee yesterday to raise this issue. We have spoken with the leadership of the House. We have spoken with the leadership of the Congress to say this is a problem and it has to be addressed as this bill moves forward and as the process moves forward because we simply can't afford to double the cost of the relocation from Japan to Guam based on a prevailing wage issue. It's too much. Too much. We've got to resolve it.

On the advanced appropriations issue, the chairman spoke eloquently about this. We reached a bipartisan agreement. I am very pleased with the way they allowed Ranking Member Mr. LEWIS and me to weigh in because none of us want to retreat from our constitutional prerogative or obligation we have to oversee all the funding on an annual basis. However, we share the goal of making sure that the VA has the money they need in a timely manner and can make decisions that maximize their effectiveness because it's a

big bureaucracy, and when the money is in doubt, the changes and reforms necessary to improve efficiency can't be met. The bill contains \$48.2 billion for advanced appropriations for medical services, medical support and compliance, and medical facilities, which is \$3.7 billion above the amount recommended in the fiscal year 2010 bill on these accounts.

On VA spending I continue to be concerned, as is Ranking Member LEWIS, about the ability of the VA to absorb large funding increases provided in this bill. I'm very pleased to support the increases, but it is absolutely our job to make sure not just that we raise the funding levels but that the money is well spent, spent in a timely manner, that it's effectively spent, and that there is accountability through the entire process. So we continue to raise this issue. I think there is a bipartisan commitment to this, and I want to point that out as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAMP. I'm happy to yield to the ranking member.

Mr. LEWIS of California. It had not been my intention to speak on this measure in order to save time, but you're making a point that's really very fundamental. I would like to commend both of you, the chairman and the ranking member, for the fabulous job here.

But, most importantly, some years ago I had the opportunity to Chair the VA Appropriations Subcommittee. During those years, we were most concerned that, while there was bipartisan support on the House floor and funding rose for veterans, that the various organizations that support funding and veterans here in Washington were not helping us much out there where the people really get their service at the veterans hospitals. There has been a radical change in our ability to make sure that service is being delivered effectively. And it's due to the work of the two of you and the bipartisan effort here that we have had this success. So thank you.

Mr. WAMP. Reclaiming my time, on this same front, the information technology account is a significant increase, \$833 million above the 2009 enacted level, an increase of \$559 million above the 2009 level when the reprogramming action that was approved is taken into consideration. It is a large, unchecked spending increase to one account, and the GAO and the OIG and others have documented the VA's inability to effectively manage these resources. I agree with Secretary Shinseki when he testified that he's going to need IT to be a key part of his plan to transform the VA. However, with the documented concerns about this account, it remains doubtful that this will occur.

Not more than 3 hours after our subcommittee markup, the staff participated in a briefing at the request of VA's Assistant Secretary for IT. The

purpose of this briefing was to provide the committee an update on a thorough analysis that the VA was undertaking to review their IT portfolio. The VA reported that there are a number of IT programs that are more than 13 months behind schedule and more than 50 percent over budget. We asked for the list of these projects along with the 2009 and 2010 costs for these programs. More than 3 weeks have now passed, and the VA has yet to provide the list to show the costs for these troubled IT projects. That is an example of how increasing the funding can be very helpful if the checks are in place to make sure that the money gets to where it's supposed to go. So it's not just increasing the funding; it's making sure that the veterans benefit from this increased funding, to make sure that the bureaucracy of the VA is held accountable, to make sure that we insist on efficiencies and that the money flows down in a timely manner.

And then the National Cemetery Administration—I want to note the increased funding for this account, \$20 million above the 2009 enacted level of \$230 million, and that will go a long way to allow the VA to meet the current needs as well as giving the ability to look at cemetery expansion in areas where expansion is needed. That includes Chattanooga, where we have a very historic national cemetery.

Without mentioning names, because the chairman already has, I can't say enough about this professional staff, those behind me, those behind him. It's an honor for all of us to be part of this team. I don't think there is a higher privilege that any of us could ask for than to serve the men and women in uniform of our Armed Forces past, present, and future.

Madam Chairman, as I conclude, I want to thank Mr. LEWIS and Mr. OBEY, who serve as the distinguished ranking member and chairman of this committee. This is a good bill. It deserves our support. I look forward to continuing our work through the conference committee, and I want to encourage Chairman EDWARDS and Chairman OBEY to insist that we have a conference committee, that we meet with the Senate, that we look eye to eye and we resolve any of our differences. I think that is the regular order that we desire to return to.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, if there is a single unsung hero in this Congress on behalf of America's veterans, it's the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY. And for that reason, I yield 2 minutes to him for any remarks he would care to make.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply have one question for the gentleman from Tennessee. Are you really sure you want us to meet with the Senate?

Mr. WAMP. I'm running for Governor, sir.

Mr. OBEY. Does that mean you're running away from the Senate?

Madam Chair, let me simply congratulate both the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas for the fine work they have done on this bill. I think every Member of the House can be proud of what has happened in terms of our delivering of benefits to veterans on the health care front and on the education front.

Over the past 3 years or so, we have had very significant increases in veterans health benefits. We also last year passed a landmark, an historic, expansion of the GI Bill education benefits by passage of the Webb amendment. In the supplemental appropriation bill this year, we enhanced the ability of spouses and children of veterans to receive transfer benefits to allow them to use the education benefits that would otherwise have accrued to a veteran. There had been a hole in the law which did not include the children of veterans who had died, and that has been corrected, and now this bill goes a whole lot more down the road in dealing with their needs.

When we go into wars, we have an obligation to provide all the support that's necessary to the warriors during and after the wars, and that's in part what this bill tries to do. And I congratulate both gentlemen for the work they have done and urge support for the bill.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the current ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee who also serves as a very valuable member of our subcommittee, Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

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

Madam Chairman, I just want today to start by saying most of us in our jobs have parts of our job that we like better than other parts of our job. Serving on this subcommittee is part of the job that I really like, not only because of the importance of the subject, dealing with and providing for the members of our military and those veterans who have served in the past in the military and, as Mr. WAMP said, those who will serve in the future, but also because of the way this subcommittee does its work. With the leadership of Chairman EDWARDS and the leadership of Ranking Member ZACH WAMP, this subcommittee works together for the good of this country. And while we may have some objection to the process on how appropriations bills are brought to the floor without totally open rules, you will be hard-pressed to find something wrong with this bill or some reason to vote against this bill. It's just not there.

There are some problems in the Veterans Administration, which is a huge bureaucracy, that can't be solved by

money. The money that the committee has made available adequately meets the requirements as proposed to us by the administration.

There is something else that this committee does that seldom gets mentioned. And I want to just take a brief comment and talk about—General Colin Powell was visiting in Europe. General Powell was asked a rather critical question that, in effect, the question criticized the United States for our arrogance and how we do things that are not good for other people. And General Powell thought for a minute, and he said, You know, the only thing that we have asked from you in Europe is enough ground to bury our dead.

There are 22 American cemeteries in Europe. The subcommittee has responsibility to provide funding to maintain those military cemeteries, and they do a good job and they are beautiful. And for those Members who haven't had a chance to visit them, you really should.

□ 1130

There are 22 American cemeteries, graves of 106,757 American soldiers who lost their lives freeing the people of Europe from the oppression of Hitler's Nazis.

This subcommittee has that responsibility and does a really good job, and I am proud to work with CHET EDWARDS and I am proud to work with ZACH WAMP and all the other members of the subcommittee and the staff who are so dedicated to meeting our mission, to doing the job that we were responsible for doing.

As I want to say to our chairman and to my ranking member, this is the part of the job that I really like around here. There are a lot of other parts that I like too, but I really like this one. Working with you two gentlemen is just very, very special.

This bill appropriates \$108.9 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs for 2010, a 15.4 percent increase in the funds for veterans medical and services available this year. This bill funds the expanded GI Bill benefits authorized last year by the 110th Congress, it funds an additional 1,200 claims processors to reduce the backlog of veterans' disability claims, and it expands programs to help homeless veterans.

Our subcommittee also reaffirms its longstanding support for veterans medical care programs by providing \$34.7 billion for VA medical services, a 13 percent increase over current year funding. The members of our subcommittee also approved a new method of funding veterans medical care to ensure that the uncertainty of our legislative cycle does not negatively impact the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to plan for and deliver the best in medical care for those who served our nation. In addition to providing funding for VA medical care in Fiscal Year 2010, it also provides advanced funding for the following year, Fiscal Year 2011.

Our committee also continues to place the highest priority on providing the best care and services for our service members who have returned from Iraq and Afghanistan and have

been diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury. One of our nation's centers for the treatment of PTSD and TBI is the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center at Bay Pines, which I have the privilege to represent. Included in the bill we consider today is \$96,800,000 to build a state-of-the-art medical facility at Bay Pines to better screen our returning service members for mental health problems and to provide the state-of-the-art facilities in which to treat them. The Committee approved my request for the design and engineering funding for this project last year to accelerate the construction of this vitally needed unit.

We also include in the bill \$371,300,000 for a new VA medical facility in Orlando that will benefit veterans throughout the state. Florida continues to experience one of the largest inflows of veterans of any state in our nation. All of Florida's VA medical facilities feel the strain of a growing caseload, especially during the winter months. The construction of this long anticipated VA hospital in central Florida will ease that burden on all the existing hospitals.

Madam Chair, this legislation honors those who wore the uniform in the defense of our nation and freedom here and throughout the world. We also honor those who wear the uniform today by ensuring that they live and work in the best facilities today whether it be on U.S. soil or on our bases in the furthest points of the world.

This includes the facilities for the forces leading the worldwide battle against terrorism which is being directed by U.S. Central Command and U.S. Special Operations Command at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida, which neighbors the 10th Congressional District I represent.

Just this week, I joined General David Petraeus, the Commander of U.S. Central Command, to break ground on a new headquarters facility that was supported by this committee and for which this committee approved my request four years ago to accelerate the funding to begin its design and engineering. Our bill this year includes \$21,000,000 to accelerate construction of a Consolidated Communications Facility to support the Joint Components of Central and Special Operations Command at MacDill. Communications is critical for both commands to manage operations that are underway half a world away. This facility will ensure that our war fighters will have the most up-to-date and secure communication capabilities for them to do their job.

This legislation also includes \$15,300,000 for the Central Command Commandant Facility which will coordinate air operations for Central Command's commanding officers and support staff to enable them to deploy rapidly and efficiently. This is imperative given the geographic distance and the number of crises that continue in the Middle East and Southwest Asia.

This facility will provide a secure facility to accommodate the Joint Special Operations Air Component, train increasing numbers of personnel, and store authorized equipment. In addition it will provide a Sensitive Compartmented Intelligence Facility to conduct analysis and assessments to provide Central Command with accurate and comprehensive situational awareness for our forward deployed forces.

Another \$7,000,000 is included for a much needed Child Development Center to care for the children of our service members who work around the clock to support their missions. This facility is designed to accommodate and care for the many families of our many working parents at MacDill Air Force Base. And \$16,000,000 is included here for a new dormitory to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with safe, energy efficient housing.

Madam Chair, this is a good bill. It fulfills our nation's promise and commitment to care for our nation's veterans, those who serve; those have served in the past, and those who will serve our nation in the future.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I consider it an honor to be even able to speak after Mr. YOUNG, who has committed his lifetime and his heart to our servicemen and -women and our veterans. He and his wife commit every week to going out to our DOD and VA hospitals to let those great Americans know that their sacrifices are not forgotten. I want to thank him for inspiring all of us to remember the sacrifice our troops and veterans have made.

With that, it's a privilege for me to recognize the vice chair of our subcommittee, who has been a leader at every step of the way on so many issues on behalf of our veterans, Mr. FARR of California, for 2 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Chairman EDWARDS, for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I just want to rise to speak on this bill, and I just want to say something following Congressman YOUNG's points.

What I love about this committee, more than any other committee I have ever served on in the State legislature or here in Congress, I think it's the best listening committee I have ever been on. We listen to people, and what I call the felt needs, and we respond.

I think what we are so proud about is the fiscal year 2010 military construction and veterans spending bill responds to what we heard and addresses those issues. What I think is remarkably progressively happening in this country is that for the first time these two huge agencies, the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, are beginning to be seamless in a sense.

I mean, you can't be a veteran without going through the Department of Defense. And the new Secretary of Veterans Affairs Shinseki has said that the minute you enroll in the Department of Defense you are automatically enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs. So you are going to begin seeing this, rather than having these lost records and folders and everything that needs to be done, that it will be administratively clean.

What I also really appreciate about this committee that probably is not recognized is that we hear over and over again about the health care of our veterans. And I can't think of two more sensitive people than Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP and our colleague on the committee, PATRICK KENNEDY, that listened so pro-

foundly to the needs of mental health care for veterans, not only those coming back with posttraumatic stress syndrome from Iraq and Afghanistan, but we have about 270,000 veterans that sleep on the streets of America.

That's the biggest embarrassment that this country has. We have not been that good at taking care of them. This budget puts \$800 million more in mental health and does the outreach for homeless veterans.

I am very proud of that and would urge support of the legislation.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to ANDER CRENSHAW from Jacksonville, Florida, who would be the vice ranking member if there were such a position, but he is an incredibly valuable asset on our subcommittee and has done just an extraordinary job this year.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman, Mr. WAMP, for yielding the time. I thank him for his hard work in the subcommittee and working with our Chairman EDWARDS, thank you for your leadership and your bipartisan spirit. And thank you both for involving all the members of the subcommittee and drafting this legislation that I think we can all support.

I ran for Congress in the first place because I believe the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and I think the best way to keep America safe is to keep America strong. But I have been on this subcommittee now for 7 years, and I think we have a tremendous responsibility not only to modernize and upgrade these bases all around the world that we oversee, but we have a responsibility to make sure that we take care of the men and women that volunteer to defend our country. Nobody forces them to do that. Nobody forces them to go into harm's way. They do it because they care about America. And I think we have a responsibility to take care of them, and that's what this bill does.

I think in terms of housing, there was a time when people that served in our military lived in substandard housing, something they couldn't be proud of. Through using some of the private sector ideas like privatization, now over 90 percent of our military men and women live in adequate housing that they can be proud of.

When they go off to deployment, they can be sure that their families are going to be taken care of back home with a good quality of life. They are going to have a peace of mind when they are gone and when they are fighting for us.

And when they come home and they leave the service, now they know they have a Veterans Administration that cares about them. This bill continues the work that we have done to make sure that we have more clinics, to make sure we have more doctors and nurses, more people to process those claims. They don't have to wait in line. We are making some giant strides.

And, finally, this bill, as has been pointed out, deals with national cemeteries, to give those veterans a final resting place that they so richly deserve.

And I know in my home district in Jacksonville, Florida, we opened a new veterans cemetery this year. And I don't think I have ever been more proud to be a Member of Congress, to be a part of that ceremony, to see the sense of gratitude in these people's eyes knowing they are going to have a place, a final resting place because of the way they have defended our country.

Madam Chairman, I think this is a bill we can all support. I am again thankful to our chairman, our ranking member, and all the members of the subcommittee for the work that we put in that we can be so proud of, so I urge adoption.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I would like to recognize a member of our committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), an Army veteran who has been a strong voice on behalf of our veterans and military, for 1 minute.

Mr. SALAZAR. I want to take a moment to recognize both Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP for their valiant effort in putting this bill together. I don't think there are any greater champions for military veterans and their families. All 17.5 million in the United States should applaud the chairman and the ranking member for their diligent fight.

Madam Chair, I would like to bring one specific project in the bill forward and not only thank the chairman and the ranking member, but also Secretary Shinseki and President Obama and the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. FILNER, for including the \$119 million for the new Fitzsimmons Veterans Hospital in Denver, Colorado.

This facility will provide full service to half a million veterans currently residing in my home State of Colorado and many across the Rocky Mountain west. This new facility will be open and begin serving veterans by 2013. The 200-bed hospital will reach over a million square feet in size and include 30 special beds for spinal cord injuries.

I am proud that after over a decade of waiting, the veterans of the Rocky Mountain west and my State will finally benefit from this state-of-the-art facility.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana and the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. BUYER, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BUYER. I want to commend my friend Mr. WAMP and Chairman EDWARDS for your strong advocacy on behalf of America's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, last year, as you may remember, I offered an amendment that would have provided direct funding for VA to advance projects at 16 VA

medical centers that were identified for the use of solar photovoltaic roof applications, but the amendment was ruled out of order on a technical issue.

You and I have had several conversations about renewable energy issues and, however, working with the Secretary, as I had indicated, I was able to ensure that the VA funded these projects with the overall amount that included the fiscal year 2009 appropriations act, of which you had no objection.

Subsequently, at the beginning of this Congress, with the prospect of a forthcoming stimulus bill, I had met with the Secretary of the VA on renewable energy projects to benefit our veterans and to provide additional funding to invest in these renewable energy projects at the VA. I was pleased the stimulus bill provided the VA with more than \$1.4 billion. That's almost half a billion more than what I even submitted in the request, so I thank the chairman.

And the VA stimulus spending for the additional 31 solar photovoltaic feasibility studies also included studies for cogeneration, of which the chairman must have done, along with wind and geothermal projects. And based on those study results, the VA plans to fund up to eight solar projects, nine cogenerations, six wind, and five geothermal using stimulus dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the VA also expects to implement the remaining 23 solar projects, 29 cogeneration, 4 wind and 4 geothermal in fiscal year 2010, subject to the feasibility determinations.

With this in mind, I want to ask my friend: Do I have your assurance that the bill before us would provide the sufficient funds for the VA to move forward with these renewable energy projects?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I first want to thank Mr. BUYER for taking the lead and for fighting to ensure that alternative sources of energy are utilized by the VA. This is an important issue and initiative.

Our bill does take into consideration this important need, and VA plans to fund a significant number of renewable energy projects with resources in this bill. I want to assure you that I will emphasize to the VA the importance of this effort.

I recognize, and I think this is critical, the result of your efforts, that every dollar saved through energy conservation in the VA will result in an additional dollar going directly to better health care and benefits for veterans.

I further look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure that the VA appropriately employs the use of solar technology to reduce energy costs and to benefit our environment.

Mr. WAMP. I want to thank the chairman for this commitment and express my strong support for funding these renewable energy projects, compliment Mr. BUYER for his tenacity and

perseverance here on this front, because I know that we can reduce VA's high energy costs with the use of these new renewable energy technologies. I look forward to working with each of you as we continue to advance renewable energy projects at VA facilities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAMP. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BUYER. I would thank the leadership of Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WAMP for your commitment for renewable energy within the VA.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) who has been the leading voice in this subcommittee and the House for improving mental health care services for America's veterans and services to homeless veterans.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Chairman Edwards, for his leadership on what has been an amazing increase in funding for veterans in this country. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we have seen in the last cycle the largest single increase in veterans funding in the 76-year history of the Veterans Administration in the last cycle. And, as such, that has carried over till this cycle and will in the succeeding years ahead as we continue to increase the veterans appropriations.

And, again, this year, we are seeing another large, large increase in the veterans spending, including increases in veterans mental health. And that, my friends, is what I am so pleased to see, especially in the wake of the terrible tragedy at Camp Victory, where we saw a murder-suicide, once again highlighting the terrible tragedy that so many of our veterans are facing with the psychological wounds that they are facing and the combat that they are so readily seeing on a day-to-day basis. They are not only suffering the physical wounds of war but the psychological and mental wounds of war.

I would like to acknowledge the ranking member, ZACH WAMP, for the incredible support that he has given to our veterans in the area of mental health services.

We have seen in this bill \$4.6 billion for mental health services in this bill. We have seen an additional \$3.2 billion for homeless veterans. It's a tragedy, as my friend SAM FARR said, that the single largest percentage of the homeless population in this country are veterans. That should not be the case. In this bill, we seek to try to end that situation.

Madam Chairman, I am also pleased to see that this committee responds to the veterans of America in providing advance funding for veterans funding for the succeeding years, so that veterans do not have to wait on Congress to provide those funds, and that we provide an additional \$48 billion in the 2011 budget.

□ 1145

And that, my friends, is a result of General Shinseki, the VA Secretary's strong advocacy and this President's commitment to our veterans to make sure that they don't have to wait—they don't have to wait for a budget in order to know that they're going to get the funds they need to take care of our veterans.

For these and all the reasons, I'm so proud to be part of this committee and to see that this country lives up to its promise to our Nation's veterans. And I thank the chairman for all the good work that he does, and I thank the ranking member for all the good work that he does. And I'm proud to be on this committee.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes and yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. Madam Chairman, I'd like to speak about the Dover Air Force Base and what it's doing with respect to its port mortuary.

For more than 50 years, Dover Air Force Base has been home to the United States military's port mortuary. It's here that Dover's expert staff receives from theater the remains of fallen American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines and conducts a solemn, dignified transfer from the aircraft to the port mortuary. The base and the community in Dover take this responsibility very seriously and treat all fallen servicemembers and their families with dignity, honor, and respect.

As you know, in March of this year the Department of Defense announced a new policy regarding media access to the dignified transfer of remains at the Dover Air Force Base. Under the new policy, the decision regarding media coverage is made on an individual basis by the families of the fallen. The new policy also expands the Department's support to those family members wishing to attend the dignified transfer by paying for travel to Dover and increasing the availability of grief counseling and chaplain support services.

The immediate result of this policy change is that many more families of fallen soldiers from across the country travel to Dover to attend. Unfortunately, the wing commander and his staff at Dover Air Force Base have expressed concern they do not have adequate chapel facilities to provide for on-base memorial services, worship, and counseling. This lack of chapel facilities would be particularly evident in the unfortunate event of a mass casualty situation in the theater of operations.

The base has submitted a proposal to build a new main base chapel center to include private space for the expressed purpose of receiving grieving families. I understand that the office of the Secretary of Defense is supportive of this project, and I look forward to working

with the committee at the earliest possible opportunity to solve this pressing matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Will the ranking member yield?

Mr. WAMP. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. The gentleman from Delaware has raised a very important issue, and as someone who once represented Fort Hood, Texas, through three combat deployments, I strongly believe in the need to treat our fallen and their families with the utmost dignity and respect.

So it will be a privilege for me to work with the gentleman on this issue. And I am hopeful that we can rectify this problem by the time we get through conference.

Mr. WAMP. Reclaiming my time, I stand with you, Mr. Chairman, and will work with Mr. CASTLE as well to resolve this matter in conference.

I yield to Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank both the distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking member, Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. WAMP, for their work on this legislation as well as discussing this particular issue. I look forward to working with you and all of the servicemembers and families who would be involved with this, and hopefully we can work it out in the near future.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I'd like to yield 1 minute to an active voice on our subcommittee on behalf of veterans and our troops, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the chairman. Madam Chair, this bill addresses one of the biggest concerns that I and many others have, and that is homeless veterans. The bill provides \$420 million over last year's level for assistance and treatment for homeless veterans.

Tonight, Madam Chair, 154,000 veterans will go to bed without a home. One out of four homeless men served in the United States military at some point. They fought for our country, they came home, but they don't have a house. They served in jungles, they served in cities, they served in deserts and bases on the high seas, and they're sleeping on sidewalks this evening in America.

That is a national shame. But thanks to the bipartisanship of this subcommittee, we are making a bold leap on behalf of those homeless veterans. We are making the investments necessary to stop this outrage and to do what every nation must do, and that is to treat its veterans as heroes, and in this case, heroes with a home. I thank the gentleman and the ranking member for their cooperation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes and yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my

dear friend, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, regarding language contained in the House report, Veterans Affairs and Related Appropriations Bill for 2010.

I'm concerned the language could have the effect of postponing activation of a much-needed clinic for our veterans in Toledo. Clearly, it is not in the best interest of our veterans to postpone activation of a new clinic that will better address a higher workload, especially in light of the increasing numbers of veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield to my good friend.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I agree with the gentleman that our veterans deserve quality health care. It's crucial to move forward to get the new clinic operational as soon as possible. The VA is recognized as a leader in quality health care, and we want to do everything possible to enhance that reputation.

