United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2013 *No. 78*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 5, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BANGLADESH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from a trip to Bangladesh where more than 1,100 garment workers died and 2,000 were injured in the Rana Plaza building collapse on April 24. Many Americans may remember the horrible pictures of workers being buried under tons of concrete from the collapsed building.

I learned a great deal about what must be done to improve safety conditions in the garment industry there. Bangladesh is the second largest garment-producing nation, employing over 4 million skilled and industrious workers, mostly women, at a minimum wage of $37 a month. I learned that many factories have continued to operate in unsafe residential or multistory commercial buildings even after the Rana Plaza collapse. I learned more about poor conditions created by a myriad of middlemen hired by retailers that pit one factory against the next, squeezing out the last few pennies per garment. I learned that Bangladesh garment workers subsidize those low prices with their lives.

I visited the hospital where there were scores of women, many with amputated legs and arms or who were suffering from brain damage from the collapse of that building where they were working and where they were locked inside. I met with a woman near Rana Plaza who was looking for her son even though the unidentifiable or the unclaimed workers had been buried in a mass grave.

And Rana Plaza is not an isolated case.

I visited with seven courageous women injured in the Tazreen Fashions factory fire that killed 112 workers last November. There were seven women who had to jump from the third and fourth floors of their factory because the factory supervisors locked the exits after the fire had started and had told them to go back to work or they would be fired, and the doors were locked. That was the policy of that factory and of many other factories. Just this week, we saw poultry workers in China locked in a factory after the fire had started; and they, too, perished in the fire. These were seven women who had to make the decision to jump from the third and fourth floors of this factory to save their lives. Tazreen produced garments for Walmart and many other American brands.

Listen to what the women told me:

Rehana jumped from the fourth floor window and was knocked unconscious. She broke her leg, and the doctors told her she will need to be on crutches for the rest of her life.

Reba was the breadwinner in her home. She jumped from the third floor. She cannot work because of the pain. Her husband is sick. She has two sons, one of whom just qualified for the military college, but she doesn't know if she can afford to keep him there; and until I prodded Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers Export Association, Reba had not received the promised stipend for those who were injured—6 months later.

Rowshanara jumped from the third floor and still has severe pain in her back and legs. She was visibly in pain after sitting too long while talking to us. She is single and gets by on loans. She has two teenage sons in school and doesn't want to force them to go to work, but she worries how she will get by.

Deepa worked on the third floor. She saw the fire, and tried to escape to the second floor. The factory manager padlocked the door and told everyone to keep working. Workers were crying and searching for a way out. A mechanic yelled to come to the east side of the building where he had created an exit. She jumped from the third floor and fell unconscious. She broke her left leg. She was 4 months pregnant, and she lost her baby.

Sumi decided to jump from the third floor rather than perish in the factory because she wanted her family to be able to identify her body, and that wouldn't happen if she were consumed in the fire. She broke her leg and arm and could not move. Her family borrowed money to pay for her medical bills before the association funds arrived. Two weeks before Rana Plaza, she came to the U.S. to urge retailers and brands to join the enforceable and

Printed on recycled paper.

binding Accord on Fire and Building Safety.

Nazma said she would have died if she had waited 10 more minutes to jump. She saw the manager locking the gate to the second set of stairs and grabbed him by the collar to stop him, but he ignored her. She cut her arms while trying to get through a window to reach the bamboo scaffolding. She broke her backbone. She can't carry anything or do housework. She has three children. Her stipend went to medical care and to her children's education. Her 14-year-old son has had to leave school to try to find work.

I am grateful that these women had the courage to tell me their stories.

There is widespread agreement that if the Tazreen fire and the Rana Plaza collapse workers had had the right to refuse unsafe work, they would be alive today. Nobody, not even the factory, denied that that's the case; but for too long, the Bangladesh Government has blocked new unions. Only now, in facing the potential loss of trade preferences, the government has opened the door a crack. Twenty-seven new unions have been registered recently, reversing the trend in which only one union per year was registered, and there are 5,000 factories.

I met the leaders of some of these newly formed unions—young and serious workers—but only time will tell if the government lives up to its promise of union rights. In addition, the Obama administration will soon conclude its review of Bangladesh's trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences. In my view, these preferences should be suspended.

The one message I have for the American holdouts who won't agree to these safety accords is: listen to the women from Bangladesh.

IN TRIBUTE TO DALE BONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, across this country, there are great men and women who answer the call to serve their communities. These folks are blessed with remarkable talents and success and share their success with their communities to improve the places that we all call home.

In North Carolina's 13th Congressional District, that man was Dale Bone. Dale was a man who exemplified the character, commitment, and charity of our district and who left behind a legacy of improving all things that he touched.