Mr. DINGELL. To continue, the existing clinic is undersized for its current caseload. The VA has been working for several years to establish larger replacements. It is my understanding if we move forward with the current plans, which have been reviewed by the majority of the impacted veterans service organizations, the VA is prepared to have a new, larger LEED-certified clinic in the fall of 2011.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. It's of the utmost importance that we address these concerns in a timely and expeditious manner so we can continue to get the quality health care the VA provides to the veterans in question.

I know that this matter has also been of concern to the veterans in the district of the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, and I know that she wants their concerns addressed as well.

The language in the committee report is not designed to needlessly delay the activation of the Toledo clinic, but simply to ensure some of the concerns raised by veterans are responded to.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to also express great respect and affection for the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR. As a veteran myself, I couldn't agree more that we need more quality care for our veterans in a timely manner. As already mentioned, given the increased workload because of the veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, doubling the size of the existing clinic will help us to meet that goal.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee controls 6¼ minutes. The gentleman from Texas controls 7½ minutes.

Mr. WAMP. I continue to reserve.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I'd like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the great work that this chairman does on behalf of veterans. He's a true friend and has done so much for so many veterans, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I just want you to know that I went to college on the GI Bill, and I voted for the Post-9/11 GI Bill with my experience in the GI Bill and in school and what it did for me in mind. And I did so to ensure that all veterans would have the same access to this great educational opportunity that I had.

Unfortunately, today in California, California veterans are being denied this important chance to get the college education so that they can have a better future. According to the Department of Veterans Administration, veterans living in California are entitled to zero dollars toward their private tuition bill, simply because California charges "fees," not "tuition," to attend college.

So because zero "tuition" is charged in California, according to the VA's tortured logic, zero tuition can be paid to veterans seeking to attend private schools in California.

This simple semantic difference means that nearly 5,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans residing in California, veterans who served our Nation honorably, are not eligible to receive financial assistance to attend the college of their choice. This is unlike every other Iraq and Afghanistan veteran in the other 49 States.

My California colleagues and I sent a letter to the VA requesting the Department fix this issue administratively. Six weeks later—6 weeks later they sent a two-paragraph response denying—denying our request.

This is not fair to our veterans, and Congress should not stand by as these brave men and women are denied the benefits they have earned.

I'd now like to yield to my colleague from California (Mr. McKEON).

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman and I both know, this spring the VA released its Post-9/11 GI Bill tuition benefit rates. Unfortunately, the VA has misinterpreted the intent of Congress and by doing so will prevent veterans from attending private institutions in California.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. McKEON. By doing so, they will prevent veterans attending private institutions of higher education in California.

Certainly, when my home State enacted free in-State tuition, they didn't anticipate the VA would use that to restrict our vets from attending private

universities as they are allowed to do in 49 other States under the Post-9/11 GI Bill.

It's important that we provide Californians parity by enacting legislation like H.R. 2474 that the gentleman from California and I introduced in May. This legislation, which has near unanimous support from our delegation, allows veterans in California to use their full fee benefit towards tuition and fee expenses.

As the gentleman knows, it's important we act quickly, as this program begins implementation on August 1, 2009. Without action, many veterans could be unpleasantly surprised when they receive no tuition assistance.

Can the chairman assure us that this exclusion of California veterans from this important benefit was not the intent of the Congress in the Post-9/11 GI Bill?

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. The committee believes this exclusion of California veterans was not the intent of Congress when it passed the Post-9/11 GI Bill. The committee will ask the VA to work with the affected States, including the State of California, to ensure that veterans attending private institutions can participate fully in the Post-9/11 educational assistance program.

Mr. WAMP. I continue to reserve.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Let me thank Chairman EDWARDS for the excellent work he's done on this important bill, which funds our military construction projects and provides for the benefits and assistance that our Nation's veterans have so clearly earned.

It's out of concern for our Nation's veterans, specifically veterans in my home region of western Pennsylvania, that I requested this colloquy.

Pittsburgh's Veterans Benefits Administration employees are alleged to have manipulated an employee bonus reward system by delaying processing veterans' claims to my district to secure additional employee bonuses.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I'm familiar with the unfortunate situation that occurred in Pittsburgh. There was a report issued by the Office of Inspector General, correct?

Mr. ALTMIRE. That's right. I thank the chairman for his awareness of our concerns, and I would comment that this report issued by the Inspector General was insufficient given the gravity of these allegations. It failed to determine the sources of the problem. And I would suggest the Office of the Inspector General should conduct a second investigation of the Pittsburgh Veterans Benefits Administration employee misconduct in delaying benefit processing to receive bonuses and submit a more thorough report.

And this strikes me as particularly possible in light of the \$19 million increase in the Inspector General's budget from last year.

I would yield again to the chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Given the increases we've provided the Office of Inspector General at the VA, I look forward to working with the gentleman to see if we can't get the IG to take a second look at this serious issue in Pennsylvania.

□ 1200

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of our time.

As we close the general debate on the 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, I want to tell a brief story because today the President of the United States is in Italy at the G-8; and photographs show him with my friend, the Prime Minister of Australia, Kevin Rudd, over the last couple of days. I have to tell you—I was with my friend, the Prime Minister, a couple of months ago here in Washington, and I asked him about the extraordinary challenges that our country faces today. And when I think of the men and women in uniform of our Armed Forces—and I know in my heart that that is truly what our country is all about, people volunteering, even sacrificing for each other—I said to Kevin Rudd, "What's the attitude in Australia and around the world about these tremendous challenges that we face? And what do you think about the United States of America's ability to deal with these many challenges?" He said, "Well, we're optimistic. We've read your history. We understand how extraordinarily difficult it was during the Civil War and the great World Wars. We know that you came out of the Great Depression and that you have overcome extraordinary adversity. We've seen your free enterprise system, your brilliance and your innovation, and we know how resilient your people are. So we have great confidence that you will do it again," he said with a smile on his face.

And I would just say to all those men and women that served us in uniform—because they are the true patriots of our time. Yet again, they stand on the shoulders of those that have come before us, and our veterans are our most important citizens—that the burden is on us to extend our way of life and preserve freedom and to try to secure our liberty. This is the challenge of our time, and the world is counting on us. This bill goes a long way to meeting these needs, and we do truly stand at the water's edge together today. There is a lot of rancor and division in the House over process in other appropriations bills, but not today. Today we come together to do what's right for our men and women in uniform, for our military installations around the world under every command, for our veterans and their families and for the quality of life of our troops.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

Most of the claims from veterans of my district in south Texas are processed at the Houston VA Regional Office. A recent article in the Houston Chronicle, which I will submit for the RECORD, notes that nearly 18,000 veterans are waiting for their disability applications, and 26 percent of these claims have been pending over a year and a half. The number of claims on appeal from Houston are about 11,389, which is the highest in the country.

I have written a letter to the Secretary of the VA that brings attention to this problem, which I would like to be submitted into the RECORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for your help to address this very serious problem so we can provide service to our veterans.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I share the gentleman's concerns and look forward to working with him and the VA to see that we address those problems. Veterans serving out of the Houston office should not have to wait the amount of time they are having to wait to receive their earned benefits.

BACKLOG OF VA CLAIMS IN HOUSTON ONE OF COUNTRY'S HIGHEST

HOUSTON.—Houston has one of the biggest backlogs and some of the longest waiting times in processing veterans' claims for disability benefits in the nation, according to the most recent data released by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Nearly 18,000 veterans are waiting for the Houston VA Regional Office to process their applications for disability benefits, the Houston Chronicle reported Saturday. Also, 26 percent of the Houston claims have been pending for more than half a year, compared with the national average of 21 percent.

Total claims in Houston, including nondisability compensations and pensions, add up to almost 24,000, with 24 percent pending for more than six months. That percentage is also higher than the national average.

The number of claims on appeal from Houston—11,389—is the highest in the country. "The situation at VA's Houston office is among the worst in America," said Paul Sullivan, executive director of Veterans for Common Sense, a national advocacy group. "Our veterans and their families deserve better."

Nationwide, the total number of VA claims has increased from 638,648 this time last year to 723,152, as of June 20.

The number of claims received by the Houston VA Regional Office has increased by 26 percent since last year, more than twice the national average of 12 percent, said spokeswoman Valerie Martinez.

The Houston office has outsourced some of its claims processing to other VA facilities, and it has been authorized to hire 105 employees to improve efficiency, Martinez said.

At a congressional hearing in Washington last week, VA Deputy Undersecretary for Benefits Michael Walcott said it is incorrect to designate all claims around the country as a backlog because the total number "includes all claims received, whether pending for just a few hours or as long as six months."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2009.

Hon. ERIC K. SHINEKI,
Secretary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY SHINEKI: Congratulations on your appointment as Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I look forward to working with you as we provide for those who have served our country admirably in the United States Military.

I was recently made aware of the attached article regarding veterans' disability benefit applications. Most of the disability benefit applications that come from my congressional district are processed at the Houston VA Regional Office. As the article explains, this office has one of the largest backlogs in the nation.

In the last two fiscal years, funds have been made available to hire more case workers in an effort to reduce the application backlogs present in many parts of our nation. I respectfully request that priority be given to the Houston VA Regional Office as workers are being allocated to address this important problem.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. If my staff or I may be of any more assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

HENRY CUELLAR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman controls 2 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Houston, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member. Thank you very much, Mr. EDWARDS, for the grand work that you have done over the years in helping our soldiers. I rise today to support the underlying bill but to particularly focus on the medical services, the \$34.7 billion; the mental health services, \$4.6 billion; and the assistance for homeless vets, \$3.2 billion. In my congressional district I work with these populations in particular, visiting them, listening to their situations; and as well, in my own community we have had a high number of suicides among active duty soldiers. I am very glad to announce that because of the legislation of this particular appropriation and the leadership of Chairman EDWARDS, we are now looking forward to having an offsite opportunity for a PTS treatment center; and as well it will be able to secure funding in the future for prospective TRICARE recipients. I am proud to have worked with Riverside Hospital. We need to be able to provide more services for PTSD, for the soldiers that are coming home. Believe it or not, Houston has been cited as the city that has the largest number of returnees or active duty soldiers who have been in Iraq and now, subsequently, will be coming from Afghanistan. Today as I speak, Madam Chair, we are burying a young seaman in my district. It is tragic, but we realize that we have to provide for these soldiers. I am very glad to support the rule and the underlying bill.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 remaining minute.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, as I finish this debate, I want to add in my thanks to others. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS). He, along with Mr. YOUNG, has spent his entire congressional career dedicated to fighting for a strong national defense and for seeing that the men and women who provide that defense are respected in a meaningful way, and that once they have taken off our Nation's uniform, they continue to be respected as veterans. He has been an active leader as chairman of the committee, as ranking member of the committee and in our subcommittee deliberations has continued to be an active voice on behalf of our troops, our veterans and their families; and I thank the gentleman for that.

Finally, I think it's appropriate, Madam Chair, that the last word in this debate from my side are not the words of my own, but the words of America's veterans. I would like to include in the RECORD of this debate letters in support of this legislation from the DAV, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, The American Legion, the Paralyzed Veterans of America and the AMVETS.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
Washington DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies, House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) and its Auxiliary, I would like to express our strongest support for H.R. 3082, the FY 2010 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, which provides record funding levels for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care and benefits programs for fiscal year 2010.

Perhaps even more significant than the FY 2010 funding, the legislation also contains \$48.2 billion in advance appropriations for VA medical care for fiscal year 2011. As you know, advance appropriations for VA health care has been the highest legislative priority for DAV and many other veterans service organizations in recent years. We applaud you, Chairman Obey, House Leadership and other Members whose support led to its inclusion in this bill.

Once enacted into law, advance appropriations for VA medical care will prevent budget stalemates from threatening the quality and timeliness of veterans health care services, a problem that has plagued VA for decades. With this crucial budget reform in place, VA will have the time and assurance necessary to effectively plan how to meet the health care needs of our nation's sick, injured and disabled veterans.

The House vote to approve H.R. 3082 will be a major milestone towards ensuring sufficient, timely and predictable funding for veterans health care programs, and DAV urges all Members of the House to vote in favor of this legislation.

Again, thank you for all that you have done to ensure that veterans, especially disabled veterans, have access to timely and quality medical care today, and for years to come. I look forward to continuing to work

with you in the future to build better lives for America's disabled veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND E. DEMPSEY,
National Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC July 9, 2009.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: On behalf of the 2.2 million men and women of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. and its Auxiliaries. I would like to offer our strong support for H.R. 3082, the FY 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriation, which we understand will be up for a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives this Friday. It is our assessment that this funding legislation will dramatically improve the health care and benefits this nation provides for its former defenders.

Notably, the legislation would transform the health care funding system by, for the first time, providing an advanced appropriation for veterans' health care. Enacting an advanced appropriation is one of the VFW's highest priorities. We strongly believe that this mechanism along with the funding provided in this bill for FY 2011 medical programs will far better allow the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to properly invest in its health care resources, including hiring and retaining top quality health care and other professionals.

The VFW also applauds this bill's historic funding levels for FY 2010. The bill includes \$77.9 billion in finding for veterans programs with \$45.1 billion targeted for veterans' health care. Within that, there is additional funding aimed at some of the biggest issues confronting the veteran population: mental health, access to rural health care and assistance for homeless veterans.

Additionally, we are especially appreciative of the \$1.9 billion in major and minor construction funding contained within the bill. This extra funding, which represents a \$256 million increase over the current year's funding level, will better allow VA to reduce the major projects construction backlog, as well as increasing the number of minor construction projects, many of which are targeted towards safety issues that directly affect the well-being of veterans.

The VFW thanks you for your continuing efforts on behalf of America's veterans. The record funding levels contained in H.R. 3082 demonstrates the ongoing commitment of all veteran's supporters in the House to those who have served the nation in uniform. We salute your leadership and advocacy in support of this bill, and we look forward to working with you to ensure its passage.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: As you and your colleagues consider H.R. 3028, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Appropriations for FY 2010, The American Legion offers its full support, especially for the advance appropriations provision for the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA's) Veterans Health Administration (VHA) in FY 2011.

Overall, H.R. 3028 would provide \$77.9 billion in discretionary spending for FY 2010, including Overseas Contingency Operations funding.

The bill would provide \$48.2 billion in advance appropriations for FY 2011 for three medical accounts of VA: Medical Services; Medical Support and Compliance; and Medical Facilities. This is an eight percent increase compared to FY 2010 and will provide reliable and timely funding to support the delivery of medical care. The amount included in this bill would provide FY 2010 current services level for the start of FY 2011. It is intended to give the Administration stability in execution, provide the subcommittee with continued oversight and the ability to address new initiatives, and allow veterans to have peace of mind when funding bills are delayed.

The FY 2010 recommendation in the bill for Military Construction, Family Housing and BRAC is \$24.6 billion. This funding level fully funds BRAC 2005 at \$7.5 billion, provides an increase of \$140 million for BRAC 1990 to enhance the cleanup of installations closed in prior BRAC rounds, and provides for the modernization of training facilities, as well as the building of child care centers, barracks, and homes. The recommendation reflects the success of the housing privatization program with a reduced need for additional federal funding for family housing construction. It also ensures that the active forces will have a better environment in which to train and operate, as well as an improved quality of life. It also would provide funds to support additional requirements for operations in Afghanistan at \$1.4 billion.

This bill includes two major military construction initiatives. First, it provides \$450 million to accelerate the Army's program to modernize troop housing facilities for trainees. Second, the bill provides an additional \$200 million for a Guard and Reserve initiative to address critical unfunded requirements. This funding would go toward critical unfunded requirements for Army and Air National Guard, as well as the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Reserves.

This bill would also provide \$53.0 billion in discretionary funding for VA for FY 2010. Within this funding increase is provided funding for the Veterans Benefits Administration to hire 1,200 new claims processors.

This increase also would provide for an additional \$4.4 billion for VHA. These funds will allow VA to increase access to services, ensure safer facilities and improve treatment including:

\$4.6 billion for mental health services;
\$3.2 billion for homeless veterans to include the \$26 million for the Presidential Initiative to combat homelessness, \$150 million for the homeless grants and per diem program, and \$20 million for supportive services for low income veterans and families;

\$580 million for medical research to include a \$48 million increase for research to address the critical needs of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans;

\$1.1 billion to address the backlog in non-recurring maintenance at our medical facilities; and

28 new Vet Centers and 30 new CBOCs.

Additionally, this bill continues the rural health initiative and beneficiary travel rates that we provided last year. Language has been included to continue oversight of VHA to ensure that VA provides funding to the medical facilities in a timely manner, delivers comprehensive mental health and substance abuse services, and improves the delivery of care to veterans who live in rural areas.

The National Cemetery Administration is funded at \$250 million, an increase of \$20 mil-

lion above the FY 2009 appropriation. With 164 cemeteries in 39 states and Puerto Rico, the Administration has an extensive backlog of maintenance. The increase will give the Administration additional resources to improve the appearance and condition of cemeteries as identified in the study on veterans' cemeteries which was submitted to the Congress in 2002.

H.R. 3028 would provide an additional \$19.2 million for the Office of Inspector General to provide additional personnel to accomplish financial audit and increased oversight of medical and information technology programs.

The bill includes \$33 billion for Information Technology Systems. This funding will continue the Department's development of improvements to its electronic health record. Other major programs include development of a new financial management system, paperless benefits processing, and cyber security initiatives.

This bill would provide \$1.9 billion for VA's construction—\$256 million above FY 2009. The bill will provide needed funding for five ongoing major construction projects, planning and design funding for seven new projects, and funding for approximately 100 minor construction projects that can be completed in FY 2010.

Finally, the increased funding will enable the Armed Forces Retirement Home to undertake a major capital construction project on its Washington, DC campus as well as begin operations at the Gulfport, Mississippi campus which is being rebuilt from damage it sustained by hurricane Katrina. The increase also would provide \$5.3 million for a project at Arlington National Cemetery to relocate power and telephone lines to allow for an additional 8,000 to 10,000 gravesites.

The American Legion applauds you and your colleagues for their hard work on this critical piece of legislation.

Thank you for your continued commitment to America's veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

STEVE ROBERTSON,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2009.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: On behalf of Paralyzed Veterans of America, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your unwavering support for our nation's sick and disabled veterans, as well as all of the men and women who have so honorably served this country.

PVA appreciates your efforts as Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs to achieve a historic funding level for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) once again this year. Through your leadership, the VA will receive funding for FY 2010 that meets and in some cases exceeds the recommendations of The Independent Budget, co-authored by PVA, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

More importantly, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill also includes approximately \$48.2 billion in advance appropriations for VA medical care accounts—Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities—for FY 2011. By providing the VA with an advance appropriation for FY 2011, the VA will be able to better plan for hiring critical new staff and addressing demand on the health

care system. Approval of advance appropriations represents a truly historic accomplishment that will benefit all veterans.

These actions reflect the priority that you and the House leadership have placed on the needs of the men and women who have so honorably served this country. Once again, we thank you for your tireless efforts on behalf of veterans. We look forward to working with you and all members to ensure that the Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs appropriations bill is approved by the full House.

Sincerely,

CARL BLAKE,
National Legislative Director,
Paralyzed Veterans of America.

AMVETS,
Lanham, MD, July 9, 2009.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: On behalf of AMVETS I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your leadership and continued, undaunting support of America's veterans, servicemembers and their families.

AMVETS wants to recognize your efforts as the Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs for fighting for and securing yet another year of incomparable funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Because of your efforts, the VA will receive an unparalleled budget for Fiscal Year 2010.

AMVETS also would like to extend our deepest gratitude for your efforts in including approximately \$48.2 billion in advanced appropriations for FY 2011. By providing the VA with advanced appropriations for 2011, VA will now have sufficient, timely and predicable funding. This will allow VA to better coordinate for the use of valuable resources, to include hiring of key medical staff and other demands that are unique to the health care setting.

Passage of advanced appropriations is a historic event that will be looked back on as one of the most important improvements to the VA health care system. It is with that, I want to thank you, the House leadership, and all members of Congress who have seen the value in advanced appropriations and have made it a reality.

Again, thank you for your continued support and advocacy for America's veterans.

Veterans serving veterans,

RAYMOND C. KELLEY,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Madam Chair, as per the requirements of the Republican Conference Rules on member requests, I secured the following earmarks in H.R. 3082.

Requesting Member: Congressman FRANK LOBIONDO (NJ-02)

Bill Number: H.R. 3082

Account: Air Force, Military Construction, Air National Guard

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: 177th Fighter Wing

Address of Requesting Entity: 400 Langley Road, Egg Harbor Township, NJ 08234

Description of Request: Provide \$1.7 million for the construction of a properly sited, adequately sized, and configured functional space to support conventional munitions administration, training and maintenance in support of 18 PAA F-16 aircraft to better enable the 177th to perform its Air Sovereignty Alert mission in defense of the homeland.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs ap-

propriations bill and thank Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP for their work in crafting this legislation.

As someone who represents thousands of military veterans and their families, I believe that we have an obligation to provide them with the benefits and treatment they deserve for their years of faithful service. This legislation accomplishes that by providing \$108.9 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, a \$14.5 billion increase over Fiscal Year 2009, when not factoring in stimulus or supplemental funding.

It is estimated that the VA will treat more than 6.1 million patients in 2010, including more than 419,000 veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. To meet this demand, the bill provides important funding for mental health programs, assistance to homeless veterans, and to improve access for veterans in rural areas. The bill also provides vital funding to hire additional claims processors to support the Department's continued effort to reduce the backlog of benefit claims.

I was also pleased to see that the committee included a provision to provide advanced budget authority and funding for fiscal year 2011 for medical related accounts. This is a step to ensure that the VA healthcare system continues to receive a timely and predictable stream of funding without subjecting it to the delays that can arise due to the larger annual budget debates.

In addition to the funds provided for our nation's veterans, I also applaud the committee's work in providing the necessary funding to meet the construction needs of our military. The bill provides \$24.6 billion for construction, facility modernization, and environmental cleanup. Among other construction projects at Ft. Lewis and McChord, I was specifically pleased to see funds included in the bill for the construction of a Joint Access Road between Ft. Lewis and McChord Air Force Base, a project that I specifically requested funding for. These funds will help provide a link between the two installations, alleviate congestion, and provide a deployment route for the air transportation of Army vehicles and equipment.

Again, I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their work on this legislation and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and the bill shall be considered read through page 58, line 6.

The text of that portion of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3082

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent

public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$4,554,906,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$924,484,000 is designated as being for overseas deployments and other activities pursuant to section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, and of which \$450,000,000 shall be for trainee troop housing facilities: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$187,872,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for trainee troop housing facilities: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Army" and under the headings "Army" in the tables entitled "Military Construction" and "Overseas Contingency Operations" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Army" under Public Law 110-329, \$59,500,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$3,757,330,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$182,569,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps" and under the headings "Navy" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$1,833,671,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$474,500,000 is designated as being for overseas deployments and other activities pursuant to section 423(a)(1) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed

\$93,407,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Air Force" and under the headings "Air Force" in the tables entitled "Military Construction" and "Overseas Contingency Operations" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$2,743,526,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$121,442,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" and under the headings "Defense-Wide" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Defense-Wide" under Public Law 110-329, \$25,800,000 are hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$529,129,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$30,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$40,488,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Army National Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an ex-

penditure plan for the funds provided for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Army National Guard" and under the headings "Army National Guard" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$226,126,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$30,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$12,021,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Air National Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Air National Guard" and under the headings "Air National Guard" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$432,516,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$30,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$25,016,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of Army Reserve shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Army Reserve" and under the headings "Army Reserve" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities

for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$125,874,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$20,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements of the Navy Reserve and \$35,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements of the Marine Forces Reserve: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,951,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of Navy Reserve and the Commander, Marine Forces Reserve shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Navy Reserve" and under the headings "Navy Reserve" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$103,169,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$55,000,000 shall be for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$4,669,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief of Air Force Reserve shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an expenditure plan for the funds provided for critical unfunded requirements: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Military Construction, Air Force Reserve" and under the headings "Air Force Reserve" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$234,914,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$273,236,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Army" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$523,418,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$146,569,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$368,540,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$66,101,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Air Force" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$502,936,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$2,859,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the heading "Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide" in

the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$49,214,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,600,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND

For the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374), \$23,225,000, to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of construction, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, as currently authorized by law, \$146,541,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under the headings "Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide" in the table entitled "Military Construction" in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990, established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$536,768,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established by section 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$7,479,498,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress 14 days prior to obligating an amount for a construction project that exceeds or reduces the amount identified for that project in the most recently submitted budget request for this account by 20 percent or \$2,000,000, whichever is less: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply to projects costing less than \$5,000,000, except for those projects not previously identified in any budget submission for this account and exceeding the minor construction threshold under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for

construction, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds made available in this title for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds made available in this title for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to initiate construction of new installations for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or the designee of the Attorney General; (3) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Acts making appropriations for military construction.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this title for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this title may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this title may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this title for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 112. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 113. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this title which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

SEC. 114. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 115. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds made available to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were made available, if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 117. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. Subject to 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883, of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to: (1) the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund; or (2) the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction of military unaccompanied housing in "Military Construction" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided*, That appropriations made available to the Funds shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guaran-

tees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

SEC. 119. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the accounts established by sections 2906(a)(1) and 2906A(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program incurred under 42 USC 3374(a)(1)(A). Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds made available in this title for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: *Provided*, That not more than \$35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days prior notification, or 14 days for a notification provided in an electronic medium pursuant to sections 480 and 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress all operation and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 122. Amounts contained in the Ford Island Improvement Account established by subsection (h) of section 2814 of title 10, United States Code, are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the purposes specified in subsection (i)(1) of such section or until transferred pursuant to subsection (i)(3) of such section.

SEC. 123. None of the funds made available in this title, or in any Act making appropriations for military construction which remain

available for obligation, may be obligated or expended to carry out a military construction, land acquisition, or family housing project at or for a military installation approved for closure, or at a military installation for the purposes of supporting a function that has been approved for realignment to another installation, in 2005 under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), unless such a project at a military installation approved for realignment will support a continuing mission or function at that installation or a new mission or function that is planned for that installation, or unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the cost to the United States of carrying out such project would be less than the cost to the United States of cancelling such project, or if the project is at an active component base that shall be established as an enclave or in the case of projects having multi-agency use, that another Government agency has indicated it will assume ownership of the completed project. The Secretary of Defense may not transfer funds made available as a result of this limitation from any military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project to another account or use such funds for another purpose or project without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress. This section shall not apply to military construction projects, land acquisition, or family housing projects for which the project is vital to the national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees within seven days of a decision to carry out such a military construction project.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 124. During the 5-year period after appropriations available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense", to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 125. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this title may be used for any action that is related to or promotes the expansion of the boundaries or size of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado.

SEC. 126. Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in an account funded under the headings in this title may be transferred among projects and activities within the account in accordance with the reprogramming guidelines for military construction and family housing construction contained in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill and in the guidance for military construction reprogrammings and notifications contained in Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation 7000.14-R, Volume 3, Chapter 7, of December 1996, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION
COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by section 107 and chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code; and burial benefits, the Reinstated Entitlement Program for Survivors, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of title IV of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 541 et seq.) and for other benefits as authorized by sections 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, and chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$47,218,207,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$29,283,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses", "Medical support and compliance", and "Information technology systems" for necessary expenses in implementing the provisions of chapters 51, 53, and 55 of title 38, United States Code, the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to "Medical care collections fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by chapters 21, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61 of title 38, United States Code, \$8,663,624,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under subsection (a) of section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, other than under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of that subsection, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by title 38, United States Code, chapters 19 and 21, \$49,288,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by subchapters I through III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2010, within the resources available, not to exceed \$500,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$165,082,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$29,000, as authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United

States Code: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$2,298,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$328,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by subchapter V of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, \$664,000.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS
FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed transitional housing loan program authorized by subchapter VI of chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, not to exceed \$750,000 of the amounts appropriated by this Act for "General operating expenses" and "Medical support and compliance" may be expended.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department, and including medical supplies and equipment, food services, and salaries and expenses of health-care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, and aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; \$71,840,500,000, plus reimbursements, of which \$37,136,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading for fiscal year 2010, not to exceed \$1,015,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a priority for the provision of medical treatment for veterans who have service-connected disabilities, lower income, or have special needs: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall give priority funding for the provision of basic medical benefits to veterans in enrollment priority groups 1 through 6: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize the dispensing of prescription drugs from Veterans Health Administration facilities to enrolled veterans with privately written prescriptions based on requirements established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the implementation of the program described in the previous proviso shall incur no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That for the Department of Defense/Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund, as authorized by section 8111(d) of title 38, United States Code, a minimum of \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, for any purpose authorized by section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

MEDICAL SUPPORT AND COMPLIANCE

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home,

domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; and administrative and legal expenses of the Department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the Department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); \$10,207,000,000, plus reimbursements, of which \$5,307,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading for fiscal year 2010, not to exceed \$145,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities and other necessary facilities of the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction, and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department; for oversight, engineering, and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving, or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry services, \$10,633,000,000, plus reimbursements, of which \$5,740,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That, of the amount made available under this heading for fiscal year 2010, not to exceed \$145,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided further*, That, of the amount available for fiscal year 2010, \$200,000,000 for non-recurring maintenance shall be allocated in a manner not subject to the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, \$580,000,000, plus reimbursements, to remain available until September 30, 2011.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and repair, alteration or improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Cemetery Administration, \$250,000,000, of which not to exceed \$24,200,000 shall be available until September 30, 2011.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-Wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms, or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$2,083,700,000: *Provided*, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under

paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (11) of section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: *Provided further*, That the Veterans Benefits Administration shall be funded at not less than \$1,690,200,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$111,000,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2011: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase (on a one-for-one replacement basis only) up to two passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

For necessary expenses for information technology systems and telecommunications support, including developmental information systems and operational information systems; for pay and associated cost; and for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including contractual costs associated with operations authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$3,307,000,000, plus reimbursements, to be available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be obligated until the Department of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget; (2) complies with the Department of Veterans Affairs enterprise architecture; (3) conforms with an established enterprise life cycle methodology; and (4) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a reprogramming base letter which provides, by project, the costs included in this appropriation.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, to include information technology, in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$107,000,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2011.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, construction management services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is more than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$1,194,000,000, to remain available until ex-

ended, of which \$16,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612) for claims paid for contract disputes: *Provided*, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, including portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and funds provided for the purchase of land for the National Cemetery Administration through the land acquisition line item, none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for fiscal year 2010, for each approved project shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2010; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2011: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a written report on any approved major construction project for which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$933,030,000 shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified under this heading in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany this bill.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities, including parking projects, under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is equal to or less than the amount set forth in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, \$726,800,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is equal to or less than the amount set forth in such section: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify, or alter existing hospital, nursing home, and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by sections 8131 through 8137 of title 38, United States Code, \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to assist States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, \$42,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2010 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred as necessary to any other of the mentioned appropriations: *Provided*, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and such Committees issue an approval, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 202. Amounts made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010, in this Act or any other Act, under the "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", and "Medical facilities" accounts may be transferred among the accounts: *Provided*, That any transfers between the "Medical services" and "Medical support and compliance" accounts of 1 percent or less of the total amount appropriated to the account in this or any other Act may take place subject to notification from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the amount and purpose of the transfer: *Provided further*, That any transfers between the "Medical services" and "Medical support and compliance" accounts in excess of 1 percent, or exceeding the cumulative 1 percent for the fiscal year, may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued: *Provided further*, That any transfers to or from the "Medical facilities" account may take place only after the Secretary requests from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 203. Appropriations available in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by sections 5901 through 5902 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 204. No appropriations in this title (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", and "Construction, minor projects") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 205. No appropriations in this title shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled to such hospitalization or examination under the laws providing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under sections 7901 through 7904 of title 5, United States Code, or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)), unless reimbursement of the cost of such hospitalization or examination is made to the "Medical services" account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 206. Appropriations available in this title for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations

required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2009.

SEC. 207. Appropriations available in this title shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from sections 3328(a), 3334, and 3712(a) of title 31, United States Code, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable only from "Compensation and pensions".

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2010, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund under section 1920 of title 38, United States Code, the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund under section 1923 of title 38, United States Code, and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund under section 1955 of title 38, United States Code, reimburse the "General operating expenses" and "Information technology systems" accounts for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in such an insurance program during fiscal year 2010 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided further*, That if the cost of administration of such an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2010 which is properly allocable to the provision of each such insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in that insurance program.

SEC. 209. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 210. Funds available in this title or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication under section 319 of title 38, United States Code, for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$35,257,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and \$3,287,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: *Provided*, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: *Provided further*, That amounts received shall be credited to the "General operating expenses" and "Information technology systems" accounts for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 211. No appropriations in this title shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental cost is more than \$1,000,000, unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 212. No funds of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospital care, nursing home care, or medical services provided to any person under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, for a non-service-connected disability described in

section 1729(a)(2) of such title, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require, current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title: *Provided*, That the Secretary may recover, in the same manner as any other debt due the United States, the reasonable charges for such care or services from any person who does not make such disclosure as required: *Provided further*, That any amounts so recovered for care or services provided in a prior fiscal year may be obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which amounts are received.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, proceeds or revenues derived from enhanced-use leasing activities (including disposal) may be deposited into the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts and be used for construction (including site acquisition and disposition), alterations, and improvements of any medical facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such sums as realized are in addition to the amount provided for in "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects".

SEC. 214. Amounts made available under "Medical services" are available—

(1) for furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the Department.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 215. Such sums as may be deposited to the Medical Care Collections Fund pursuant to section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to "Medical services", to remain available until expended for the purposes of that account.

SEC. 216. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall allow veterans who are eligible under existing Department of Veterans Affairs medical care requirements and who reside in Alaska to obtain medical care services from medical facilities supported by the Indian Health Service or tribal organizations. The Secretary shall: (1) limit the application of this provision to rural Alaskan veterans in areas where an existing Department of Veterans Affairs facility or Veterans Affairs-contracted service is unavailable; (2) require participating veterans and facilities to comply with all appropriate rules and regulations, as established by the Secretary; (3) require this provision to be consistent with Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services activities; and (4) result in no additional cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Indian Health Service.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 217. Such sums as may be deposited to the Department of Veterans Affairs Capital Asset Fund pursuant to section 8118 of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to the "Construction, major projects" and "Construction, minor projects" accounts, to remain available until expended for the purposes of these accounts.

SEC. 218. None of the funds available to the Department of Veterans Affairs, in this Act, or any other Act, may be used to replace the current system by which the Veterans Integrated Services Networks select and contract for diabetes monitoring supplies and equipment.

SEC. 219. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks from

conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

SEC. 220. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a quarterly report on the financial status of the Veterans Health Administration.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 221. Amounts made available under the "Medical services", "Medical support and compliance", "Medical facilities", "General operating expenses", and "National Cemetery Administration" accounts for fiscal year 2010, may be transferred to or from the "Information technology systems" account: *Provided*, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall request from the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress the authority to make the transfer and an approval is issued.

SEC. 222. Amounts made available for the "Information technology systems" account may be transferred between projects: *Provided*, That no project may be increased or decreased by more than \$1,000,000 of cost prior to submitting a request to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress to make the transfer and an approval is issued, or absent a response, a period of 30 days has elapsed.

SEC. 223. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with—

(1) section 842 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-115; 119 Stat. 2506); or

(2) section 8110(a)(5) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 224. Of the amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2010, in this Act or any other Act, under the "Medical facilities" account for non-recurring maintenance, not more than 20 percent of the funds made available shall be obligated during the last 2 months of that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the Secretary may waive this requirement after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 225. Section 1925(d)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "appropriation 'General Operating Expenses, Department of Veterans Affairs'" and inserting "appropriations for 'General Operating Expenses and Information Technology Systems, Department of Veterans Affairs'".

SEC. 226. Section 1922(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "administrative costs to the Government for the costs of" and inserting "administrative support financed by the appropriations for 'General Operating Expenses, Department of Veterans Affairs' and 'Information Technology Systems, Department of Veterans Affairs' for".

TITLE III

RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one-for-one replacement basis only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed

\$7,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$61,800,000, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for purposes authorized by section 2109 of title 36, United States Code.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by sections 7251 through 7298 of title 38, United States Code, \$27,115,000, of which \$1,820,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$42,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds available under this heading shall be for construction of a perimeter wall at Arlington National Cemetery. In addition, such sums as may be necessary for parking maintenance, repairs and replacement, to be derived from the Lease of Department of Defense Real Property for Defense Agencies account.

Funds appropriated under this Act may be provided to Arlington County, Virginia, for the relocation of the federally-owned water main at Arlington National Cemetery making additional land available for ground burials.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

TRUST FUND

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$134,000,000, of which \$72,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Washington, District of Columbia and the Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport, Mississippi.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2010 for pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 403. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment,

the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 404. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, except in presentation to Congress itself.

SEC. 405. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 406. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 407. Unless stated otherwise, all reports and notifications required by this Act shall be submitted to the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 408. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a project or program named for an individual serving as a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the United States Congress.

The CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except the amendments printed in House Report 111-195. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

After disposition of the amendments specified in the first section of House Resolution 622, the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer the amendment on behalf of Mr. COHEN of Tennessee. It's an important amendment. I don't think there's any objection to it.

The CHAIR. The gentleman shall be considered the designee of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

Page 33, line 16, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 37, line 14, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I thank the Chair.

I want to salute Mr. COHEN of Tennessee for his leadership in bringing this issue to the House. We are facing tremendous challenges. The number of veterans who need mental health care services, including PTSD services face a tremendous challenge finding enough psychiatrists, psychologists and mental health care professionals to provide the services that these great Americans so very much need. Mr. COHEN has taken the lead in this amendment in providing an additional \$1 million for educational debt forgiveness for mental health care professionals who agree to employment at the Department of Veterans Affairs. I have actually had a number of discussions with VA employees in my district, and I think there is a sense that this kind of incentive might really encourage mental health care professionals who otherwise would not go into the VA system to do so. So I think this is a very important amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition but not to oppose this amendment but to support this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. I thank my colleague from the State of Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for this amendment. We support the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, my amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Texas increases the Medical Services account at the Veterans Administration by \$1M with an offset of the same amount to the General Operating Expenses account.

It is my hope that this modest increase could be used toward the budget of the VA's Education Debt Reduction Program (EDRP).

Started in 1998, the Education and Debt Reduction Program is an excellent asset to VA. The program is a loan repayment and debt cancellation program specifically for VA medical personnel. It helps the VA to recruit and retain the most competitive and qualified professionals.

Over the course of the year, I have encouraged the VA to review its processes for hiring and retaining its doctors, nurses, clinicians, psychologists, psychiatrists and other employees that are so critical to the treatment and care of our veterans.

In years passed, more medical personnel have wanted to participate in EDRP but were unable to enroll because of funding restrictions.

This amendment could directly address this program and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER and staff for considering my amendment.

I also want to applaud Chairman OBEY, subcommittee Chair CHET EDWARDS and staff for crafting a fiscally responsible appropriations bill that will benefit military construction projects, the veterans' affairs administration, and veterans throughout this country.

This appropriations bill took into consideration the most feasible parts of the President's requests as well as the concerns of our veterans and veterans groups.

For years, the Veterans Administration, Veterans Service Organizations, and veterans across the country have fought for advanced funding to ensure that the VA Healthcare system is funded in a timely and predictable fashion.

For the first time, Congress is providing advanced appropriations not just for the upcoming fiscal year but for two years ahead of time. This advanced funding will affect the medical services, medical support and compliance, and medical facilities accounts and will enable the Veterans Hospital in Memphis and Veterans Hospitals throughout the country to plan and implement its programs early.

It offers \$4.6 billion for mental health, the same as the President's request and \$800 million above the budget for 2009. This increase will allow the VA to better deal with the mental health diagnosis, care, and treatment of our courageous veterans.

I support this bill and again I ask for your support of my amendment as offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for debate on the amendment having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chair, I rise to offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. FILNER:

Page 35, line 4, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,500,000)".

Page 37, line 14, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$3,500,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. I thank the Chair. I would like to thank Chairman EDWARDS and Chairman OBEY for the incredible work they have done on this budget for the last, now, 2½ years. As I understand it, we have increased the

health care budget in that time 60 percent. In this bill we have raised the health care budget 11 percent; and in a revolutionary kind of approach, I think, we forward fund the health care items for the VA, and the increase is 8 percent. This is an incredible victory for veterans; and we thank, again, Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. OBEY for leading the charge on this.

You know, in the last 22 years I think we've only had the VA budget approved on time in three out of those 22 years. From now on that VA budget will be approved a year in advance. It will make sure that we have timely and adequate funding, for the VA health care system needs to know what its budget is in order to be able to run efficiently and at high quality. So we thank Mr. EDWARDS for these items. I know there are numerable things in here that we're going to pass that will strengthen health care for our Nation's veterans.

Some of my colleagues may recall that last year we authorized the VA to fund the Office of National Veterans Sports Programs and Special Events at a \$10 million authorization which we believe is the appropriate amount to enhance and improve the quality of life for the men and women who have made a tremendous sacrifice for our country. The underlying bill provides \$6.5 million, as requested by the administration, but it does not provide the full authorized amount. But what this amount does is it increases the level of funding by \$3.5 million. I strongly believe that providing this program the needed funding to assist our injured servicemembers and veterans will enhance and improve the quality of life for these men and women while they heal from their wounds.

Madam Chair, I think all of us have been inspired whenever we have a chance to watch these warrior athletes, those who have been "disabled"—and I put that in quotes—perform at an incredibly high level in these Paralympics with their training. It obviously strengthens their quality of life and their optimism, but it helps us all as we realize not only do people sacrifice life and limb for their country, but we can provide the resources to make sure that they have a full and productive life. So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I would like to take this time to thank the gentleman and Mr. LANGEVIN for their leadership on this amendment. I also want to thank the gentleman for everything he has done in the past 2½ years. Our subcommittee cannot appropriate without his subcommittee authorizing it, and all the accomplishments we've listed absolutely would not have happened without the leadership of Mr. FILNER. And a particular

thanks to Mr. FILNER who has been the national champion in the Congress for advance funding. It's truly a historic initiative this year.

□ 1215

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman. I would yield the balance of my time to the cosponsor of this amendment, Madam Chair, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN). I thank him for his leadership on these issues.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Filner-Langevin amendment to provide full funding to the United States Olympic Committee's Paralympic Veterans Program.

I would like to thank in particular Chairman EDWARDS for his great work in support of our service men and women through increased funding levels in the underlying bill and Chairman FILNER for his continued advocacy for our disabled veterans especially.

The USOC Paralympic program provides a unique opportunity for personal recovery and achievement for our wounded servicemembers who return from combat with serious and life-changing injuries.

Daily physical activity is often the most critical mental and physical aspect of the rehabilitation process. It reduces stress, depression and secondary medical conditions while increasing self-esteem, employment rates and quality of life.

Full funding of the U.S. Paralympic Adaptive Sports Program will expedite the expansion of services and programs to injured veterans.

The USOC has created Paralympic programs in 99 communities, providing access to physical activity and sports opportunities, regardless of skill level, for over 5,000 injured servicemembers and veterans.

Paralympic, community and veteran organizations are partnering with the USOC to invest more than \$40 million in private resources annually to develop programs, provide Paralympic mentors and expand to 250 U.S. communities serving over 8,000 injured servicemembers by 2012.

After all our servicemembers have sacrificed for our country, we have an obligation to provide services and opportunities for them as they return home.

The Paralympic program has already touched thousands of lives, and with additional resources, it can help countless more veterans regain both physical strength and self-esteem. And I urge my colleagues to support the Filner-Langevin amendment.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though we support the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. I yield our time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Is there any remaining time on the majority side?

The CHAIR. No.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment to increase funding for the Office of National Veterans Sports Programs and Special Events by \$3.5 million.

Seven or eight years ago, I had the opportunity to visit the U.S. Olympic training center in San Diego, and I was inspired by the attitude and positive example that our Olympians that train there continue to set for all Americans. It is truly a remarkable place.

Then as I drove away from the training center, I was also upset. I was upset because at that time in history the United States Olympic Committee was embroiled in a scandal. I was very bothered that individuals were seeking to profit off of someone else's ideal, the pursuit of excellence. I then set the course to help reorganize the United States Olympic Committee. I am very pleased that the committee was reorganized. They did great things as we went into the 2004 Olympics and then the 2008 Olympics, summer Olympics on both. Based on the experience and the relationships that developed with the Olympic Committee and the relationships of the VA, we were able to create a memorandum of understanding between the Olympic Committee and the VA to further create these sports programs. That led then to our bipartisan legislation, Public Law 110-389, to authorize a total of \$10 million to fund a VA grant program to increase participation in sports at all levels by disabled athletes.

This program creates a partnership between the VA and the United States Paralympic program and grassroots disabled sports programs such as those sponsored by the Veterans Service Organizations, Disabled Sports U.S.A., and local parks and recreation organizations.

Madam Chair, it is well known that sports are a great venue to rehabilitate a wounded veteran both physically and mentally. We need to offer every possible avenue for our wounded heroes to regain their self-esteem in the face of what are often severe disabilities. By increasing the funding to the full authorization, we will ensure a fast start for the program and maximize its impact on the disabled veteran community.

I want to thank Chairman EDWARDS and Mr. WAMP for meeting this request. I ask all Members to support my amendment. You say, STEVE, "my" amendment? What do you mean? Well, the amendment before the House—are you ready for this—is word for word, comma for comma, period for period the amendment that I submitted to the Rules Committee.

Now bipartisanship is an affirmative act. It requires two people. It is a choice. You can either do things the

partisan way or you can do things the bipartisan way. You see, when I drafted this amendment, I sent my staff down to speak with Mr. FILNER's staff. I made an offer to him that if he wanted to be on this amendment. His staff then said, Mr. FILNER is working on an amendment. The two staffs then exchanged both amendments. My staff said to Mr. FILNER's staff, Your amendment could be subject to a point of order, but if you would like Mr. BUYER to be on your amendment, that's fine.

Mr. FILNER made a choice. He wanted to have his own amendment. So he submitted his amendment to the Rules Committee, which was subject to a point of order. I submitted my amendment to the Rules Committee clean. Clean. It is mystical, almost magical, how my amendment ends up with somebody else's name on it before the House floor. It is truly magic. But in the end, bipartisanship is a wonderful thing, because through that magic and mystery that is what we have here, Mr. Chairman. We got our bipartisanship in the end because the most important thing is these disabled veterans will have an opportunity to use a platform of healing. That is what we are about.

So it is important that we get rid of the politics. That is my quest here. That is why I enjoy working with you, Mr. EDWARDS and ZACK. Stop the games. And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't know all the processes of the timing and who had what amendment, but what I do want to make clear is Mr. BUYER obviously clearly has been a real leader on this effort. So I salute you for your leadership on it and commend you for it.

There was no intention of any partisan politics being involved in this. I'm glad, as you are, at the end of the day because of your work and Mr. FILNER's work and Mr. LANGEVIN's work that these great Americans will be honored. I salute the gentleman for that.

Mr. BUYER. I reclaim my time, you are absolutely right. I applaud Mr. FILNER for his legislation. He worked with me to create that legislation.

But, Mr. FILNER, I want to work with you, and it is a choice. You chose not to, but in the end, through mystery and magic, we got our bipartisanship. So I will continue to extend my arm of the magic dust.

I ask for everyone to support this mystical and magical amendment.

I yield back.

The CHAIR. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mrs. CAPITO:
Page 39, line 14, after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 54, line 21, after each dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for the great work they do for veterans and our military construction around the world.

I appreciate the opportunity today to rise to offer an amendment to the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill that would increase funding for a program that provides free legal services to our veterans under the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims Account.