Born and raised in rural Nash County, Dale was a proud graduate of NC State University with degrees in agronomy and agricultural economy. After several years farming in his home community, Dale founded Nash Produce in 1977 and, within a decade, had grown it into the largest cucumber producer in the country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bone was a man of constant and restless energy. He served on countless State and national boards, committees and commissions, including his service as president of the National Council of Agricultural Employers. Dale also delved into his local community with characteristic resolve. He served as a trustee for Barton College, as a board member for the Salvation Army, and on the Arts Council of Wilson, North Carolina.

In addition to all of his honors and activism, Dale was also able to make a direct, personal impact in the lives of his employees and their children. Dale cared deeply for the well-being of all of his employees, many of whom were migrant workers, by providing them with the financial support necessary for them to learn English at the local community college.

Dale and his beloved wife, Genia, were also committed to improving the lives of local children. Dale and Genia endowed the Bone Scholars program at NC State University, which continues to offer significant scholarships to the children of migrant workers. In his later years, Dale was particularly proud of the involvement he and his wife had in creating and promoting Wilson Youth United, which offers direction and guidance to help local youths in the community.

Dale was a man of great ability and, as a result, of great means. He recognized the fact that our country is only as strong as its communities and that the best solutions to our problems usually come from the most local sources.

Across the Nation, members of the agricultural community sent thanks to Dale for his decades of untiring work on their behalf. In equal measure, Dale educated and prepared those around him to face the challenges of their futures. Dale was in all things a humble man, but I do believe that he would take great pride in the legacy that he leaves behind.

Mr. Speaker, America was built by people like Dale Bone; and it's that spirit, not what we do here in Washington, that will rebuild our economy.

□ 1010

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is my 13th End Hunger Now speech this year. Thirteen times I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America; 13 times I've come here and defended the anti-hunger safety net, the Federal programs that provide food to 50 million Americans; 13 times I've stood here and talked about hunger as a health issue; 13 times I've said we need to set a goal to end hunger now.

People ask me all the time: Is it even possible to end hunger in America? Mr. Speaker, the answer is a definitive ''yes.''

The truth is we've done this before. That's right, Mr. Speaker, we nearly eradicated hunger in the 1970s. It wasn't easy, but the concept was simple. The political leadership in Washington made a commitment to end hunger in this country.

In the 1970s, Congress and the President expanded the food stamp program, created the WIC program, and expanded the school meals programs. They found the political courage to do what's right because they believed that it was unacceptable that anyone in America went hungry.

Yet that effort was lost when these programs were slashed in the 1980s. Hunger came back with a vengeance. The number of hungry people skyrocketed. In fact, it's been rising steadily since the Reagan Presidency. These programs weren't just cut; they were demonized. Food assistance became a pejorative to some, and we see the results of those years of demonizing those programs today.

The truth is SNAP works. Food assistance works. People on food assistance are able to feed themselves and their families. They're able to use money they might have had to use for food for other purposes like rent, utilities, medical costs, school supplies for their kids, and transportation costs—just to name a few—in order to be able to buy nutritious food. They didn't have to make the choice between food or rent.

But that's not all. The money spent on food from these programs is spent on food which is produced by our farmers. It is spent in grocery stores. In fact, a recent report showed that approximately $70 billion was spent in grocery stores just from SNAP alone during our economic downturn. That's a lot of money going to our economy when our economy was damaged and needed the help.

These programs work, Mr. Speaker. But what's the response from the Republican-controlled House? Are they strengthening a program that is already among the least fraudulent and most efficient and effective in terms of our Federal Government? No.

In 2 weeks, this House will consider a farm bill that will cut $20.5 billion from SNAP. It will take food away from 2 million Americans. It is a bill that will take 210,000 poor kids off free school meal programs. It is a bill that would reduce the monthly SNAP benefit by $90 for another 850,000 people. And that's on top of the automatic across-the-board cuts to SNAP that will take place in November even if we cut nothing else. That's not only wrong. It is quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, beneath this great country of ours.

I will fight these cuts, and I urge all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to stand with me in pushing back on these cuts.

We should be praising this program for keeping people from starving. We should be strengthening it and making it work better, not neutering it and

taking food away from millions of poor families.

SNAP works, but don't take my word for it. Listen to the words of Trish Thomas Henley, someone who had to rely on SNAP to make ends meet. She says:

In 1993, I was a single parent with a 3-year-old and an 18-month-old. Even though I was working full time making $8.50 an hour as an administrative assistant, I could not afford to pay for food, housing, and day care. I went on food stamps. I remember the shame I felt every time I stood at the register while other shoppers waited for me to count out my food stamps.

The only way out of the cycle of poverty and off aid was to go to college. I applied and, at the age of 25, began my undergraduate career. I had to give up my full-time job to go to school. Instead, I worked three part-time jobs.

I would never, ever have been able to get through school without food stamps, Pell Grants, and student loans. It took a village and government aid. I was not a victim. I did not feel entitled. I, then as now, felt immensely grateful that I lived at a moment when my government chose to invest in me. It has been a smart investment. I am grateful that because of this investment I am now able to contribute and live up to my full potential.