I am sure all of us as Members of Congress have talked to a veteran that has not received the benefits that they feel they are fairly entitled to. And if that happens, they can appeal the decision in the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. However, as many veterans are on fixed incomes, they cannot afford the costly legal services associated with appealing a Department of Veterans Affairs decision.

The present law entitles certain veterans who wish to appeal to free legal services so that they can receive a fair hearing that they are entitled to without the burden of huge legal fees.

Veterans from throughout my district have expressed their concern that many veterans are struggling with the appeals process, and with so many of our warriors returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, we must take measures to ensure that all of our veterans' needs are provided for.

My amendment would increase the veterans' legal services account by \$1 million, providing for more services for our brave veterans.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important amendment. I appreciate the opportunity to offer it.

I reserve my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition. I want to clarify that I support this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. It is a good amendment. I thank the gentlewoman for offering it. I just want to say I think it is important to send a message that we want all veterans, regardless of their income levels, to have access to the full appeals process. That is what this amendment is about. I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. I appreciate the chairman's support and the support of the ranking member. I yield back my time.

The CHAIR. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 42, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(decreased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 43, line 6, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. My amendment seeks to increase funding for the Grants For Construction of State Veterans Cemeteries account by \$4 million and decrease funding for the Grants for Construction, Minor Projects account by \$4 million.

I have met with a number of veterans in my district for a period of time, and one of the topics we have discussed at length was funding for our veterans cemeteries. There are basically two types of veterans cemeteries: Federal and State. When the original Federal cemeteries began to run out of room, the Federal Government created an optional program, the State Cemetery Grant Program that is administered by the Veterans Administration.

The Veterans Administration provides funding for State Cemeteries through this grant program. And all pending projects are evaluated by the VA and ranked in priority of order. This is not an earmarked program. It is a competitive type and ranking process.

The current priority list, however, shows there are \$151 million worth of projects where the State matching funds are in place and ready to go. In other words, there are at present more than \$150 million worth of unfunded State Cemetery Projects waiting for the Federal matching grant.

Yet the appropriations bill that we now consider provides only \$42 million. Of course the very first priority for the State Cemetery Program is to provide funding for new cemeteries and existing cemeteries that are in need right now. However, this means that many cemeteries which require expansion,

and improvement projects will not receive the funding if we keep it at the current level.

To make matters worse, the program has been underfunded for years even though the number of World War II veterans needing interments will increase rapidly.

My State of New Jersey is home to the BGWC Doyle Veterans Memorial Cemetery. This cemetery has two improvement projects that are waiting for Federal funding.

I communicated this with several VA officials in New Jersey, and they agreed that there is a need for an overall increase in the annual budget for this program, and my amendment would do just that. My amendment will simultaneously decrease the Grants for Construction for Minor Projects. It basically means we will put the money today for the use of the veterans that need it today and deal later with some administrative changes and costs like that.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise to claim my time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment. I commend the gentleman for this. I have seen firsthand what it means to our living veterans to know that they will have a place of honor to be remembered by their loved ones and the country which they served.

The State Veterans Cemetery Program is a great State-Federal partnership. This is a tremendously important amendment. I'm glad to support it.

I yield back the rest of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Before the gentleman sits down, I wanted to say thank you to the gentleman on the area of cemeteries and dealing with our heroes in the past for the work we have done together here, and the comments he made years ago in the Budget Committee dealing with the situation of spouses of our veterans as well and making sure that they are adequately taken care of as well. Besides this matter that is before us today, I just want to say thanks for your work in those areas as well.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SESSIONS: Page 58, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 409. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report detailing the current and planned use of Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy (hereinafter in this section referred to as "HBOT") in Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities. Such report shall include the number of veterans being treated with HBOT, the types of conditions being treated with HBOT and their respective success rates, and the current inventory of hyperbaric chambers.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Chairman, the amendment that I bring forth today requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit a report to Congress on the use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy, commonly known as HBOT, in VA medical facilities. My active interests in hyperbaric therapy over the last 3 years has led me to more understanding of the critical function it has performed and performs even today, and the promising potential it has for injured active-duty soldiers and veterans.

I would like to briefly comment on the currently approved uses of HBOT and the promising research into hyperbaric therapy as a possible treatment for traumatic brain injury, known as TBI.

Hyperbaric oxygen therapy uses a chamber to administer oxygen in particular dosages for already FDA-approved treatments, many of which provide remarkable benefits to our injured veterans. The oxygen acts as a catalyst in healing wounds which often fail to respond to other medical and surgical procedures and usually lack the blood circulation and blood oxygen levels necessary to heal.

These treatments include, but are not limited to: treating nonhealing diabetic foot wounds; advancing healing for crush injuries such as gunshot wounds, falls, and vehicle accidents; support for individuals suffering from exceptional blood loss; and advanced assistance in reconstructing complex wounds which require the transferring of tissues from one part of the body to another.

HBOT frequently saves a veteran from an expensive, painful, life-altering, and potentially life-threatening amputation of an arm, a leg or a foot. This therapy has been extremely impressive, and I look forward to hearing the VA's report on its current and planned use of hyperbaric therapy in its medical facilities.

Since 2006, I have been actively engaged in researching a new cross-application of hyperbaric therapy for treating another very common and life-threatening nonhealing wound: TBI,

traumatic brain injury. I have held numerous meetings with physicians, Ph.D.'s, scientists, government officials, and our servicemen and women, the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, all regarding the treatment of TBI with hyperbaric therapy being available to them.

Over the past year, I have seen a multitude of evidence from numerous cases that show substantial progress in brain function of our injured soldiers after treatment with hyperbaric oxygen.

As we speak today, veterans all across our country are suffering from TBI, and they are in the process of receiving hyperbaric therapy from private physicians with amazing real-world results. Many of these soldiers who could not hold a job or properly care for their families, they sometimes can't even leave their own bed, or others who have suicidal tendencies, have returned to active duty, employment, school, and perhaps more importantly, to the life of their own families.

These results have led me to believe in the promising potential of healing our brain-injured soldiers suffering from TBI and PTSD.

The Defense Center on Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, under the command of Brigadier General Loree Sutton, is conducting a study into hyperbaric therapy for the treatment of TBI, and it is scheduled to be delivering study results in December of 2010. I highly encourage my colleague to join me over the next few months in engaging with General Sutton and the Department of Defense on this promising new application of hyperbaric therapy.

My amendment today is very simple. It asks for the VA to submit a report

on their current and planned use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy. By knowing today how it is used, we can have a greater understanding of how we can assist our injured veterans tomorrow. So we are asking how the VA uses it today and where those facilities are so we can be prepared to work, when the Department of Defense has their answer available soon, to where we then coincide that with the veterans who are home with us today.

Madam Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) both engaged me yesterday in the Rules Committee on this amendment. I believe there could be widespread agreement that this is a good application for both of us to vote for.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but let me make it clear I am very honored to support this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I commend Mr. Sessions for his interest in pursuing innovative health care procedures for our veterans. We provided tremendous increases for health care funding for our veterans over the last 2½ years. In addition to that funding and the oversight of that funding, we need to encourage the VA to be innovative. We want them to be prudent and careful. Perhaps, as we go through to conference, we should encourage the VA not only to provide a report on where it is used and how often it is using hyperbaric oxygen therapy, but perhaps we ought to work with them, en-

couraging them to do some studies to look into the potential opportunities of this type of care making a real difference in the lives of our veterans.

I am proud to join with the gentleman in support of his amendment.

I yield to the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, for any comments he would care to make.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank, actually, the Rules Committee yesterday for agreeing to this amendment coming before the House today.

Mr. Sessions has persevered on this issue now for some time. He deserves great credit. It has tremendous potential, and I look forward to working with the chairman and Mr. SESSIONS as we go forward. I also support the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111-195.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available from the following Department of Defense military construction accounts for the following projects:

Account	Location	Project	Amount
Army	Alabama: Anniston Depot	Industrial Area Electric System Upgrade.	\$3,300,000
Army	Alabama: Fort Rucker	Water Survival Training Facility	\$401,000
Army	Alabama: Redstone Arsenal	Gate 7 Access Control Point	\$3,550,000
Air Force	Arkansas: Little Rock AFB	Security Forces Operations Facility	\$1,400,000
Army NG	Arkansas: West Memphis	Readiness Center	\$1,240,000
Army	Arizona: Fort Huachuca	Fire Station, Two Company	\$6,700,000
Navy	California: Bridgeport MWTC	Commissary	\$6,830,000
Air Force	California: Los Angeles AFB	Consolidated Parking Area Ph 1	\$8,000,000
Air Reserve	California: March ARB	Small Arms Firing Range	\$9,800,000
Navy	California: Monterey NSA	Marine Meteorology Center	\$10,240,000
Navy	California: Point Loma NB	Add/Alt Marine Mammal Surgical Center.	\$2,330,000
Air Force	California: Travis AFB	Taxiway Mike Bypass Road	\$6,000,000
Air Force	Colorado: Peterson AFB	East Gate Realignment	\$7,200,000
Air NG	Connecticut: Bradley IAP	CNAF Beddown--Upgrade Facilities	\$9,000,000
Navy	Connecticut: New London NSB	MK-48 Torpedo Magazine	\$6,570,000
Air Force	Florida: Eglin AFB	Flight Test Operations Facility (413 FLTS).	\$9,400,000
Air Force	Florida: MacDill AFB	Mission Support Facility	\$384,000
Air Force	Florida: MacDill AFB	Consolidated Communications Facility	\$21,000,000
Navy	Florida: Mayport NS	Fitness Center	\$26,360,000
Navy	Florida: Panama City NSA	Joint Diver A-School Dormitory	\$520,000
Navy	Georgia: Albany MCLB	Weapons Maintenance Hardstand Facility.	\$4,870,000
Army NG	Georgia: Hunter AAF	Readiness Center	\$8,967,000
Air Force	Georgia: Robins AFB	Hot Cargo Pad/Taxiway	\$6,200,000
Air Force	Hawaii: Hickam AFB	Ground Control Tower	\$4,000,000
Army NG	Hawaii: Kapelei	Readiness Center (JFHQ)	\$5,446,000
Navy	Hawaii: Pearl Harbor NSY	Drydock 2 Starboard Waterfront Facility.	\$850,000
Army NG	Iowa: Camp Dodge	Motor Vehicle Storage Buildings, Freedom Center.	\$1,963,000

Account	Location	Project	Amount
Army NG	Iowa: Davenport	Army Aviation Support Facility Add/Alt.	\$2,000,000
Army NG	Iowa: Fairfield	Field Maintenance Shop Add/Alt	\$2,000,000
Army NG	Iowa: Iowa Falls	Add/Alt Readiness Center	\$2,000,000
Air Force	Idaho: Mountain Home AFB	Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex	\$690,000
Air NG	Illinois: Lincoln Capital Airport	Relocate Base Entrance	\$3,000,000
Air Force	Illinois: Scott AFB	Aeromedical Evacuation Facility	\$7,400,000
Navy	Indiana: Crane NSWC	Strategic Weapons System Engineering Facility.	\$510,000
Air NG	Kansas: McConnell AFB	Upgrade DCGS	\$8,700,000
Army	Kentucky: Fort Campbell	Physical Fitness Complex	\$900,000
Army	Kentucky: Fort Campbell	Chapel Complex	\$14,400,000
Army NG	Kentucky: Frankfort	Joint Forces Headquarters	\$334,000
Army NG	Kentucky: London	Phase IV Aviation Operations Facility	\$1,805,000
Air NG	Kentucky: Standiford Field	Contingency Response Group Facility	\$600,000
Army	Louisiana: Fort Polk	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	\$6,400,000
Navy	Maine: Portsmouth NSY	Consolidation of Structural Shops	\$2,000,000
Navy	Maine: Portsmouth NSY	Gate 2 Security Improvements	\$7,090,000
Army	Maryland: Aberdeen Proving Ground	Information Processing Node, Ph 2	\$956,000
Air Force	Maryland: Andrews AFB	Physical Fitness Facility	\$930,000
Navy	Maryland: Carderock NSWC DET	RDTE Support Facility, Ph 2	\$6,520,000
Army	Maryland: Fort Detrick	Auditorium and Training Center Expansion.	\$7,400,000
Army	Maryland: Fort Meade	Intersection, Rockenbach Road & Cooper Avenue.	\$2,350,000
Navy	Maryland: Indian Head NSWC	Advanced Energetics Research Lab Complex, Ph 2.	\$16,460,000
Air NG	Massachusetts: Barnes ANGB	F-15 Aircraft Ready Shelters	\$8,100,000
Air NG	Massachusetts: Hanscom AFB	Joint Forces Operations Center--ANG Share.	\$1,500,000
Army NG	Michigan: Camp Grayling	Barracks Replacement, Ph 2	\$440,000
Army NG	Michigan: Fort Custer (Augusta)	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS).	\$7,732,000
Air NG	Minnesota: Minneapolis-St.Paul IAP	Add/Alt Starbase Facility	\$1,900,000
Air NG	Mississippi: Gulfport-Biloxi RAP	Relocate Base Entrance	\$6,500,000
Army	Missouri: Fort Leonard Wood	Health Clinic	\$7,800,000
Air Force	Missouri: Whiteman AFB	EOD Operations Complex	\$7,400,000
Air Force	Missouri: Whiteman AFB	Land Acquisition North and South Boundaries.	\$5,500,000
Army NG	Montana: Fort Harrison	Add/Alt Troop Medical Facility	\$1,750,000
Army NG	Nevada: Las Vegas	Civil Support Team Ready Building	\$727,000
Air NG	New Jersey: Atlantic City IAP	Munitions Administration Facility	\$1,700,000
Air Force	New Jersey: McGuire AFB	Warfighter and Family Support Center	\$7,900,000
Army	New Jersey: Picatinny Arsenal	Ballistic Evaluation Facility, Ph 2	\$10,200,000
Air Force	New Mexico: Cannon AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	\$450,000
Air Force	New Mexico: Holloman AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	\$10,400,000
Air Force	New Mexico: Kirtland AFB	Add to Space RDTE Operations Center	\$5,800,000
Army	New York: Fort Drum	All Weather Marksmanship Facility	\$8,200,000
Air NG	New York: Fort Drum	Reaper LRE Beddown (Wheeler Sack AAF).	\$2,700,000
Air Reserve	New York: Niagara Falls ARS	Indoor Small Arms Range	\$5,700,000
Army NG	North Carolina: East Flat Rock	Readiness Center Add/Alt	\$2,516,000
Army	North Carolina: Fort Bragg	Field Support Brigade Headquarters	\$720,000
Army NG	North Carolina: Fort Bragg	Tactical UAS Support Facility	\$6,038,000
Air Force	North Carolina: Seymour Johnson AFB	Radar Approach Control Complex, Ph 1	\$6,900,000
Air Force	North Dakota: Minot AFB	Control Tower/Base Operations Facility	\$1,710,000
Army NG	Ohio: Beightler Armory	Joint Forces Headquarters (JOC) Addition.	\$2,000,000
Army NG	Ohio: Ravenna	Shoot House	\$2,000,000
Air NG	Ohio: Toledo Express Airport	Multi-Use Instructional Facility	\$2,000,000
Air Force	Ohio: Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace West Ramp, Ph 2	\$10,600,000
Air NG	Ohio: Zanesville ANGS	New Supply Warehouse	\$1,000,000
Air Force	Oklahoma: Tinker AFB	T-9 Noise Suppressor	\$5,100,000
Army NG	Oregon: Camp Rilea	Water Supply System	\$368,000
Army NG	Oregon: Polk County	Readiness Center	\$12,100,000
Army NG	Pennsylvania: Luzerne	Readiness Center	\$924,000
Navy	Rhode Island: Newport NS	Renovate Perry Hall	\$8,530,000
Air NG	South Carolina: McEntire JRB	Joint Use Armed Forces Reserve Center	\$1,300,000
Air Force	South Carolina: Shaw AFB	Add/Alter USAFCENT Headquarters	\$21,183,000
Air NG	South Dakota: Joe Foss Field	Add to Munitions Maintenance Complex	\$1,300,000
Army Reserve	Texas: Bryan	Army Reserve Center	\$12,200,000
Army	Texas: Fort Bliss	Access Control Points	\$6,500,000
Army	Texas: Fort Hood	Family Life Center	\$8,500,000
Navy Reserve	Texas: Fort Worth NAS/JRB	Replace Joint Base Communications Building.	\$6,170,000
Air NG	Texas: Kelly Field Annex	Add/Alt Aircraft Maintenance Shops	\$7,900,000
Navy	Texas: Kingsville NAS	Solar Panel Array	\$4,470,000
Army Reserve	Texas: Robstown	Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility.	\$10,200,000
Air Force	Utah: Hill AFB	PCC Apron NW End Taxiway A	\$5,100,000
Army NG	Vermont: Ethan Allen Range	BOQ Add/Alt	\$1,996,000
Navy	Virginia: Dahlgren NSWC	Electromagnetic Research & Engineering Fac Ph 2.	\$3,660,000
Defense-Wide	Virginia: Dam Neck Annex	SOF Force Protection Improvements	\$4,100,000
Army	Virginia: Fort Lee	Defense Access Roads	\$5,000,000

Account	Location	Project	Amount
Navy	Washington: Everett NS	Small Craft Launch	\$3,810,000
Air Force	Washington: Fairchild AFB	Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Facility	\$4,150,000
Army	Washington: Fort Lewis	Fort Lewis-McChord AFB Joint Access	\$9,000,000
Navy	Washington: Indian Island NM	Ordnance Storage Pads with Covers	\$13,130,000
Army NG	West Virginia: Logan/Mingo County	Readiness Center	\$501,000
Army NG	West Virginia: Parkersburg	Readiness Center	\$2,234,000
Army NG	West Virginia: Parkersburg	Field Maintenance Shop	\$967,000
Air NG	Wisconsin: General Mitchell IAP	Add/Alt KC-135 Corrosion Control Hangar	\$5,000,000
Air Force	Guam: Andersen AFB	Postal Service Center	\$3,500,000
Army NG	Puerto Rico: Camp Santiago	Urban Assault Course	\$1,669,000

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, this amendment would simply strike funding for all of the Member-requested earmarks for military construction projects and would return the money to the various accounts.

I am not here to dispute the merits of any of the earmarks in this account. I have no doubt that each of these projects will vastly improve the quality of life for military servicemembers and for their families, but that is not the issue here. I am here to draw attention to what we have talked about before, and that is the spoils system that these earmarks represent.

There are 109 Member-requested earmarks in the bill; 43 of them are going to powerful Members of Congress who serve in leadership or as appropriators, committee chairs, or ranking members. That represents about 40 percent of the share of earmarks being taken by less than 24 percent of the Members of the House.

I am sure my colleagues will tell me that these projects are sorely needed at the military bases they are earmarked for and that servicemembers will suffer without them, but what about the many installations that don't receive Member-requested earmarks in the bill and the servicemembers stationed there?

Neither Camp Lejeune nor Camp Pendleton received any Member-requested earmarks in the bill. Each of these camps houses a Marine Expeditionary Force comprised of tens of thousands of marines who deploy with great frequency. I am willing to bet that each of these installations have suggestions for new structures to build. Why haven't they received any earmarks in this bill? The answer is pretty simple: Neither of them resides in a district represented by a powerful Member of Congress.

The earmarks in this bill total more than \$578 million. That is just a little bit less than the earmark totals for the CJS and Ag bills put together. Of that dollar amount, more than \$240 million are being taken home by powerful Members of Congress. That is nearly 41 percent. When you take into account earmark dollars secured by rank-and-file Members in conjunction with pow-

erful Members, that number jumps to more than \$300 million, or 52 percent.

So just to reiterate, the earmarks in this bill favor powerful Members by a ratio of 2 to 1. One-quarter of the Members of this House are associated with more than half of the earmark dollars in this bill.

I wish I could say that this is an anomaly, but this is pretty consistent with the rest of the appropriation bills we have considered so far this year, and I have a chart that demonstrates that.

Earmark dollars associated with powerful Members of Congress. Again, those are committee chairs, leadership, or those on the Appropriations Committee, representing 24 percent of the Members in this body. In the CJS bill that we considered earlier, 58 percent of the earmarked dollars went to just 24 percent of the Members.

In the Homeland Security bill, 68 percent of the earmarked dollars went to just 24 percent of the Members of the House.

In the Interior bill, 64 percent of the earmarked dollars went to just 24 percent of the Members of the House.

In the Agriculture bill, 67 percent of the earmarked dollars go to just 24 percent of the Members of the House.

And in this bill, 52 percent of the earmarked dollars go to just 24 percent of the Members of this House. That is a pretty stark pattern.

There are different types of earmarks, obviously. There are those that are simply wasteful. We see those for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and whatever else that is easy to laugh at. Sometimes it is small amounts of money and sometimes it is a lot larger.

And then there are those, particularly in defense bills, where you are giving no-bid contracts to private companies. There is often a pattern of campaign contributions coming back to Members who secure no-bid contracts in private companies. That does not describe what is going on here.

These earmarks, as I mentioned, I have no doubt that they are for a legitimate purpose. But here is another problem with earmarking: It represents a spoils system where rank-and-file Members of the House are not given access to those that others are.

In the Homeland Security bill, it was particularly stark. As I mentioned, a huge percentage, nearly 70 percent, went to just 24 percent of the body. In fact, more than 50 percent went to just

14 percent, those represented on the Appropriations Committee, and these were for predisaster mitigation programs, flood control districts and the like. I don't think Mother Nature decides, I'm going to hit those districts represented by appropriators more than I am going to hit other districts. It is just because they are able to do it, and so they do it. So the rest of the country that competes for these grants on a competitive basis has, at least in that case, 25 percent of that account is earmarked before they can even compete for the rest of the grants that are given out on a competitive basis. Madam Chair, that is just not fair. That is just not the way we should do this. I think we ought to rethink this and we ought to strike that funding in this bill.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in strong opposition to this ill-advised amendment.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I would like to begin by yielding to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), the chairman of the House Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Chairman EDWARDS and my good friend, Mr. WAMP—and to my other good friend, Mr. FLAKE—for bringing this responsible bill to the floor.

□ 1245

I rise in opposition to the Flake amendment. The Military Construction authorization and appropriations process is a tedious process, and it requires close coordination with my good friends on both sides of the aisle, Chairman Edwards and Mr. WAMP, and members of the committee. It also requires extensive coordination with the Department of Defense.

The committees critically review the administration's request and ensure that facilities are built for a sound requirement. The committees also ensure that the projects are executable and validated for the correct costs.

This process forces a dialogue with the local installation commanders that requires that they communicate their needs to their Representatives in Congress. This dialogue is critical to ensuring Members of Congress that they have a complete understanding of local military requirements and can correctly advocate for our Nation's defense. It is a hard process, but in the

end it ensures that the right facilities are built at the right time and at the right location. I would not be executing my oath of office if we did anything else.

I would remind my colleagues that each of these projects has already been debated in the National Defense Authorization Act.

I recommend that my colleagues vote “no” on the Flake amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, reclaiming the rest of my time, I have great respect for the principled position of Mr. FLAKE. I disagree with it. He believes that basically the administration should decide in 100 percent of the cases where America’s tax dollars should go. I believe article I of the Constitution gives the Congress the responsibility for that.

And I feel very strongly that, while he has a principled position, he misstates and inaccurately states the process by which these project decisions were made. These were made based on what was right for our military troops and their families. The vast majority of these congressionally designated projects have gone through the Department of Defense approval process, and the Department of Defense said they were needed.

Now, he said he simply wanted to strike the earmarks. Despite his intentions, let me tell you the impact, because it’s not simple intentions; it’s actual impact where amendments make a difference.

If his amendment passes, we will cut \$56 million for 16 National Guard readiness centers and Reserve centers. We will cut \$44 million for nine military ranges and training facilities. We will cut \$83 million for 16 quality-of-life facilities such as housing, clinics, and military family centers. We will cut \$98 million for 16 projects to improve force protection, facilities for emergency responders, and flightline safety. We will cut \$86 million for 18 equipment maintenance and storage facilities and \$47 million for seven military research and testing facilities.

We will cut a project to provide properly sized and configured storage space for Mark-48 torpedoes at one of our key submarine bases, and a new hardstand for weapons maintenance at the Marine Corps’ East Coast Logistics Base will be lost.

The gentleman would cut a new chapel complex to replace more than 15,000 square feet of trailers and World War II-era facilities. And he would cut a platoon-sized machine gun range at the Army’s Joint Readiness Training Center.

I know he has no intention of harming our military—I would never accuse him of that—but in my opinion, he misrepresented the process by which these decisions were made. And I think not only Democrats, but my Republican colleagues, would agree that this has been a fair, legitimate process.

And by the way, it should be no surprise to anyone that Members of Con-

gress who ask to be on the Armed Services Committee and the Military Construction Appropriations Committee are Members who represent military installations. So the allegation that because they get a higher percentage of congressionally designated funding compared to other Members somehow suggests a spoils system is just simply dead wrong, and I reject it categorically.

I would yield any time to my friend, the ranking member, Mr. WAMP, for any comments he would care to make.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the gentleman yield for a 15-second clarification?

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I will yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman mentioned that this would cut several programs. This does not cut one dollar. It simply returns the money to the account and the military services would decide where to best—

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Reclaiming my time, the amendment would cut these projects out of this bill.

I would be glad to yield to Mr. WAMP for any comments he would like to make.

The CHAIR. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-195.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

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 for the processing of new enhanced use leases in the three original National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (soldier’s home branches) established before 1868.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment which would prohibit the use of

funds in this bill for the processing of enhanced use leases at the original National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers or Soldiers’ Homes established before 1868.

My amendment would protect these soldiers’ homes established before 1868, these historic Civil War-era buildings or the campuses on which they reside, from diversion from veteran activities to commercial purposes and it would retain these national treasures for future generations of veterans, their families, and an interested public.

The concept of a National Asylum for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was first established by congressional legislation and approved by President Abraham Lincoln on March 3, 1865. The National Asylum was established for officers and men of the volunteer forces of the United States who had been totally disabled by wounds received or sickness contracted while in the line of duty during the Civil War. In all, 11 national soldiers’ homes across the country were opened and eventually integrated into the newly established Veterans Administration in 1930. These old homes reflect how the Forefathers chose to care for and honor the soldiers who fought to keep the country united as one Nation. Their creation changed the Nation’s attitude toward the care of soldiers after battle.

Built in 1867, the Milwaukee Soldiers’ Home, located in my district in the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, was one of the three original soldiers’ homes; the other two are located in Maine and Ohio.

In late 2005, I learned that the VA and the city of Milwaukee were aggressively pursuing an enhanced use lease proposal that included the possible commercial development of several 19th century soldiers’ homes buildings located on the Milwaukee VA grounds, much to the dismay and against the wishes of the Milwaukee veterans community, who wanted to protect these historic buildings for veterans purposes.

The Allied Council of Veterans and their membership approached my office with their concerns and they alerted me to the potential outcomes of the proposal and reported that they had had no input in the ongoing lease discussions.

Currently, the Milwaukee Soldiers’ Home is on the National Park Service list to be designated for a place on its National Register of Historic Places. This will give the veterans an even stronger voice against any attempts to lease out for commercial purposes these historic buildings.

I urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to join me in standing with veterans to protect these historic soldiers’ homes grounds for veterans’ uses by voting “yes” on my amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I

don't oppose this amendment. I support this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I want to thank the gentlewoman for raising this issue, and I am glad to support her effort on this.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 62, noes 358, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

AYES—62

Bachmann	Gohmert	Minnick
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Myrick
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Nunes
Broun (GA)	Inglis	Pence
Brown (SC)	Issa	Petri
Campbell	Jenkins	Pitts
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Cassidy	Kirk	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Conaway	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Cooper	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Deal (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duncan	Lummis	Shadegg
Ehlers	Marchant	Stearns
Flake	Marshall	Sullivan
Foxx	McCaul	Tiberi
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Westmoreland
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	McHenry	

NOES—358

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Capuano
Ackerman	Bocchieri	Cardoza
Aderholt	Boehner	Carnahan
Adler (NJ)	Bonner	Carney
Akin	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Alexander	Boozman	Carter
Altmire	Bordallo	Castle
Andrews	Boren	Castor (FL)
Arcuri	Boswell	Chandler
Austria	Boucher	Childers
Baca	Boyd	Christensen
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Clarke
Baird	Braley (IA)	Clay
Baldwin	Bright	Cleaver
Barrow	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Bartlett	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Bean	Ginny	Cohen
Becerra	Buchanan	Cole
Berkley	Burgess	Connolly (VA)
Berman	Burton (IN)	Conyers
Berry	Butterfield	Costa
Biggert	Buyer	Costello
Bilbray	Calvert	Courtney
Bilirakis	Camp	Crenshaw
Bishop (GA)	Cao	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Capito	Cuellar
Blackburn	Capps	Culberson

Cummings	Kucinich	Reyes
Dahlkemper	Langevin	Richardson
Davis (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (IL)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Rooney
Davis (TN)	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Roskam
DeGette	Lee (NY)	Ross
Delahunt	Levin	Rothman (NJ)
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dent	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Rush
Dicks	Loebbeck	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Loftgren, Zoe	Sablan
Doggett	Lowey	Salazar
Donnelly (IN)	Lucas	Sanchez, Linda
Doyle	Lujan	T.
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Sanchez, Loretta
Driehaus	E.	Sarbanes
Edwards (MD)	Lynch	Scalise
Edwards (TX)	Maffei	Schakowsky
Ellison	Maloney	Schauer
Ellsworth	Manzullo	Schiff
Emerson	Markey (CO)	Schmidt
Eshoo	Markey (MA)	Schock
Etheridge	Massa	Schrader
Fallin	Matheson	Schwartz
Farr	Matsui	Scott (GA)
Fattah	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (VA)
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Fleming	McCollum	Sestak
Forbes	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Fortenberry	McGovern	Sherman
Foster	McIntyre	Shimkus
Frank (MA)	McKeon	Shuler
Frelinghuysen	McMahon	Shuster
Gallely	McMorris	Simpson
Gerlach	Rodgers	Sires
Giffords	McNerney	Skelton
Gonzalez	Meeke (FL)	Slaughter
Gordon (TN)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NE)
Grayson	Melancon	Smith (NJ)
Green, Al	Mica	Smith (TX)
Green, Gene	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Griffith	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Grijalva	Miller (MI)	Souder
Guthrie	Miller (NC)	Space
Gutierrez	Miller, Gary	Speier
Hall (NY)	Miller, George	Spratt
Halvorson	Mitchell	Stark
Hare	Mollohan	Stupak
Harman	Moore (KS)	Sutton
Harper	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Hastings (FL)	Moran (KS)	Taylor
Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)	Teague
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Terry
Herger	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Herseeth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (MS)
Higgins	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (PA)
Hill	Murtha	Thornberry
Himes	Nadler (NY)	Tiahrt
Hinchoy	Napolitano	Tierney
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Titus
Hirono	Nye	Tonko
Hodes	Oberstar	Towns
Holden	Obey	Tsongas
Holt	Olson	Turner
Honda	Olver	Upton
Hoyer	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Hunter	Pallone	Velázquez
Inslee	Pascarell	Visclosky
Israel	Pastor (AZ)	Walden
Jackson (IL)	Paulsen	Walz
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Wamp
Johnson, E. B.	Perriello	Wasserman
Johnson, Sam	Peters	Schultz
Jones	Peterson	Waters
Jordan (OH)	Pierluisi	Watson
Kagen	Pingree (ME)	Watt
Kanjorski	Platts	Waxman
Kennedy	Poe (TX)	Weiner
Kildee	Polis (CO)	Welch
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pomeroy	Wexler
Kilroy	Posey	Whitfield
Kind	Price (NC)	Wilson (OH)
King (IA)	Putnam	Wittman
King (NY)	Quigley	Wolf
Kingston	Radanovich	Woolsey
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rahall	Wu
Kissell	Rangel	Yarmuth
Kosmas	Rehberg	Young (AK)
Kratovil	Reichert	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Barrett (SC)	Engel
Bishop (UT)	Faleomavaega
Blunt	Fudge

Hoekstra	Klein (FL)	Paul
Jackson-Lee	Mack	Payne
(TX)	McHugh	
Kaptur	Norton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1320

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, BOEHNER, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Messrs. MOORE of Kansas, JOHNSON of Georgia, BURTON of Indiana, AKIN and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BROWN of South Carolina and HALL of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 528, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2010”.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Ms. BALDWIN, 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. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 622, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Pursuant to House Resolution 622, the question on adoption of the amendments will be put en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Austria	Barton (TX)
Ackerman	Baca	Bean
Adler (NJ)	Bachmann	Becerra
Akin	Bachus	Berkley
Alexander	Baird	Berman
Altmire	Baldwin	Berry
Andrews	Barrow	Biggert
Arcuri	Bartlett	Bilbray

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo

Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Flimer
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
 Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Chaffetz
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
 E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarty (CA)
McCarty (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
 Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak

Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Townes
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
 Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions bills, as is the custom, will be announced at the close of business today.

In addition to the suspension bills, we will also consider the 2010 Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriation Act and the 2010 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, this is our first colloquy since the July 4 recess, and we are scheduled to be in session for 3 more weeks before the next recess. So, Madam Speaker, I'd ask the gentleman if he could give us a sense of what will be considered on the floor beyond next week.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I expect to complete the appropriations bills and also the large item that will be on the agenda is the health care legislation that we hope to pass before we leave on the August break. Prior to that, I intend to have on the floor a provision dealing with statutory PAYGO.

NAYS—3

Campbell
Flake
Stark

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Barrett (SC)
Fudge
Granger
Graves
Heller
Hoekstra
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
Klein (FL)
Marchant
Marshall
McHugh
Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1337

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 529, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I missed two rollcall votes on Friday, July 10, 2009. I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 528 and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 529 of H.R. 3082, the Fiscal Year 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote on the amendment to H.R. 3082 of Mr. FLAKE because we were detained in a hearing on the Honduran coup. Had I been present on the floor of the House, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland,

□ 1345

We have not yet determined exactly whether that bill will be free standing or whether it will be on another bill that would be reported to the House. In addition, the food safety bill is possible. The committees are still working on other matters, and we hope to have the food safety issue resolved. That came out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, but there are a number of other committees, including the Agriculture Committee and your own committee, Ways and Means, that have expressed interest in that.

Those are essentially the items that we intend to deal with between now and the August break.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, the Senate is scheduled to be in session 1 week longer than we are in the House, and I ask the gentleman if he expects us or anticipates our working into August, as the Senate is scheduled to do.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman I think knows, because I think he got a preliminary schedule from my office which had us working the first week in August, I received comments from both sides of the aisle from a lot of Members who have young children, school-aged children. One of the realities is, we called around

the country, and a lot of the schools are going back into session anywhere between August 15 and August 25, some later, but a lot of the schools, and Members on both sides of the aisle were concerned that if we did not break on July 31 that they would be unable to have a vacation with their children during the summer months. As a result, we concluded that we would end our session on the 31st, a week before the Senate concluded. Originally, as I say, we were both scheduled to be in the first week of August. Obviously, as the gentleman knows, the good news is that because of our rules, we are able to get our work done more quickly than the Senate is able to get its work done. So we think that we can accomplish what we need to accomplish within the time frame available.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Speaking of rules, I want to, first of all, thank the gentleman for the ongoing dialogue that he and I have had over the last several weeks regarding how the House will go forward in terms of deliberating on appropriations bills. I sincerely express my gratitude for his engagement, his patience and the back and forth; and I know that we have been unsuccessful thus far in getting to what I believe is a mutually desirable goal, which is to return to the precedents of the House in terms of open rules surrounding appropriations bills.

Madam Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, he has noticed two approps bills for next week, and I would like to ask him, what kind of rules does he expect these bills to be considered under?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation with respect to trying to work together to reach an agreement under which we would have confidence that we could consider the appropriation bills within the time frame available to us. We are on a good schedule now. As you know, we have passed seven of the 12 bills from the House. We have five more left to go. My expectation is that we will complete those.

Let me say that he and I have now been talking, I think, for somewhere in the neighborhood of about 3½ months about this issue. Early on I made a proposal that, from my perspective, did two things: one, it provided for time frames in which we would consider legislation; and two, it provided to the minority party, which does not control the Rules Committee—we were both in that situation for a period of time—but nevertheless, provided your party with the opportunity to offer such amendments as it deemed desirable, that it wanted to offer.

With respect to the two bills that you asked me about, I have not had an opportunity to discuss with Mr. OBEY or with the subcommittee Chairs of those two committees the specific rule that they are looking for and whether or not they've been able to reach any agreements with their counterparts, the ranking members on those two subcommittees. So I can't answer your question at this point in time; but as

we have had discussions, I want those discussions to continue. I will say to my friend that I had a discussion with one of your Members who is on the Appropriations Committee today who came over to this side of the aisle. We were talking about it, again, with a continuing effort to see if there is some way we can provide for the objectives of, I think, both of us.

Mr. CANTOR. I do want to, again, express my gratitude for his belief, as a former appropriator, that we ought to be operating under open rules and an open process when we are talking about deliberating and executing our constitutionally mandated role of expending and authorizing taxpayer dollars. And I do know that the gentleman shares my belief that we ought to get there. And I do also know and the gentleman has been very forthright in telling me and the leader on our side about his desire to want to get the work done of the people. I don't think that we disagree on trying to get the work done. I do believe, though, that we do owe to the American public the ability to see our work and the ability to have a full discussion on the separate issues that surround each appropriations bill. As the gentleman knows even more than many in this House, as he has served here and on the Appropriations Committee, the precedents of the House is open rules. And he and I have had discussions about what, perhaps, our party did when it was in the majority. During the Republican majority, the most appropriations bills ever to be considered under a restrictive rule during any one year was in 1997 when there were four bills discussed under a restricted rule. Again, that was in 1997. As the gentleman knows, so far this year—it's his party in the majority—there have been six bills that have been deliberated and discussed and debated under a restricted rule, and we, seemingly, are on track for 12.

Again, I know from the gentleman's discussions with me that we agree that we need to be under an open process. But as the gentleman has told me, it is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has basically overruled nearly all of us here in the House. And essentially, Madam Speaker, it seems that the gentleman who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee closed down the process again this week, prevented Members on our side and the other side from exercising their constitutional duties while disenfranchising the millions of American citizens that they represent. So I, for the life of me, don't understand how it is that any individual, much less the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is content to spend the taxpayer dollars without allowing there to be a full and open debate. In fact, I would bring a quote to the majority leader's attention from the gentleman from Wisconsin from October 6, 2000, when Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin said, in the context of discussing the need for

open and full debate, "We have gotten so far from regular order that I fear that if this continues, the House will not have the capacity to return to its precedence and procedures of the House that have given true meaning to the term representative democracy." He went on to say, "The reason that we have stuck to regular order as long as we have in this institution is to protect the rights of every Member to participate; and we lose those rights, we lose the right to be called "the greatest deliberative body left in the world." And I say that and I bring that to the gentleman's attention for exactly the point of what he and I have been trying to achieve. Let's open up the process. Again, bearing in mind, Madam Speaker, the gentleman's goal of trying to finish the work, I know that he knows—I have represented—I will do all we can; and we on this side feel that we can meet his time frame. I would ask the gentleman if he is still in the posture of being able to deliver the ability for us to have the choice of the amendments that we offer. So if we were to now say—and I'm willing to offer this to the gentleman—if we were to say, fine, as the gentleman suggested 2 months ago outside the precedents of the House, if we were to agree to time limits, then we could have the ability to offer the amendments and have full and open discussion on the appropriations bills, as he had asked several months ago; and I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the gentleman puts a lot of thoughts and words into my mouth that aren't necessarily there. Let me say to the gentleman that as he knows, some 3½ months ago I did, in fact, come to the gentleman, I subsequently came to the leader and indicated that I thought that we could reach agreement if, in fact, we could reach an agreement on time limits; and I was prepared under those agreements to have the minority choose such amendments as they wanted to offer, rather than have the Rules Committee do that. That offer was rejected, as the gentleman knows. It was rejected relatively emphatically by Mr. BOEHNER in a meeting in my office, attended by Mr. LEWIS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BOEHNER and myself.

Now you quote Mr. OBEY. In November of '06 the American public decided that they wanted to change the leadership in the House and Senate. They did so. Mr. OBEY took over as chairman of the committee, as he had been chairman in years past. Of the 12 bills, Mr. OBEY brought 10 bills to the floor under open rules. We did so under the understanding that you would give to us exactly what we gave to you under time agreements. Notwithstanding that, we debated those bills for 50 hours longer than the time constraints that we had agreed in '06 with you, the year before, when you were in charge of the House of Representatives.

So Mr. OBEY concluded—and I did as well—that those time agreements

would not be honored and were not honored. Now I know there is a disagreement between your side and our side as to why they weren't honored. But there is no disagreement that they took 50 hours longer to consider those bills than was the case in '06.

Now having said that, we then went to Rules. I offered an agreement some 3½ months ago that was rejected. We then went to the bills, and we had gone to markups. Now we had a markup just the other day in committee on the Financial Services bill and the Energy and Water bill. I'm not sure exactly the number of amendments that were offered but most of which were not germane to the bills. That markup took until after 1 a.m. in the morning on nongermane amendments.

You and I have been discussing, trying to come to grips with time constraints. But I will tell you that time constraints—and you've indicated, trust us on good faith. I tried to get some indication of what "good faith" means, what criteria could I judge good faith on. We haven't reached agreement on that. But I will tell you that during the CJS debate on the rule, Mr. LEWIS was asked on the bill that came to the floor under an open rule—Mr. LEWIS said this after being asked, "Can we reach a time agreement?" He said, "Because of that—referring to the 127 amendments, et cetera, et cetera, that were preprinted in the bill, 104 of which were Republican amendments."

Now under an open rule, of course, as the gentleman well knows—which, by the way, he serves on a committee that hardly ever reports its bills under an open rule. Hardly ever does a bill come out of the Ways and Means Committee that has an open rule. It's closed. You guys decide what to do, you bring the bill to the floor, and say, "Take it or leave it."

Now here's what Mr. LEWIS said in response to that question: "I think the time limitation you were discussing was like for 8 hours or something," which is essentially what the bill took in the year 2006 when you were in charge. "I'm afraid my conference might very well have a revolution on its hands, and you might have a new ranking member," was in response to, could he agree to time constraints.

So I tell my friend that he is right. I have tried to reach an agreement on where we could have a time agreement, and you would offer such amendments as you deemed to be appropriate within the time frame agreed upon. Unfortunately we didn't reach such agreement. I talked to Mr. OBEY about that, and I talked to the Speaker about that. I believe that had we reached agreement, we would have proceeded on that course.

Now that does not mean because we did not proceed on that course that I don't want to continue discussing it. I want to assure the gentleman of that, because I believe that the more open our debate is, the better we are. The gentleman is correct when he charac-

terizes my feeling as that. But it has to be within the context of being able to get the American people's work done in a timely fashion. I know the gentleman has indicated he agrees with that. Unfortunately in 2007, the last time we really did appropriation bills—we didn't do them last year, again, because extraneous amendments were offered to a number of the bills in the Appropriations Committee, and we didn't move ahead on those, as you did not move ahead in some of your years. I think that was, from my standpoint, unfortunate.

But I tell the gentleman in closing that I am hopeful that as we move ahead, we can do so perhaps through agreement. Now in terms of Mr. OBEY, Mr. OBEY is the chairman of the committee. Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS have talked. They have not reached agreement, as Mr. LEWIS indicated he could not. And frankly, the subcommittee chairmen have not reached agreement. I'm sure that the gentleman understands that, as majority leader, I'm very concerned about what the chairmen of both the committee and the subcommittee feel in terms of how their bills are handled on the floor, and we try to accommodate them.

□ 1400

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

He and I have talked about Ways and Means, and again, he and I both agree that as far as the duty of this House to deliberate on appropriations bills, precedent has always been, by and large, for open rules. We have diverted from that precedent wholly at this point, and we are just trying to see if we can turn back to some open and full debate around the bills.

So I hear the gentleman, and he, as he properly says, accurately reflects discussions that have gone on between a variety of individuals. But I'm here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman has asked for us to commit, and he wants to know what is reasonable and fair and what our good faith means.

So I would respond to the gentleman by saying this: Because we were unable to fulfill the full return to the precedents of the House, although I do think that the gentleman from Maryland would like to, because Mr. OBEY has seemed to get his way in shutting out the millions of American people, I will sit here and tell the gentleman that in consultation with our leader, JOHN BOEHNER, as well as the ranking member, JERRY LEWIS, we are committed to fulfilling the leader's desire to finish the appropriations bills in a timely manner, but with full and open ability of our side to discuss the issues that we and our constituents feel should be discussed.

So I would ask the gentleman, is he in the position to readily accept at this point the ability for our side to have 20 amendments, 20 amendments, and give our side 10 minutes on each amend-

ment to discuss those? That is a fair and good faith proposition, largely divergent from the precedents of this House. But in trying to meet the majority's desire to do what it can, the minority then proffers this offer.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I will certainly have a discussion with that. It sounds to me a little bit like the offer that I made 3½ months ago, so I certainly am going to consider it in light of the fact it sounds a lot like the offer I made. I will be in further discussions with the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the very thoughtful remarks coming from my friend, the distinguished majority leader, I am reminded that he came to Congress just a few months after I came in 1980. And I am reminded how we stood here on opposite sides engaging in the first Oxford-style debate, if the gentleman recalls, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of trade policy being used to enforce human rights. That was the discussion we had two decades ago. I simply put that forward, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to underscore the fact that we are both institutionalists. We both served nearly three decades here, and we feel strongly about this institution and about the responsibility that we have to the American people.

I know that my friend understands full well that if one looks at the Constitution and the precedents that have been set in the past, there is a clear differentiation between the Ways and Means Committee's work and the Appropriations Committee's work. And there is also clearly an understanding of the disparity between the notion of opening up the Tax Code to a completely open amendment process and dealing with the appropriations process through an open amendment process which has, for 220 years, been the case, with some exceptions.

The interesting thing about those exceptions, and I know we have had both private discussions and we are engaging in public discussion now, and I thank my friend, the distinguished Republican Whip, for yielding to me, one of the things that I believe has not been tried, I know has not been tried in this process, is to allow not the top elected leaders of the party to make these kinds of decisions, not even the chairman and ranking member of the full committee.

But just to report to my friends here, Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee the day before yesterday we had an opportunity to hear from the distinguished Chair of the Agriculture subcommittee, Ms. DELAURO, and the ranking member of that committee, Mr. KINGSTON. And recognizing that

there has been difficulty, recognizing that sometimes the appropriation process has, as my friend correctly has said, seen Members engage in dilatory practices, Mr. KINGSTON made it clear that if we were to have an open amendment process, that he would do everything within his power to ensure that shenanigans would not take place on our side of the aisle that could delay the process, because we all acknowledge that we want to get the work done. Mr. CANTOR has said that. Mr. LEWIS has said that. We very much want that to take place.

What we are arguing is that if you look at when we have had structured rules in the past, they have, in almost every instance, followed the inability of the subcommittee chair and ranking member to successfully propound a unanimous-consent agreement.

So while Mr. CANTOR just made an offer, I frankly believe that we should do everything we can to at least attempt, just take one of the appropriations bills, and see if, not the majority leader and the Republican Whip, or the Republican leader and the Speaker or whatever, the top elected positions within our party, rather let the subcommittee chairmen make an attempt at doing that.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because as we look at even the notion of what we began with, which was what created the high level of frustration for us—and yesterday I did a “Dear Colleague” explaining this process, the notion of somehow having a preprinting requirement does create undue constraint on both Democrats and Republicans when it comes to the appropriations process. And that is what led to the over-100 amendments being filed, because of the fact that when we considered the bill that we just passed 1 hour ago, in this House, last year, the unfortunate thing was there was no chance for even perfecting amendments to be offered to technical concerns that were there. In light of that, we felt very concerned about even having the preprinting requirement.

So my request would be, since we have now—unfortunately, having passed the five appropriations bills that we have, I guess it is six now that we have passed, six now as of this afternoon—we are unfortunately creating what I’m describing as the “new norm.” I know that as an institutionalist, the majority leader would not like to see that continue.

I hope very much, Mr. Speaker, that we are able to at least make an attempt to embolden, as has been the case in the past, our Chairs and ranking members of the appropriations subcommittees, who are expert on these bills, to work on them and work with our colleagues on that.

I thank my friend for yielding. I hope very much we can at least make that attempt on one bill as we move forward.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from California. He really echoes the

remarks, I think, and my sense in the beginning of this discussion many, many weeks ago that he and I have spoken, as well as spoken with the gentleman from Maryland. I do think the gentleman from Maryland agrees.

But I would just leave this subject, Mr. Speaker, with that fact that the gentleman from Maryland has said he will get back to me in terms of the offer that is on the table. And as he may know, and certainly the chairman of the Appropriations Committee does know, that in the year 2007, when the Republicans became the minority, it took 23.3 days to discuss appropriations bills for a total of 170¼ hours. If we compare that, and I’m sure that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee does know this, or could find this out, in 1995, the first year that his party took minority status or was relegated to that status, the appropriations bills took 31 days and 205 hours. So we are not talking about anything other than the RECORD here, and the RECORD indicates the minority in 1995 took a lot more time than we did in 2007.

Now, in keeping with the gentleman from Maryland’s desire to get the work done, the gentleman from California says he shares that, as do I, as does our leader, as does our ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. We are committed to doing that. I look forward to the gentleman’s return in terms of the offer that I have expressed. And my friend, the gentleman from California, I will yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

One other caveat, as we talk about these committees, one of the things that I think my colleague should know about the Rules Committee is that we have the ability to do virtually anything that we want in the Rules Committee. And as we have heard over the past few weeks, the concern that has been raised is this calendar issue, trying to get this work done before we head into the August recess to deal with these issues.

I think that it is clear that after this process goes on, an outside time limit could be put into place on each of the appropriations bills. That could be the rule that comes down, if that is something that the majority chooses to do. The concern that I have as we look at the amendments, traditionally there have been opportunities for bringing about real spending cuts in appropriations bills.

As we look at these double-digit increases in the appropriations bills, unfortunately, cherry-picking amendments, which is really what has happened so far with this process—and I understand the offer that my friend made early on about minority amendments and the opportunity to offer that. But right now what we have is a situation where the Rules Committee is choosing these amendments. If, in fact, it simply is a time issue, rather than choosing those at all, the Rules

Committee could, as my friend has pointed to the 200 hours that have been spent, it would be very easy to simply say, 8, 10, 12 hours would be the outside time limit for the appropriation work of a subcommittee here on the floor, and then we can do it under an open amendment process.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we are wondering on this side, having read the news reports, having listened to the gentleman this past Sunday on FOX News about his, in my opinion, refreshing comments about his disappointment as to where we are in this economy and the stimulus that was supposed to have addressed this economy. Again, “refreshing” not because the economy is bad, but simply because I think there is a recognition that the “stimulus” bill, that it was called, that passed has not delivered on the promise that this administration made about keeping unemployment down.

I would ask, since we see unemployment nearing 10 percent, since the promises that were made of the stimulus bill was that we would stave off that unemployment, and it would be no higher than 8½ percent, I would ask the gentleman if he expects to be able to return to the subject and be able to put in place a plan to really do something to create or foster an environment to create jobs, or should I believe the reports that I am reading that perhaps we are going to have yet another stimulus bill the likes of which we have already seen that has not worked?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, before I go to the gentleman’s specific issue, I want to make it very clear that, first of all, Mr. OBEY, contrary to what was represented, did not make his decisions in a vacuum. This was discussed. I don’t want any implication that Mr. OBEY arbitrarily and capriciously acted on his own.

When the determination was made, as a result of the conversations that ensued between chair and ranking members, both of the full committee and of the subcommittees, that was a collective decision that was made. It was not Mr. OBEY’s alone. So any implication that that was the case is not accurate, I tell my friend.

□ 1415

Now, with respect to the stimulus package, the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we believe the Recovery and Reinvestment Act is working. We believe there are an awful lot of policemen, firemen, teachers, who are still protecting the public safety, fire and police. And teaching our children, class sizes have not increased because of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act, because of the investment we made in States to try to stabilize their fiscal condition, which is very, very bad, as the gentleman knows.

The gentleman was not here, of course, but in 2001 and 2003, Mr. DREIER

and I were here, some others on the floor were here. We adopted an economic program that the leader, your present leader said, and others said, Mr. DeLay said and other members of your leadership said, and the President of the United States said, would build an extraordinarily robust economy, would take our country to new heights of economic well-being.

The gentleman I am sure probably knows these figures, but during the last year of the Bush administration, after having passed, without the Democrats stopping it or changing it or modifying it, after adopting the economic program and pursuing it for 7 years, from 2001 to December of 2008, in the last year from January to December, we lost 3.189 million jobs. 3,189,000 jobs were lost, the worst economic performance of any administration over 8 years in the last 75 years. In other words, since Herbert Hoover. The worst performance.

Now, in the last year of the Clinton administration, I tell my friend, we gained. In the last year, when, as you recall, there was a slight slowdown, we gained 1.9 million jobs. So the turnaround from the last year of the Clinton administration and the last year of the Bush administration was 5 million jobs. That was the economic status that was left, the legacy of the Bush administration and of the policies adopted by the Republican Congress from 2001 to 2006 which was not changed, as you recall, because President Bush had, of course, the veto.

The fact of the matter is that the Clinton administration created an average of 216,000 jobs per month on average over 96 months. The Bush administration, under the economic policy that you promoted then and are promoting now, I don't mean you personally, but your party is promoting. And let me say this again, under the Clinton administration, 96 months, an average of 216,000 jobs a month were created, plus. Under the Bush administration, the average job performance over 96 months was 4,240 jobs per month. You need 100,000-plus to stay even in America.

Now let me give you an additional figure. In the last 3 months of the Bush administration, you lost an average of 650,000 per month. Over the last three months, we have lost far too many, but an average of 450,000 per month. In other words, while we are not in the plus place, which is why I expressed on Fox News my disappointment, I can't imagine there is anybody in this Chamber, the President is disappointed, the Vice President is disappointed, the American people are disappointed that we are not creating those 216,000 jobs per month that we did under the Clinton administration, and we are still losing jobs because of the disastrous economy that was inherited.

I tell my friend that it was not just the facts that argue that, but Secretary Paulson, Ben Bernanke and President Bush said we had a disas-

trous economic crisis that confronted us at the end of the Bush administration's economic policy conclusion and asked us to respond very vigorously to that.

As you know, during the course of the Bush administration, we did that. Unfortunately, it has not been enough. We did that again with the Recovery and Reinvestment Act which we think is succeeding. But my friend would, I think, fairly observe that his 2001 tax cut after 130 days had not turned America around; in fact, in my view, never turned America around.

Now your leader talked about on that same show, well, we created 5 million jobs. There was a spike up, and a disastrous spike down, which is why, as I said, 3.18 million jobs were lost during the last year of the Bush administration.

We believe that the Recovery Act can work. We think it will work. We hope this economy comes back from where it was left us on January 20, 2009. America is experiencing pain. Too many of our people are experiencing pain. We regret that. It is disappointing. We need to take such efforts as we can to correct that.

I will tell my friend in addition to that, at this point in time there is no intent to have an additional bill on the floor. The administration is not talking about it. We are not talking about it. I was asked a question in the press and I said rightfully, we certainly wouldn't put that off the table. We will consider steps that need to be taken in order to address the economic crisis that confronts our Nation, but there is no plan at this point in time to offer an additional bill of that type.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and just say historical facts can be applied and used at will, and that there were plenty of opportunities to point and cast blame and claim credit as there were Republican Congresses and Democratic Presidential administrations and the like. So we could go on for a long time about the past.

My point, Mr. Speaker, in posing the question to the gentleman is as a result of the mere fact that promises were made by this administration, goals were set. We were told this stimulus bill, if we were to act in haste, the way this Congress acted, and in fact no one in this body read that bill of 1,100 pages, we were told if we were to pass that bill and it were to be signed into law that unemployment in this country would not exceed 8.5 percent. As we know, as the gentleman knows, in many parts of the country it is well in excess of 10 percent. Nationally, we are on the way to 10 percent.

We must and should, Mr. Speaker, in this House do all we can to try and get this economy back on track. It is not that we should repeat the mistakes of the past in that stimulus bill, and we await the administration, the gentleman's prescription as to how to address, as he says, the very real pain

that America's families are experiencing.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, let me say that looking in the past is not fruitful unless you learn from the past.

The point of my recitation was that the policies proposed in 2001 and 2003 demonstrably did not work, and I read the results of those policies which were the policies of the Bush administration. What I pointed out is that it is the same formula that is being recommended once again from your side of the aisle. So it is instructive to learn from what didn't work in the past.

I reject your assertion that the Recovery and Reinvestment Act hasn't worked. I have pointed out to you that we have lost a third less jobs over the last 3 months than we lost during the last 3 months of the Bush administration.

Is losing one job one too many? It is. Is it a disappointment? It is. But after a quarter and a little more of effectiveness, 95 percent of Americans got a tax cut, got money in their pocket, as you know, as a result of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act. There is \$65 billion of construction jobs being affected. Has it gone out fast enough? It hasn't. Is it starting to pick up? It is. Was the thought 10 to 15 percent would be spent within the time frame we are now talking about? Yes, that was the projection. Has that happened? Yes, it has. So that projection was correct. Is unemployment higher than we anticipated? Yes, it is, because the recession and almost depression, according to Bernanke, that we inherited from the last administration was so deep and so endemic that we are having real trouble getting out of it.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and in closing, I would leave the gentleman with two points: one, the plan that the House Republicans put on the table and presented to this President was focused on small businesses. If he looks at that plan as the President did, and the President clearly said there is nothing crazy in this plan, which meant that these are things that could work.

The President also, to my second point, claimed that we may have philosophical differences on tax policy and the rest, but he said to me, "I won." So it is, Mr. Speaker, this President's and this Congress's economy. We stand ready and willing to proffer up yet again our plan to address the economic woes of the American families. We have a plan that would be at half the cost of that stimulus bill and produce twice the jobs.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 13, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further,

when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 14, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 3170, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. SERRANO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-202) on the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, 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.

UNINFORMED OR MISINFORMED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said, "If you don't read the newspaper, you are uninformed; if you do read the newspaper, you are misinformed."

Both might be true for those who rely on the national media for all the facts. For example, you might not know that the unemployment rate jumped to 9.5 percent last month, the highest rate in almost 30 years.

Or that the Vice President this week admitted the Obama administration misread the economy.

Or that President Obama has given more than a dozen ambassadorships to individuals who raised a total of over \$4 million for his campaign.

Or that while the media report that 46 million people lack health insurance, there really are only 10 million people who can't afford or can't get health insurance.

The national media should report all the facts so Americans are not uninformed or misinformed about major issues.

□ 1430

HONORING HAZEL HAINESWORTH YOUNG

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride and a deep sense of sadness. Pride because I'm honoring Hazel Hainesworth Young, 103 years old, who passed just a week ago in my own hometown of Houston, Texas.

I am honored to say that she was an educator all of her life, a school teach-

er. She, in essence, set the standard for our famous Jack Yates High School and Phillis Wheatley High School. Phillis Wheatley High School was the school that Congressman Mickey Leland graduated from and Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

Hazel Hainesworth Young was a magnificent soul, someone who nurtured the leaders of today, who was the dean of girls at Wheatley High School, whose daughter, Maryann Young, followed in her footsteps as a teacher. She was a Soror. She was a wonderful icon of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. But she was a public citizen.

Her brother, of course, part of the, if you will, the intelligentsia and the excellence of legal prominence in the civil rights movement, but she brought about the civil rights movement by teaching to young Negro children—yes, Negro children—the opportunity to go forth and to shoot for the stars. There were no barriers to her teaching.

She was honored in her lifetime because so many were guided and inspired by this wonderful, beautiful woman. I had the chance to be mentored by her, and I will go home to honor her, but she is honored today on the floor of the House. What a wonderful woman. Hazel Hainesworth Young, 103. She passed, but she will live on forever.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, Americans all agree, and even Members of this body, Members of Congress, agree on the broad major concepts of health care reform. We all agree that health care should be cost effective, easily accessed, high quality with choices, focused on the patient, and it should be for everyone.

A government takeover, though, wouldn't be affordable. It will cost \$1.6 trillion. Easy access? Ain't gonna happen. High quality? I don't think so. Customer service? You've got to be kidding. Doctors might say you need an x ray; but under the government-run plan, you may just get told you've been X'd.

NEW HEALTH CARE WILL COST AN ARM, A LEG, AND A WHOLE LOT OF TAXES

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country want to know how we're going to pay for this health care plan that the Democrat majority is going to put forth.

Last week, on "Fox News Sunday," Mr. Wallace asked this question of Congressman HOYER, the majority leader, he said, How are you going to pay for it

specifically? What taxes are you willing to raise, and are you going to tax health care benefits? And Mr. HOYER said, "Well, I'm not going to go into—that's a proposal on the table in the Senate, not in the House, as you know. The pay-fors are going to be tough. Nobody wants to pay for what we're buying. And very frankly, our financial status in America has gone down." In other words, he didn't want to tell how the American people were going to have to pay for that program.

And then the President of the United States, at his town meeting last week, said, Now, one-third of it we're going to pay for by increased revenues—that's increased taxes—and the cost will be between \$1 trillion and \$3 trillion, probably closer to \$3 trillion. So he's saying they're going to have to raise at least \$1 trillion in new taxes.

And then he went on to say about two-thirds of it would come from reallocating money that's currently in the system. Now, where in the world are they going to get \$2 trillion out of other programs to pay for the extra two-thirds?

The people of this country are being hoodwinked. This health care program they're talking about, this socialized medicine, is going to cost an arm, a leg, a lot of taxes, and inflation because they're going to spend money we do not have.

HEALTH CARE: MEND IT, DON'T END IT

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be debating health care reform on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. The goal is to pass legislation before the upcoming August recess. No doubt one of the most significant features of the debate on health care reform will involve what is now known as the "public option."

The public option is a government-run health care program. The President has said that anyone who has private health care insurance will be allowed to either keep it or join the government plan. Mr. Speaker, the public option is the first step to a complete government takeover of our private health insurance system. The public option will have advantages by virtue of being a government entity. It will destroy the private health care insurance market, turning the entire system over to a Federal bureaucracy.

The Federal Government's record of managing Medicare, Medicaid, and the care of our veterans is one of allowing massive fraud, inefficiencies, and the abuse of patients.

Mr. Speaker, our private health insurance is in need of reform, but I would urge my fellow Members of Congress to mend it and not end it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to without amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution directing the Architect of the Capitol to engrave the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and the National Motto of "In God we trust" in the Capitol Visitor Center.

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution directing the Architect of the Capitol to place a marker in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center which acknowledges the role that slave labor played in the construction of the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1007. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a limited 6-month period for Federal judges to opt into the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System and begin contributing toward an annuity for their spouse and dependent children upon their death, and for other purposes.

S. 1289. An act to improve title 18 of the United States Code.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DREAM ACT AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week, hundreds of thousands of people throughout the country, many of whom were in Colorado, picked up their phones and called Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano to ask her to delay the deportation of a young man from Miami, Florida, Walter Lara.

Let me tell you a little bit about Walter. Walter moved to the United States from Argentina when he was 3 years old, and he has never left. He has dedicated thousands of hours to serving his community, tutoring children in mathematics and computers. He stood out in high school as an honor student and graduated from Miami Dade Honors College in 2007. But instead of following his dream and pursuing a promising career in computer animation and Web design, Walter's graduation gift was an imminent deportation order.

Walter was scheduled to be deported over the 4th of July weekend, but thanks to a week of intense activism by congressional leaders, the SEIU, bloggers, and thousands of grass-roots activists who made calls and sent letters on Walter Lara's behalf, the Department of Homeland Security moved to defer 23-year-old Lara's scheduled deportation back an entire year until July 3 of 2010.

While I was thrilled to hear that Walter's deportation has been delayed and he would be able to stay in the United States, this action alone is far from enough. What will happen to Walter in 2010 if we don't pass comprehensive immigration reform? What does it mean for the hundreds of thousands of Walters throughout the country who came to the United States as children, excelled in school, played by the rules, only to face deportation?

Despite meeting State residency requirements, immigrant students in most States are charged out-of-state or international tuition rates which effectively render college inaccessible. These kids, Mr. Speaker, are as American as anybody else, but for far too long they have had their dreams shattered by an education system that ignores their good grades and hard work.

Educational opportunity is a right, and something that we are all taught that if you work hard in this country and you don't give up, you can achieve anything. But the doors to opportunity have been shut for thousands of hard-working students who have been raised and educated in our country.

Even though Walter was able to stay, the U.S. Government deports thousands of students just like Walter and will continue to do so until we pass the DREAM Act as part of comprehensive immigration reform. The DREAM Act will ensure that children who have grown up in the United States and studied in American schools can remain here and work and pay taxes and live in our country.

Under the American DREAM Act, qualified students would be eligible for temporary legal immigration status upon high school graduation that could lead to permanent legal residency if they attend college or serve in the military.

Students like Walter are our greatest natural resource, and they should have access to higher education, the key to both individual success and our Nation's economic growth and prosperity.

I recently had the opportunity to visit an immigrant detention facility in Aurora, Colorado. These are young people, people of all ages, who are picked up. They might have broken the speed limit, they might have a taillight out on their car, they might simply have been loitering, and now, with taxpayer money, we are putting them up at \$120 a day of our hard-earned money rather than them being out working and paying taxes to reduce our deficit.

Mr. Speaker, in this era of budget deficit, putting Walter and people like

him in a government hotel that taxpayers are paying for for \$120 a day makes absolutely no sense when Walter would rather be out working and paying taxes to help reduce our deficit.

To help the hundreds of thousands of Walters across the country, now is the time to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE NEED TO CUT TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country many times get so frustrated because they think that we here in Congress don't hear them, we don't listen to them. I have a couple of letters here I would like to read into the RECORD—at least part of them—so that my colleagues in the House can get some flavor for what the people in mid-America are thinking right now.

This letter is from a lady named Emmaline P. Henn in Huntington, Indiana. And she says: "Dear Congressman Burton, it was great to hear you and speak with you at Huntington's Lincoln Day Dinner, but we want to stress the things we said then. We do have confidence in you"—which I really appreciate.

She says: "We are appalled by what is happening in Washington. Now in our 80s, we have seen many administrations; none has been as frightening as this one. In less than 6 months, President Obama and his team have drawn the U.S. Government deep into private business. The government's business is governing, not business.

"There is no doubt the President and his team have taken us far on the road to socialism, so far that we fear there may be no return. Their spending is out of this world, and it will not save the economy.

"In the long run, bailouts don't work. The health care issue, the credit card issue, the card check issue, and more, are taking us far from free enterprise and are causing many citizens to give up on self-reliance and responsibility in favor of relying on the government. There is little incentive for talented people to innovate, work hard, and create business. What a terrible lesson.

"We pray you fight for this movement. At the same time, we pray you will support keeping the United States safe in every way you possibly can."

You can hear the frustration in this lady by the way her letter sounds. But then there is another one here from a

General Motors dealer in Wabash, Indiana. And I will just read part of this letter because I think it really—I want to put the whole thing in the RECORD, but I want to read part of it because it tells you the frustration that small business people have in this country.

It is from David and Kay Dorais. And she says: “My husband, David Dorais, and I are the owners and operators of Dorais Chevrolet in Wabash, Indiana. This business was started over 60 years ago by my husband’s grandfather, Gus Dorais.

“Gus was the first All American in football from Notre Dame University. He came to Wabash, Indiana, from Detroit. He began a Chevrolet dealership operating under the philosophy of ‘give back to the community that has given so much to you.’ This is the philosophy we have strived to operate under.

“We have always been extremely loyal to General Motors and to our community. Small business is what helped to build this great country of ours, and loyalty is what makes all of us successful. We have always given back whenever asked, often times without being asked. We have always paid taxes. We have always voted. We have always made contributions. We’ve always participated in the programs that General Motors asked us to participate in.”

And then they go on to say that they had an attorney that was talking to them about the way they’re being treated by the government and by General Motors, which is now controlled by the government—Government Motors now, no longer General Motors. And they say: “We are now no longer to be a part of the ‘new General Motors.’ We are no longer good enough, even though we were part of the faction that helped to support them for years.

“Yesterday I listened to an attorney representing auto dealers speak. He is the first person I have heard make any sense in this mess. He asked, where are your elected representatives? Where are the elected officials that you donated to? Where are the elected officials that you voted for? He further added that these people never hesitated to ask for your help, but where are they now? The most important question asked was, why are you allowing them to turn their backs on you?”

And I would just like to say, if I were talking to my colleagues in the House, my friends in the Senate, or if I were talking to the President, I would say, it’s time for us to pay attention to these people. Instead of putting everything under government control, instead of trying to bail out everything by printing money that we don’t have, we ought to be cutting taxes like they did under Ronald Reagan.

We cut taxes across the board when we had terrible problems back in the early eighties. We had 14 percent inflation, we had 12 percent unemployment—worse than we have right now, and when Reagan came in, instead of throwing money at everything what he

did was said, we’re going to give people some of their money back, we’re going to cut their taxes. We’re going to cut business taxes because if we do that, they will have more income and more money to spend on expanding our economy to buy products, to produce new products. And he did that.

□ 1445

And because of that, we had one of the longest periods of economic expansion in this country’s history.

You compare that to what we’re seeing today where businesses are being driven out of business. This business has been there for 60 years, and they’re going out of business because we’re trying to solve the problems by letting government solve everything. Sixty-one percent of General Motors is going to be run by the unions now, and we’ve spent \$57 billion bailing these companies out when we could have done it the way Ronald Reagan did.

I want to end by just saying I feel real frustration when I get these letters from my constituents, and I hope my colleagues are paying attention and the people at the White House are paying attention, because instead of printing more money and throwing more money and putting more government control in charge of everything, we ought to be giving the American people the right to have some of their money back so they can expand this economy, because government sure isn’t doing it.

JUNE 3, 2008.

Congressman DAN BURTON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON: My husband, David Dorais, and I are the owners and operators of Dorais Chevrolet in Wabash, Indiana. This business was started over 60 years ago by my husband’s grandfather, Gus Dorais. Gus Dorais was the first All American in football from Notre Dame University. He came to Wabash, Indiana from Detroit. He began a Chevrolet dealership operating under the philosophy of “give back to the community that has given so much to you”. This is the philosophy we have strived to operate under.

We have always been extremely loyal to General Motors and to our community. Small business is what helped to build this great country of ours and loyalty is what makes all of us successful. We have always given back whenever asked, often times without being asked. We have always paid taxes. We have always voted. We have always made contributions. We have always participated in the programs that General Motors asked us to participate in. We have even participated in extra programs that General Motors did not request, such as an advertisement group. My husband served as an officer in this group for years. We employ many people, who also help to keep our community alive. We pay our employees a fair and honest wage and we provide insurance to them. We feel we have done everything that an American citizen should do. We have been voted Small Business of the Year in our community, the only auto dealer to receive this award.

May 15th, 2009 we received a letter from General Motors that stated they will not be renewing our contract with them. Our American Dream became our American Nightmare. The Automotive Task Force (none of

which drive American cars) handed down their decree. We are now no longer to be a part of the “New General Motors”. We are no longer “good enough”, even though we are a part of the faction that helped to support them for years. Yesterday I listened to the attorney representing auto dealers speak. He is the first person I have heard make any sense in this mess. He asked, where are your elected representatives? Where are the elected officials that you donated to? Where are the elected officials that you voted for? He further added that these people never hesitated to ask for your help, but where are they now. The most important question asked was, “Why are you allowing them to turn their backs on you?”

These are the people that wanted your support to put them in their present position. It is a position that is to help the people. Where are they and why are you not furious that they are turning their backs on you”. It did give me reason to think. Politicians run on the premise of helping the people. Yet, when you are actually needed, where are you? Has a political office simply become a place to sit and receive a check? Are campaign promises simply empty words used to become elected. During the last election it was all about the Middle Class, all about small business, it was all about keeping business alive, it was all about keeping people employed. What happened? Was it all simply political rhetoric, business as usual.

As previously stated, we are a small business. We do believe in helping and giving back. We believe in helping and supporting those around us. We have even managed to keep doing this in these difficult economic times. We are a small business in Wabash, Indiana that does give back in every way possible. We are a small business in which the owners do not take huge paychecks in order to give back to a community that we are loyal to. We received the Small Business Award because of our loyalty. It is our hope that this is not a word that has been forgotten in government. No, we are not as profitable as we once were. Yet these are difficult times and they will pass. Given the opportunity, we will again be profitable—even more profitable than in the past. It is our hope that you will look at this Small Business of the Year in Wabash, Indiana. Look at the contributions we make to the people who live here. It is our hope that you have not turned your back on us.

Sincerely,

DAVID and KAY DORAIS.

MAY 27, 2009.

Representative DAN BURTON,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTON. It was great to hear you and speak with you at Huntington’s Lincoln Day Dinner, but we want to stress the things we said then. We do have confidence in you.

We are appalled by what is happening in Washington. Now in our eighties, we have seen many administrations. None has been as frightening as this one. In less than six months President Obama and his team have drawn the U.S. Government deep into private business. The government’s business is governing not business.

There is no doubt the President and his team have taken us far on the road to socialism, so far that we fear there may be no return. Their spending is out of this world and it’s not what will save the economy. In the long run bailouts don’t work.

The health care issue, the credit card issue, the card check issue and more are taking us far from free enterprise, and are causing many citizens to give up self-reliance and responsibility in favor of relying on the

government. There is little incentive for talented people to innovate, work hard and create business. What a terrible lesson!!

We pray you fight this movement!!

At the same time, we pray you will support keeping the United States safe in every way you can.

Sincerely,

EMMALINE P. HENN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE HEALTH CARE BILL'S PUBLIC OPTION WILL DENY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CHOICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I came to talk about the health care problems here in America. I'm a medical doctor. I have practiced medicine for three-and-a-half decades. I'm an old-time general practitioner. I treat infants all the way to the elderly. My patients are like family. They're like friends. They are friends. They are family. And I'm very concerned about where we are going as a Nation.

Certainly health care in this country has become extremely expensive. In fact, I myself, prior to being elected to Congress, being a small businessman, could not afford a comprehensive

health care insurance policy. I had a catastrophic health care policy because that's all I could afford. There are many small businessmen and women all across this country that are in the same category that I was in. Now, since I have been elected to Congress, I buy into the government health care insurance program that all Federal employees can buy into.

We hear from our President that everybody in this country should have a public option, an option that they can buy into. Last night my good friend JOHN SHADEGG in a Special Order was talking about the draft of the bill that Energy and Commerce is going to be looking at next week. And during Mr. SHADEGG's discussion last night on this floor, he said that the public health care option is not an option at all. And, in fact, the American people, if I could speak to them, Mr. Speaker, I would ask them to look at what is being proposed and how quickly this major policy change is being brought to the forefront.

Next week on Tuesday, the Energy and Commerce Committee is going to start their process of looking at the health care reform bill. Tuesday they are scheduled to have opening statements by the members of the committee. Wednesday and Thursday they're going to have markup. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the American public quite understands that term. It's a term that we use, as you know, where the committee goes through a bill line by line, issue by issue, section by section, and amendments are offered, voted on, and are put in place in the final product.

Well, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee has decided to not go through the regular order process of letting the Health Subcommittee look at the bill. He wants the whole committee to do so. Why? Well, it's reported that the reason that he wants to do that is because he's concerned about the subcommittee's taking too much time and maybe not even passing out this bill.

The majority, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, is trying to force this down the throats of the American people in a very expeditious manner. Why would they want to do that? Well, I think the American people, if they knew what was going on, Mr. Speaker, would understand that this major policy change is being hastened through the legislative process so that it can be put in place so that the American people don't have the light of day shed upon this bill so that the American people can say anything about it.

Over and over again, Mr. Speaker, in this House with these appropriation bills, we have seen a change, an historical change, of how regular order is carried out. Normally an appropriations bill is brought to the floor with an open rule. Both sides agree on amendments that are introduced. Both sides agree on time limits, and we can go through a regular order. But the

majority has declined to allow that to happen. Even leadership, some of the leadership on the other side, reportedly, would like to do so. But the Speaker and the chairman are declining to allow that to happen.

So we're getting bill after bill presented to the floor that nobody has had the opportunity to read. The public can't read it. The Members of Congress can't read it.

We've had thousand-page bills, such as the nonstimulus bill that was presented by the President and was introduced in the dead of night, and we voted on it on this floor where no human being anywhere had had the opportunity to read that bill. No one, Mr. Speaker, had the opportunity to read that bill. It was 1,100 pages. Our leader, Mr. BOEHNER, had that large stack of paper and dropped it on the floor. No one had the opportunity to read that bill.

We don't have a health care bill. I have not seen it. No member of the Energy and Commerce Committee has seen it on either side, Democrat or Republican, because it has not been produced. Though Tuesday morning they're going to start opening statements on that bill.

We here in Congress have not seen the bill. We here in Congress have no way to evaluate the bill. We here in Congress have no way to understand what the bill says in totality and how we can introduce amendments to the bill to make it better. Democrats and Republicans alike are being denied their opportunity to allow amendments to all these appropriations bills and to a lot of the authorization bills, such as the tax-and-cap bill, which is going to be a disaster economically for America. This process is blatantly unfair. It's unfair to Democrats. It's unfair to Republicans. But most of all, it's unfair to the American people. The American people should demand better.

Our Speaker, when she came to office in the prior Congress, said we're going to have a new era of openness and honesty, high ethics, transparency. Nothing could be further from the truth. That's what went on in the last Congress and is particularly going on in this Congress. And we are having this health care reform bill being put together by just a small handful of the committee leadership and the leadership of this House, Democrats. The medical doctors, health care professionals, at least on our side, aren't even being consulted. We have, I'm not sure, 10 or 11 of us on our side. Not the first one of us has been consulted about what my patients and all of our patients need in health care reform.

We are being shut out of the process, and that's not fair to the American people, Mr. Speaker. The American people should demand more. They should demand openness. They should demand transparency.

We've had resolutions where we wanted to have at least 72 hours of every bill being posted on the Internet

so that the American people could look at those bills. The American people have been denied that opportunity by the leadership of this House and of the U.S. Senate. It's not fair. It's not fair to the American people.

We are having a major change in health care policy being shoved down the throats of the American people, Mr. Speaker. The American people need to rise up and say "no" to this cloaked-in-darkness process, where members of the public across this country should be able to take their reading glasses and put them on and read the bill, where Members of Congress should be able to take their reading glasses and put them on and look and see what's being proposed by the majority. The minority is being totally shut out of this process.

Now, we do know some things that are in the bill. And the American people need to understand what the ramifications of those things that are in the bill that we know about are all about.

The first thing, we hear all the time by the majority, we heard it during Special Orders, we've heard it during the 1 minutes this morning, we hear it over and over again in all the debate and discussion going around here in the House, about people need to have a public option. Well, the American people need to understand, Mr. Speaker, that that public option is going to deny them choices. It's going to put a bureaucrat, a Washington bureaucrat, between them and their doctor. And that Washington bureaucrat is going to make their health care decisions for them about what tests they can have, what medicines they can have, whether they can have surgery or not. And what it's going to do is it's going to shift people, as Mr. SHADEGG was saying last night, over the next 5 years off their employer-based health care insurance over to a single-party payer government insurance.

We are told if people like their health insurance, fine, keep it. And most American people will say, yes, that's right, I like my American insurance policy that I have today. I don't like the insurance companies. I don't like the costs. But I'm satisfied with my insurance.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to each individual in America today, I'd warn them that, Mr. and Mrs. America, you're not going to be able to keep your private insurance. You're going to be forced into a government-run, socialistic medicine health care system where some Washington bureaucrat is going to tell you whether you can go to the hospital or not, whether you can get an MRI or not, whether you can have the new treatments for cancer or hypertension or diabetes. It's going to destroy the health care system that we know today.

We have the finest health care system in the world. That's the reason people from Canada come to America to get their health care, even when they could buy the private health care

in their own country. But they come to the United States. People in Great Britain come to the United States. Even if they can afford to go through the private sector in the United Kingdom, they come here because we have the finest health care system in the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I could tell the people in America, if I was allowed to through the rules of the House, I would tell them that that health care system that you're enjoying today, the quality of health care, the medications, the treatments, the tests, surgeries, and all of the things that make us have the highest quality of health care in the world, is going to be destroyed by this bill that's going to be started through the legislative process next week.

□ 1500

I have been joined in this hour by a physician colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, who has tremendous experience with TennCare in his home State of Tennessee. I welcome him to join us today, and I ask the doctor, I yield to the doctor to give us some insights about TennCare and what it produced in Tennessee and about the cost and quality and how things were affected there and whatever the gentleman wants to inform the Speaker.

Dr. ROE, if you could speak to the American people. I know you would like to speak to them, but you have to speak to the Speaker and me.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I think when you are looking at health care, and I practiced medicine in the State of Tennessee for over 30 years in an OB/GYN practice, delivered a lot of babies. And I can tell you, having watched this very complex system, it's unfair to the American people. We are not talking about Democrats or Republicans. We are talking about the American people here who are going to be affected, all 300 million of us are.

And when we look at the issues out there that we are dealing with, first of all, there isn't any American that doesn't want to have quality, affordable health care for all of our citizens. I don't think any of us in this body, all 435 of us want that. It's how do we get there and how do we afford it when we do get there and not break the bank.

We have, if you read various publications, around 47 million people in America who are uninsured. And of that 47 people who are uninsured, approximately 10 million, these are estimates, but are approximately 10 million are illegal in this country.

Of the remaining 35 to 37 million, we have about 12 to 14 million who currently qualify for plans that are out there, SCHIP or Medicaid, but who are not on it. So we need to find out who these individuals are and make those assets available for them.

About 9 million people make over \$75,000 a year and choose not to buy

health insurance. Now, in my part of the world, in the First District of Tennessee, that's a lot of money, and I assume in a lot of places in Georgia and other places around this country that's a lot of money. We have about 8 million people who make between \$50,000 and \$70,000 a year who are uninsured. And certainly for those, if there are families, there are ways, very inexpensive ways to make sure affordable health care is available to them.

When I first heard—when I first came to D.C., I heard the argument of the President's plan, and it turns out, I don't think the President had a plan. But the plan that was coming out of the House of Representatives is that we are going to have private health insurance and we are going to have a competitive government-sponsored plan. And I said, What exactly is that supposed to do? And they told me, and I said, Wait a minute. 16 years ago, we did this plan in Tennessee. It was called TennCare. We got a waiver from Medicaid, HHS, to provide health care for as many citizens in the State as we could. And as you know, Tennessee is not a wealthy State. We have a much lower than average per capita income in the country. So it was a noble goal. And it was the government, the managed care plans, put a very rich plan together; in other words, it was very generous in benefits.

And what happened was almost 50 percent, 45-plus percent of the people who got on TennCare had private health insurance. And what we found, and for them it was fine. I mean, they had a plan that paid the coverage, paid to see a doctor. The problem with it was it didn't pay the cost. And when I started asking, digging into this plan, I said, How much of the cost of the providers—I am speaking of hospital outpatient surgery centers. What percent of cost does this plan pay? It paid 60 percent. Medicare, another government-run plan, pays about 90 percent of costs.

So what happened was you had costs shifted to the private insurers. And these private insurers—that would be the other businesses in Tennessee—their costs went up and up and up when they tried to buy health insurance. So more and more people were dumped into the plan because businesses couldn't afford it.

How did the State of Tennessee handle this?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I want to make that crystal clear. Businesses could not afford to continue paying for the private insurance, and so people went from private insurance, and they were being forced over to the government plan; is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Exactly. They made a perfectly logical decision. It was cheaper to go into the subsidized government plan than it was for businesses that were struggling to survive anyway.

And when you add this extra cost, they dropped that cost onto the public

plan. Well, what happened was the State couldn't even afford even paying 60 percent of the cost of the care. There were so many people on it, the health care part was getting more than all the education and the other things that the State was providing.

So our Governor, who is a Democrat in the State of Tennessee, and a Republican legislature, they had to cut the rolls. You only have two choices: You can either cut the rolls or you can ration care. So I predict to you, Dr. BROUN and Madam Speaker, that when this public option comes out there, that it will be exactly like that. It will be a very generous plan subsidized by the taxpayers and supported by that. And businesses, especially small businesses first—the ones who provide most of the jobs in this country are small businesses, and you want to make it easier for them to provide the benefit, not more difficult—they will drop that. And over time, this will morph into a single-payer system.

Now, some people, Madam Speaker, would say, Is that a bad idea or a good idea? I think some people would be happy with the single-payer system. I believe health care decisions should be made between patients, their families, and their doctors. And you don't need a bureaucrat, no pun intended, injecting himself into this very important decision, in health care decisions. That's what will happen.

In this plan in England, they have a comparative effectiveness, as you well know, called NICE. And what an acronym for NICE, and let me explain that to the viewers out there. What happens in a public system where it's funded by a single payer—for instance, the taxpayer, in England the government—a board or committee is put together by the government to evaluate the outcomes of certain treatments.

Well, they have, for instance, if they estimate in England that you are in your last 6 months of life—and a cancer, for instance, a cancer treatment, they might invest as much as \$22,000 in you, about what a used Honda would be.

Well, I don't think the American people, I know the American people, I know the American people in my district, Madam Speaker, in your District, are not ready to let the government decide that your life and your family's life is worth that. So that is sort of, in a nutshell, where we were or are in Tennessee dealing with this.

There are a lot of other options out there. I think these mandates for, in this particular legislation which we haven't seen other than just a synopsis of it, we haven't seen the full legislation. And, of course, the devil is always in the details.

So I want to sit here and look at the American people and tell them that the Doctors Caucus, the conservatives in this House, I think both the Republicans and the Democrats, want to be sure that the patient and the doctor are making those very important

health care decisions and not the Federal Government.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I wanted to bring out a point. I have got an article here that came from Capitalism Magazine. The title of the article is "Health Care to Die for in Britain" by Ralph Reiland, from February 6, 2005. I just want to read a couple of points that Mr. Reiland makes in this article.

He says, "Among women with breast cancer, for example, there's a 46 percent chance of dying from it in Britain, versus a 25 percent chance in the United States. 'Britain has one of the worst survival rates in the advanced world,' writes Bartholomew, 'and America has the best.'"

He is quoting an issue in the Spectator Magazine, the British magazine, where James Bartholomew was talking about the British health care system.

The point of that, and the American people, I hope, will understand as we look at this, their single-payer system—now, in Great Britain, if you are extremely wealthy, you have to be extremely wealthy, you can buy private health insurance. And we have seen a lot of those people who are extremely wealthy actually come to the United States for their health care.

But unless you are extremely, extremely wealthy and you are in that single-payer system—and that's where we are headed, in my belief, in the United States—you have almost a half chance, and that's in a 5-year survival rate in Great Britain, of dying, where actually it's less than 25 percent today in America.

I think you have quoted some statistics on breast cancer. Do you have those at hand that you could give?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I do. When I began my medical practice, we had the same survival statistics that they did, 50 percent 30 years ago. In stage 1 disease now in America now it's as high as 98 percent 5-year survival. So when the patient comes to us, Dr. BROUN and Madam Speaker, and they say, Dr. ROE, what are my chances of living? I am going to look at that patient, I am going to look at her and say, It may be tough, you may have some down days, you probably will, but you are going to make it. You are going to be okay.

And we can provide that kind of hope in this country for our patients. I look at St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital in Memphis where I was a medical student, and when I first went there, 80 percent of children died of childhood leukemias and cancers. Today, over 80 percent live.

I had one of the greatest evenings this last Monday night of a young boy I had delivered 16 years ago, and 2½ years ago his mother called me and said, Dr. ROE, I am afraid my son has cancer. And we were there for that 16th birthday to celebrate. He is cancer free, and that is a wonderful, wonderful thing to celebrate. And my joy goes out to that family and that community. The whole community celebrated. And that's the kinds of things we have

seen, I think, in America, with our health care system.

And I think back, Dr. BROUN and Madam Speaker, when I began my medical practice, we had only five high blood pressure medicines. Three of them made you sicker than high blood pressure did. Today, over 50. Antibiotics, there was one type of cephalosporin antibiotic. Today, over 50.

We have all of the new robotic surgeries, laparoscopic surgeries that I was able to do and privileged to do in this Nation and provide everyone. I was at a business meeting not long ago, a year or so ago, and they said the health care system, certainly there are excesses, we need to do a better job of managing the system. They said, You need to run this like Southwest Airlines. I said—well, I was in Washington when I was told that. And I said, I will tell you what we will do. We will go over to Reagan National and we will pick a guy up who lives under the bridge there, a homeless person, and we will show up at Southwest Airlines. And I will go in my pocket, and I will pull my credit card out and I will say, here, I want to fly and the guy with me can fly, but the man that has no money can't.

And in America, if we all three get in there and go back to George Washington University's emergency room, day or night, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, regardless of your ability to pay, in America we will take care of you. Now is that the best way to do it, and I would argue it is not. And that's what this debate should be about is how we better use those resources.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Let's make this perfectly clear for Madam Speaker and for the American public. You just made a statement that I want to focus upon. You say somebody could go to the emergency room, and it's really an emergency room in the United States, and they will get health care provided to them; is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. And there is a Federal law actually called EMTALA, the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act, that requires emergency rooms to evaluate and essentially treat everybody who walks in the door, whether they can pay or not, whether they are here legally or not or any other way; is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. And then the point I keep hearing, particularly from those on the other side that want this socialized medicine program, this Washington-based, Washington bureaucratic administered health care system, that everybody needs access to health care.

But you just made a statement that the American people need to understand, and, Madam Speaker, I hope that they will understand. Everybody

in this country has access to health care by walking into an emergency room.

And the question is, really, where people are going to get their health care provided to them, who is going to pay for it and what cost. Is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes. I know that only you can show up at an emergency at any time, but the only hospital that I have had patients denied care because of some bureaucratic snafu, they didn't qualify, was a government hospital, the VA. I have never had a patient refused care that I have taken care of if I said this patient has to be in the hospital. Our problem is not the quality of the care; it's figuring out a system to best pay for it. That's what we are dealing with here. And we are not going to wrap this up and be fair to the American people in 2 weeks.

□ 1515

It's too complicated. I was speaking with a friend of mine this Monday in Kingsport, Tennessee, Dr. Jerry Miller, and he and I were in a very detailed discussion about how complex when you're looking at home health care, oxygen infusion, devices, occupational therapy, physical therapy. All of that goes with increasing and improving the quality of your life. That's what we're dealing with, an incredibly complex system. And I don't believe that the government can best run this system. I think that the private sector is much more equipped to deal with new technologies.

I'll give you an example. I think if we were waiting on the government to develop a da Vinci robot, you wouldn't be having your da Vinci robotic surgery right now.

We see radical prostatectomies for prostate cancer that now are done in a couple of hours or less with very minimal blood loss. I mean, before radical prostatectomies, it was several hundred cc's of blood. Now it may be 75 or a 100 cc's. Minimal blood loss. Patients are leaving the hospital in a day or two and resuming normal activities incredibly fast.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I want to interject here just a moment. With the current technology we have on that radical prostatectomy, as we call it in medicine—taking the prostate out, all the prostate out—in the past, when we did it with the nonrobotic surgery, the chances of that gentleman having to wear a condom catheter because they cannot control the urine and they just have a constant leakage of urine out of their bladder was very high compared to today.

Their chances, if they're a young man, of having impotence prior to that—in other words, they cannot perform sexually—was a pretty good chance that they were going to have problems with that. But with the

robotic surgery, the incidence of impotence, the incidence of incontinence, which is where the urine leaks out, is very low.

It's because of that technology that the development of that technology is going to come to a screeching halt, I believe. Would you agree with that?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would agree with that. I think the biggest problem you have when you don't have enough resources in the system to develop new medications and new technologies, new treatments, new pieces of equipment, there's no question that you freeze in time where you are.

I recall it wasn't a day that I would go to the operating room that I wouldn't see somebody back in the seventies getting operated on for an ulcer, bleeding ulcer. It's almost unheard of now because of medical treatments and other endoscopic treatment. You have almost eliminated that very invasive surgery. We certainly don't want this to slow down.

One of the things that I think we value in America—I know we do—is we value every human life. Every life has great value here. And that's one of the things that I've seen in my practice. Whether you are rich or you are poor, you are valuable to the American people and to the health care system. And we're going to take care of you.

Dr. BROUN, Madam Speaker, one of the things that's an untold problem in the health care system is the availability of care—the accessibility of it, I should say. In the next 10 years, 50 percent of our registered nurses are able to retire. Fifty percent. We need a million more nurses by 2016. That's only 7 years from now.

So we need to be encouraging young people to go into these very needed specialties in medicine and as physicians. We're already behind the curve. In the next 10 years we will have more physicians retiring or dying than we're producing in this country. And the population is growing and the baby boomers are going to need more care. And guess what we're doing? We're living longer than we've ever lived in the history of the world.

So we have a multiprong problem. It's not just that; it's do we have access. Am I going to be able to find a nurse and a doctor to take care of me.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, you're exactly right, Dr. ROE. We have a critical shortage today of medical care personnel, nurses and doctors, as you're saying. In fact, my alma mater, the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, is starting to develop some satellite campuses to try to train more physicians in the State of Georgia.

In fact, one is going to be opening within the next 2 years in Athens, Georgia, where the University of Georgia is, near where I live. I live outside of Athens in Watkinsville.

But we still are going to be behind even with this new training. But what I have seen, and I think Dr. ROE will

probably corroborate this, is that we have seen doctors stop taking Medicaid, stop taking Medicare because of the poor reimbursement rates. And if we go to this supposedly two systems of one private and one public, as has been projected by the leadership and many people on the other side, what is going to happen is that you're going to have, because of the very poor reimbursements rates, you're going to have hospitals fail; you're going to have doctors not take those patients on the public plan. So that in itself is going to take choices away. Plus, you're going to have a Washington bureaucrat telling the patient what medicines that they can have.

You mentioned, Dr. ROE, just a moment ago about all the cephalosporins, one of the powerful antibiotics. When you and I came along—we were almost contemporaries in medical school, though you went to Tennessee and I went to the Medical College of Georgia—we had antibiotics that were very limited.

We have got bacteria today—in fact, a patient that's very close to me personally has pseudomonas pneumonia. When I went to medical school, that patient would have died within a matter of weeks. She now has a PIC line. She's gotten IV antibiotics over and over again. That's not going to be available to her in this new public-option plan, this government-run plan, and she's just going to die. She's 85 years old. And she's going to die. She's had this pneumonia for about 6 months now. And she's still living. When I was in medical school, she would have died within a matter of days.

Life is precious. Some would say, Well, she's 85 years of age; we should just let her die. And that's exactly what's going on in Canada and Great Britain today. They don't have the appreciation of life as we do in our society, evidently.

Dr. ROE, a lot of people are going to die. This program, government option that's being touted as being this panacea, the savior of allowing people to have quality health care at an affordable price, is going to kill people.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think, Madam Speaker, what we need to do is look at the problem we're faced with. What are people concerned with? Well, affordability. Certainly, we've got to deal with this.

Number two is accessibility. We have talked about that somewhat. Thirdly, when we have a job, our health insurance is tied to our job. So we're concerned if I lose my employment, I lose my job.

Do you need an entire government takeover of medicine to address those issues? No, you don't. When you look at portability, that's certainly one thing that I think can be done with very minimal government involvement.

I will give you another quick example. Many of us have children. And today is a very poor work environment. So when you see young people come out of college or out of high school today, it's very difficult for them in this market to find a job.

But guess what happens to them when they graduate from East Tennessee State University or the University of Georgia, wherever, and there's no job available? They lose their health insurance coverage. Why not just leave them on their parents' plan until they're 25 years old? It wouldn't cost the government a nickel.

Do you know how many people that would cover, estimated, in this country? Seven million young people. And I know for all three of my children, when they got out of school, they all needed help with their health insurance coverage. I had to go out and buy a private health insurance plan, which was not tax deductible.

Another example I'll give you is myself. Last year, when I worked in my medical practice, I provided health benefits. That was one of the benefits we have for our employees and for me. I retired from my medical practice to run for Congress. The next day, my health premiums went up 33 percent because they were no longer deductible.

That's not expensive for the government to do. Simply allow individuals out there who want to purchase their own private health insurance plan—if you're a farmer or small business person, let them deduct that exactly like GE does, or any other large business.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. You made a great point there. The vast majority of employees in this country are employees of small businesses. The small businesses are having a hard time paying these high premiums. And so if we could just have some tax changes to allow deductibility for the individual or for the small business, which is not in law today—it's only the large businesses that can deduct and not pay taxes on that benefit to their employees or the employee not have to pay tax on that benefit. It's only applicable to large businesses.

Most people who are employed, most of the uninsured in this country who have a hard time affording it, most small businesses who have a hard time affording to pay for health insurance for their employees are in that situation because it's not deductible. And if we made some tax changes to make it deductible for everybody for their health premium, that in itself would take care of a lot of those people that you were talking about earlier who are not insured today?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would like to know the logic. I haven't had any-

one yet since I've been in this body give me the logic of why a corporation with multiple assets is allowed to take a—let's say a small businessman. Let's take someone who is in a small landscaping business, who takes care of my yard—I should be mowing it myself—but who takes care of my yard.

Why shouldn't he be able to deduct as an individual employer—he's just got himself, is all he works for—why can't he deduct his health insurance just like General Motors does? I've never had anyone yet explain to me. You could help a tremendous number of people in this country if we did that simple thing.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding. You're exactly right. I hear the majority Members over and over again, many Members of the Democratic side talk about the Republican Party as the Party of No, N-O, because we say "no" to this energy tax, "no"—they're going to accuse us of being the Party of No on this health care reform bill that they're going to shove down our throats—down the American people's throats, this socialistic, Washington government-based, Washington bureaucratic-run health care system. They're going to accuse of us being the Party of No, N-O.

But I submit that the Republican Party is the Party of Know, K-N-O-W, because just that one point, if we would make that one tax change, it would pull into the insurance pool privately administered, no cost to the taxpayer, no cost to our children and grandchildren. It would not increase the deficit. Bring in that one thing of a tax policy change and it would ensure on a private basis a lot of those people who are uninsured today.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would argue that would even do more than that, because it would do just the opposite of what the public plan will do. What it will do is, if you make that available where the uninsured can afford it to this tax break, it will make less people uninsured and therefore less cost-shifting to the people who already have health insurance.

I would argue it would do exactly the opposite. I bet you if we try, it will work immediately.

The challenge we have in a down economy, there's no question, is when people lose their job, they lose their health insurance. And it can't be COBRA. As you all know, Bill Gates can't afford COBRA, it's so expensive.

We have to have a plan that is affordable for people when they're unemployed. That's a real challenge, there's no question.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank Dr. ROE for yielding back. In fact, I'm developing a bill in my office right now that will give patients the ownership of

their health insurance, whether they buy it themselves or whether it's paid for by their company. If the patient owns the health insurance, that will stop that portability problem because the patient owns it; and if they leave one job and go to another, they take the insurance with them. That's what I'm talking about. We as Republicans are the Party of Know because we know how to make insurance portable.

We have numerous Members over on our Republican side that are putting together proposals that the American people will never see. Why? Because the leadership of this House will not allow the American people to see my bill or your bill, Mr. SHADEGG's bill, Mr. RYAN's bill, the Health Working Group of the Republican conference.

Bill after bill are being proposed to be introduced that will never see the light of day. The American people won't see it, the Members of this House won't see it, Members of Congress in either House won't see those. Why? Because the leadership of this House is forcing in a dictatorial manner their health care bill that's going to destroy the quality of health care.

□ 1530

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I am going to make an impassioned plea to the American people. A week ago we saw a cap-and-trade tax here that was brought before this House, not thoroughly vetted, a very, very important issue, and not read. Let me say this again—and I get angry when I think about this, something that affects every single American. Not one Congressman of the 219 that voted for that ever read the bill, and it will affect every American. I want to challenge this body right here and now not to bring a bill here in 2 weeks which no one has read, which affects the most precious decision, the care of you and your family and your children, and you haven't even read it. The American people need to know every dot and T in that bill before we have the audacity to pass that bill on to the U.S. Senate.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Dr. ROE, I agree with you wholeheartedly. The American people need to demand that the bill be presented to the American people so that they can understand how it's going to affect them because it's going to affect every single person. There's a lot of people who work for big companies that say, Well, I've got good insurance through my employer, and I like it. Well, they need to understand that they're not going to be able to keep it because in 5 years, whether they are in a big multinational corporation that's paying for their health insurance today, they're going to be forced out of that into their single-payer government program where that Washington bureaucrat is going to be making their health care decisions. That's the first thing. Secondly, it's going to be extremely expensive for everybody. Government intrusion into

the health care system is what's driving up the cost. Dr. ROE and Madam Speaker, let me give you a good example that happened in my own medical practice of how government intrusion has affected the cost of insurance and health care across the country, whether it's government-paid health insurance, such as Medicare, Medicaid or SCHIP, or whether it's private insurance.

I was practicing in a one-man office. I had three employees down in Americus, Georgia, and I had a small automated lab in my office. If a patient came in to see me, a doctor, and they had a red sore throat, they might have white patches on their throat, they were running a fever, coughing, and aching all over, maybe their nose is running, maybe they're coughing up some stuff, I, as a physician, knew that they may have a bacterial infection or they may have a viral infection or they may even have allergies. An allergy can actually show those same symptom complexes. I was taught in medical school not to abuse antibiotics because the overprescription of antibiotics causes a whole lot of problems for patients and causes a whole lot of increased cost. Well, Congress passed a bill called CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, which basically shut down my small automated lab that had quality control. I wanted to make sure that whenever I ran a test that I had good, proper results. Well, Congress passed a bill, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, CLIA, that shut down my lab; and if a patient came in with a red sore throat, coughing or aching all over, I would do a CBC, a complete blood count, to find out if they had a bacterial infection and, thus, needed antibiotics or had a viral infection and did not need the expense or the exposure to those antibiotics. I charged \$12 for that CBC. CLIA shut down my lab. I had to send patients over to the hospital. So they had to drive from an office over there. It took an hour or two to do all the paperwork to get into the hospital and have their blood drawn. Then they'd come back to my office and sit and wait, frequently for several hours before I got the results of the test back. But I was charging \$12 for that test, CBC. It took 5 minutes to do. It is a good quality control test, proper results, \$12, 5 minutes. The hospital charged \$75, and it took 2 to 3 hours. You take that one test. It jumped from \$12 to \$75 for one test. What does that do to costs for insurance across this country? It markedly increases the cost of everybody's insurance and makes it less affordable for everybody. HIPAA—let me bring another critter out. I call CLIA and HIPAA and all these things critters. I tell my constituents in the 10th Congressional District of Georgia that if they see these congressionally creative critters, HIPAA, CLIA and all those other acronyms, that they'd better hold onto their wallets because it's going to take

a big bite out of their wallets. Well, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, HIPAA, was passed, and it's cost the health care system billions of dollars and has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches it's created. It's totally unneeded legislation. So government intrusion into the health care system has created this mess of unaffordability, and the more government intrusion we get into the health care system, the less affordable it's going to be.

I will yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just to amplify what you've said. Madam Speaker, years ago we had a test in our office, which we did about 10,000 of them a year. We contacted a local pathologist and said, We'd like to pay \$10 for this test; and they said, Well it's \$100,000 of income. We'll be glad to. Well, we couldn't do that because—guess what—it was \$5 less than what Medicare paid. So we had to charge all of our patients \$15 for this test. So that one little office, that one test ended up costing our patients another \$50,000 in one medical practice in little old Johnson City, Tennessee. Now I've seen that already. You can amplify that across the country, and you can imagine the billions of dollars that are being wasted because of a lack of competition in the health care system.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman for bringing that test up. It's just a good example of how government intrusion in the system creates higher costs for everybody, whether it's a privately insured plan that a patient has or whether it is the government-insured plan that the patient has, government involvement creates higher costs. And we know, at least on our side, that we have some solutions. We can literally lower the cost of health care if we change health care tax policy and make it deductible for everybody, if we allowed the patients to have some input into how health care decisions are made. In the plan that I'm developing in our office, we have a plan that would make patients be in charge, whether they're government insured or not. We create a marked expansion of health savings accounts. We need to have health savings accounts for Medicare patients where the Medicare patients and the Medicaid patients control that health savings account. It seems as if some in this body have decided it's a God-given right for people to own health insurance. Maybe it is. I don't know. I don't find it in the Constitution of the United States. And we haven't had that until Medicare came along and then Medicaid, where government intrusion in the health care system really has created this boondoggle that we have today. But government intrusion already is rationing care for my patients and yours. It's already causing problems for patients to find providers that will accept their insurance. It's already causing the high cost. It's already causing rationing of

care. And to go down this road that's going to create a bigger government intrusion, which is going to destroy the quality of care, stop innovation, it's going to stop all of these life-saving drugs and treatment modalities that we see in the health care industry today, it's going to stop all of that because of that cost effectiveness that the gentleman from Tennessee was talking about.

I will yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think the thing that I want the American people to understand is that for 30-something years I have had to look at patients, some who had health insurance and some who we had to try to figure out. How do we get this patient care? And that is certainly a patient we want to find out. We're the ones who go to the emergency room at 3 o'clock in the morning and treat a sick child or see a youngster who has a fractured arm or whatever. We're the ones who provide this and go out there along with the other health care providers. We want a way for that system to flourish as efficiently and as cost effectively as we can. And we can do this. We have solutions out there. The solution is not the government running your health care. That will be a problem. It will be a problem as far as innovation is concerned, as you've pointed out. It will be a problem as far as access is concerned. Access is already a major problem that we have to address.

I want to tell the American people—I want you to be engaged in this, learn about this. Call us. Tell us what you think. One of the last patients that I saw in my practice was a 60-something-year-old woman who worked, who didn't have health insurance. And quite frankly, that is a problem. She is 60 years old, just before Medicare. It's something that can be dealt with, though, without a complete takeover of the government health care system. The people had better pay attention. These next 2 weeks will be the most critical debate about health care that's occurred in the last 45 years.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate it. I want to ask the gentleman this: During my three and a half decades-plus of practicing medicine, I know in my own medical practice, and I know with colleagues that I've been associated with in Georgia, which is where I practiced medicine, that all of us have given away our services and not gotten paid. I don't resent that. I don't regret that. It's just part of what I did as a family doctor. Now under Federal law if I was accepting Medicare as a preferred provider, if somebody were to come into my office to see me—I did a full-time house call practice. I still practice medicine. I still see patients when I go home today. So I am still practicing medicine. I am actively practicing. But I don't take Medicare or Medicaid. I just see those patients and treat them. If they pay me, great. If they can't, that's great too. I don't

care. I went to medical school to serve people. I think you did the same thing, Dr. ROE. But under current Federal law, if I were a physician that was a preferred provider in the Medicare system, and I had a young man, young woman who came into my office, was working, trying to make ends meet, had a health care problem, and they just could not afford to pay my bill, literally under the laws of this country today if I told them, "Don't worry about it. Don't worry about it. I will treat you for free," as I've done to literally thousands of patients, given away hundreds of thousands of dollars of my services over my career practicing medicine. If I did that to one patient in the Medicare system, if they knew about it, they could fine me for every single Medicare claim I ever made, ask for all that money back, and can put me in jail for seeing a patient for free. That's inane. It's absolutely stupid. If we change how government insurance is provided and get the Medicare, Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, all the government insurers so that the patients own the policy and the insurance is what it's supposed to be, to help those people manage their finances, to help them manage their expenses for their health care that they purchase, that they go see the doctor, go to the hospital, if we could give them the ownership and give them their rights to make those decisions, then doctors could see patients for free, if they needed to be. Doctors could make those decisions; patients could make those decisions; and that's what we want to do on our side. But those philosophies are never, ever going to come to this floor because the leadership won't allow it to happen. We can literally lower—and I think by at least a third to half of what the costs are today for medicines, health insurance, hospital bills, doctors' bills, oxygen, wheelchairs, all those things—we can lower the cost of those things if the Republicans' proposals could ever see the light of day and be passed into law.

□ 1545

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, I think one of the things that Dr. BROUN brings out so eloquently is that it is a true privilege to do what we have done, to practice medicine and try to heal the sick and take care of those folks. That is what we want to do, to be able to continue to provide those services where patients and doctors make those decisions, not the government.

I yield back.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have just a moment or two.

Madam Speaker, if I can speak to the American public today, what I would say to the American people is that starting next week the majority is going to force this health insurance reform down the throats of the American

people. It is going to adversely affect every single American. The American people should stand up and say No, we want transparency.

Madam Speaker, if I could speak to every individual across this country, I would tell the American people to get on the phone, e-mail, fax, or visit your Congressman, your U.S. Senator, and say, Let's slow this process down. Let's get it right. Let's don't hasten in this process of trying to force something down the throats of the American people in the blackness of night where people can't see what's going on. Let us see, as Americans, what you are proposing, so we can look at the bill, so we can evaluate the bill, and so that everybody's voice across this country can be heard.

The former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen once said that when he feels the heat, he sees the light.

The American people, Madam Speaker, need to put the heat on every single Member of Congress in the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate by calling, writing, faxing, e-mailing and visiting their offices and say "no" to this process of not allowing people to read the bill.

The American people need to demand that this health care policy be looked at and be available for the American people to evaluate and not be forced down their throats like it is being done today.

Not only that, Madam Speaker, I invite the American people to call their family and friends and ask them to do the same thing. We have to light a grass fire of grassroots support all across this country to slow this process down. Demand transparency. Demand fairness. Demand openness. We are not getting that today, Madam Speaker. We have to demand it. The only way that is going to happen is if the American people will stand up and say "no" and tell their Member of Congress, particularly here in this House, between now and next Wednesday, they need to tell their Congressman to stop this process, allow fairness and allow transparency.

Let's have reform that makes sense. Republicans want that. Democrats want to have reform. But we don't need to do something that is going to break the system, destroy the quality of health care and be extremely expensive for everybody. We need to say "no."

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2009, AT PAGE H7082

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 614. An Act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots ("WASP").

S. 615. An Act to provide additional personnel authorities for the special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction. Re-

ferred to homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 17.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 17.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1107. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a limited 6-month period for Federal judges to opt into the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System and begin contributing toward an annuity for their spouse and dependent children upon their death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1289. An act to improve title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 13, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2574. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0770; FRL-8413-6] received June 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2575. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triallate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0386; FRL-8421-2] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2576. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting

notification of both an Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) and a Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) breach for the enclosed program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2577. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2578. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Striving Readers — received June 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2579. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New York: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R02-RCRA-2009-0346; FRL-8916-7] received June 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2580. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Oxides of Nitrogen Regulations, Phase II [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-1131; FRL-8921-5] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2581. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Approval of Revisions to the Knox County Portion [EPA-R04-OAR-2008-0676-200820 (a); FRL-8903-6] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2582. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2009 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0503; FRL-8922-7] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2583. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulations of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Modifications to Renewable Fuel Standard Program Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0161; FRL-8922-6] received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2584. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-31, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 09-31; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2585. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-26, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2586. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Delta Regional Authority, transmitting in compliance with the Accountability for Tax Dollars Act of 2002 (ATDA), a copy of the Authority's Audited Financial Statements for FY 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2587. A letter from the President, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting

the 2008 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2588. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, United States Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's report on the amount of acquisitions made from entities that manufacture the articles, materials, or supplies outside the United States in Fiscal Year 2008; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2589. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Library of Congress, transmitting activities of the United States Capitol Preservation Fund for the six-month period which ended on March 31, 2009, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 188a-3; to the Committee on House Administration.

2590. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Required Fees for Mining Claims or Sites [LLW03200000-L1999000.PP0000] (RIN: 1004-AE09) received June 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2591. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Policy Development and Research, ETA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Employment of H-2A Aliens in the United States (RIN: 1205-AB55) received June 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report on the Secretary of State's decision to designate an entity and its aliases as a "foreign terrorist organization", pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1189); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2593. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment — received June 22, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2594. A letter from the Deputy, Regulations and Security Standards, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — False Statements Regarding Security Background Checks [Docket No.: TSA-2008-0011] (RIN: 1625-AA65) received June 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

2595. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to Congress concerning the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility being constructed at the Department's Savannah River Site near Aiken, South Carolina, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4306(A)(3); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

2596. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Compliance, transmitting the Office's biennial report entitled "Report on Occupational Safety and Health Act Inspections" conducted during the 110th Congress and pursuant to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 860. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 129. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Los Padres National Forest in California; with an amendment (Rept. 111-197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1442. A bill to provide for the sale of the Federal Government's reversionary interest in approximately 60 acres of land in Salt Lake City, Utah, originally conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association under the Act of January 23, 1909; with an amendment (Rept. 111-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 409. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 509. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004; with an amendment (Rept. 111-200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to conduct a Joint Venture Program to protect, restore, enhance, and manage migratory bird populations, their habitats, and the ecosystems they rely on, through voluntary actions on public and private lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SERRANO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3170. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 3167. A bill to allow mail carriers to serve in temporary enumerator positions in connection with the 2010 decennial census; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3168. A bill to provide for duty-free treatment of certain recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 3169. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to carry out a study to determine

the most effective manner by which to carry out the Lake Pontchartrain flood control project, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a new pumping station at Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 3171. A bill to help stabilize and restore the economy by providing for greater access to credit for the underbanked, the unbanked, and consumers with low credit scores through the establishment of bridging bank depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care management services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. DENT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 3173. A bill to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation and shipment of certain species of carp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3174. A bill to provide that only certain forms of identification of individuals may be accepted by the Federal Government and by financial institutions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida:

H.R. 3175. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to Miami-Dade County certain federally owned land in Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 3176. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require Medicaid coverage of professional medical services of optometrists; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 3177. A bill to promote the development of practical fusion energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PAUL, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona):

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the expensing of certain real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to require the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program to include the effect of the Troubled Asset Relief Program on small businesses in the oversight, audits, and reports provided by the Special Inspector General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 3180. A bill to establish the National Advisory Committee on Rural Education in the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 3181. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to permit the establishment of Jobs Corps centers in territories of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Res. 624. A resolution condemning all violent repression by the Government of the People's Republic of China of peaceful Uighur protests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 625. A resolution recognizing and commending the 2009 National Veterans Wheelchair Games, to be held in Spokane, Washington, July 13 through 18, 2009; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama:

H. Res. 626. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress who participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) should be automatically enrolled in the public plan; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. INSLEE):

H. Res. 627. A resolution honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Washington, including the 81st Brigade Combat Team (Heavy) of the Washington Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H. Res. 628. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should pursue the global elimination of obstacles to the proliferation of technologies and services that science has proven are necessary to address the most pressing environmental problems of our time; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H. Res. 629. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments of the U.S. General Services Administration since its creation in 1949 for providing policy leadership and expertly managed space, products, services, and solutions, at the best value, to enable Federal employees to accomplish their missions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H. Res. 630. A resolution condemning the June 28, 2009, coup d'etat in Honduras, calling for the reinstatement of President Jose Manuel Zelaya Rosales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey):

H. Res. 631. A resolution congratulating Continental Airlines on its 75th Anniversary; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MELANCON:

H. Res. 632. A resolution congratulating Jockey Calvin Borel for his victory at the 135th Kentucky Derby; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIREs (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HARE):

H. Res. 633. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. DUNCAN introduced a bill (H.R. 3182) for the relief of Hotaru Nakama Ferschke; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 155: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mrs. BONO MACK.

H.R. 156: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 275: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 276: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 442: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 450: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 481: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 621: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of

- Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. INGLIS.
- H.R. 622: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
- H.R. 678: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 682: Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 734: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 897: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 932: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
- H.R. 936: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 950: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H.R. 1017: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 1024: Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 1064: Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 1159: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 1173: Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 1177: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1179: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 1197: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1207: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
- H.R. 1215: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1255: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H.R. 1283: Ms. WATERS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. CLYBURN.
- H.R. 1293: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 1339: Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 1347: Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 1361: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 1389: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 1392: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 1428: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
- H.R. 1454: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 1458: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1485: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1547: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 1548: Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 1549: Mr. POLIS and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 1557: Mr. PITTS and Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 1612: Mr. DICKS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1616: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 1618: Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. AKIN.
- H.R. 1633: Mr. REHBERG.
- H.R. 1643: Mr. ORTIZ.
- H.R. 1677: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 1678: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1682: Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 1708: Mr. HALL of New York.
- H.R. 1744: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. SHUSTER.
- H.R. 1751: Mr. DELAHUNT.
- H.R. 1800: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1826: Mrs. MALONEY.
- H.R. 1835: Mr. CARTER.
- H.R. 1868: Mr. SHADEGG.
- H.R. 1870: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 1881: Mr. COSTELLO.
- H.R. 1894: Mr. KISSELL.
- H.R. 1981: Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 2000: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 2017: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2057: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2060: Mr. OLVER.
- H.R. 2067: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 2068: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 2097: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HODES, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. HENSARLING, Mr. LINDER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KILROY, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MICA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FORBES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. DENT, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. FOX, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 2102: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 2105: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
- H.R. 2106: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
- H.R. 2119: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 2139: Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 2160: Mr. WU.
- H.R. 2178: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. CLARKE.
- H.R. 2194: Mr. NUNES, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Ms. KOSMAS.
- H.R. 2227: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
- H.R. 2246: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 2254: Mr. SALAZAR and Mrs. EMERSON.
- H.R. 2271: Mr. WU.
- H.R. 2287: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 2296: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 2314: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 2324: Mr. STARK, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 2349: Mr. DRIEHAUS.
- H.R. 2363: Mr. HOLT, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2378: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
- H.R. 2448: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2518: Mr. INGLIS.
- H.R. 2542: Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 2567: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 2575: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2584: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 2605: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
- H.R. 2625: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2626: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 2632: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
- H.R. 2697: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 2743: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. MICA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2746: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2770: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 2796: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
- H.R. 2811: Ms. HIRONO.
- H.R. 2852: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2882: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 2910: Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 2920: Mr. DICKS and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 2963: Mr. NYE, Mr. BACA, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2969: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 2982: Mr. BARTLETT.
- H.R. 3001: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3006: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 3012: Mr. KENNEDY and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 3015: Mr. CULBERSON.
- H.R. 3017: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 3040: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 3042: Mr. NADLER of New York and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 3044: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 3047: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3109: Mr. FILNER, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 3119: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
- H.R. 3141: Ms. FALLIN.
- H.R. 3147: Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. FLEMING.
- H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. OLVER and Mr. POE of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
- H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. BERMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. KANJORSKI.
- H. Res. 93: Mr. MINNICK and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H. Res. 175: Mr. KILDEE.
- H. Res. 402: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H. Res. 409: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H. Res. 433: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H. Res. 441: Mr. REYES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FOX, and Mr. LATHAM.
- H. Res. 487: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H. Res. 496: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 531: Mr. KIRK.

H. Res. 555: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FALCONE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 558: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 561: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 562: Mr. DENT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 563: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 574: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 577: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. HILL.

H. Res. 590: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 613: Mr. WOLF, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 615: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CANTOR.

H. Res. 619: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 3 by Mr. LaTOURETTE on House Resolution 359: Tim Murphy, Ed Whitfield, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Lamar Smith, Nathan Deal, Roy Blunt, Michele Bachmann, Mark E. Souder, and Michael N. Castle.