Today, Trish is a professor at the University of Cincinnati. You see, Mr. Speaker, a little investment goes a long way.

SNAP works. It worked in the 1970s as the food stamp program, it worked for Trish in the 1990s, and it's working now. This is not the time to cut SNAP. We should be strengthening the ladders of opportunity that help people succeed. We should, with the help of the White House, develop a plan to end hunger now. We should not be supporting a farm bill that will make hunger worse. Now is the time to renew our efforts and pledge to end hunger now.

[From Cincinnati.com, May 31, 2013]

FOOD STAMPS DO WORK

My name is Trish Thomas Henley, and I'm an assistant professor of early modern literature and culture at the University of Cincinnati. I received my B.A. and M.A. from the University of Idaho and hold a PhD. from Florida State University. My first book was published in 2012. I'm also a volunteer with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Cincinnati and a mother of four boys.

My current life—as a teacher, volunteer, published author, homeowner and middle-class taxpayer—would not have been possible without government aid. In 1993, I was a single parent with a 3-year-old and an 18-month-old. Even though I was working full-time, making $8.50 an hour as an administrative assistant, I could not afford to pay for food, housing and day care. I went on food stamps. I remember the shame I felt every time I stood at the register while other shoppers waited for me to count out my food stamps.

The only way out of the cycle of poverty and off of aid was to go to college. I applied and, at the age of 25, began my undergraduate career. I had to give up my full-time job to go to school. Instead, I worked three part-time jobs.

I would never, ever have been able to get through school without food stamps, Pell Grants and student loans. It took a village and government aid. I was not a victim. I did not feel entitled. I, then as now, felt immensely grateful that I lived at a moment when my government chose to invest in me. It has been a smart investment. I am grateful that because of this investment I am now able to contribute and live up to my full potential.

Lately we're hearing a lot about food stamps, now called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, as Congress debates the farm bill We could see anywhere from $4 billion to $20 billion in cuts to SNAP, based on the Senate and House bills, respectively. I am not able to stand by and watch silently while Congress votes to allow people to go hungry while simultaneously subsidizing agribusiness.

SNAP helps lift 50 million Americans out of poverty and puts food on families' tables—on our neighbors' tables.

I am telling my personal story because someone needs to talk back to food stamp stereotypes and myths. Somehow, the myths persist and are used to defend the drastic cuts that have been proposed in the farm bill. If we want to save SNAP and other anti-hunger programs, it's time for a reality check.

Myth: SNAP recipients are inner-city minorities.

Fact: Food insecurity is neither an urban issue nor an ethnic issue. Nearly one in six people faces food insecurity, and they live in every county in the nation. In addition, 76 percent of SNAP households include a child, an elderly person or a disabled person.

Myth: People on SNAP are lazy and sign up for the program so they don't have to work.

Fact: Eighty-five percent of households with a food-insecure child have at least one working adult. The SNAP benefit formula provides a strong work incentive—for every additional dollar a SNAP participant earns, their benefits decline by about 24 cents to 36 cents, not a full dollar. Participants have a strong incentive to find work, work longer hours or seek better-paying employment.

Myth: SNAP is rife with fraud and abuse.

Fact: Despite steady growth of the program over the past decade, fraud and abuse have been reduced significantly. A 2010 report from the USDA found the national rate of food stamp trafficking (the practice of trading food stamps for cash) declined from about 3.8 cents per dollar of benefits redeemed in 1993 to about 1 cent per dollar.

Myth: SNAP recipients use their benefits to buy alcohol, cigarettes or lottery tickets.

Fact: It is illegal to buy any of these things with SNAP benefits.

Myth: SNAP is an inefficient government giveaway.

Fact: SNAP benefits drive economic growth in every community. Every $1 in new SNAP benefits generates up to $1.80 of economic activity.

These benefits are investments to help struggling families realize brighter futures. My fellow SNAP alumni brothers and sisters are evidence that these investments can pay off over the long run.

I am living proof SNAP can provide the boost a struggling child or family needs to realize the American dream. This program works, and we should all speak up together to protect it.

Please write and call your representatives in Congress and urge them to vote against any cuts to SNAP. These are not just numbers. These are people—people who will go hungry. If we allow Congress to do this, we are responsible for that. You and me.

STOPPING UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House leadership for its continuing commitment to restore the open appropriations process of the House.

That process is absolutely essential if the House is to meet its constitutional responsibility to superintend the Nation's finances. It assures that the people's elected Representatives can provide the maximum scrutiny of every public expenditure.

In the recent past, this process has given way to continuing resolutions that simply rubber-stamp past Federal spending, thus abrogating Congress' most fundamental fiscal responsibility. For this reason, I, for one, will not support any continuing resolutions of this nature.

The regular order over the Nation's finances must be reasserted, and the open appropriations process that has begun in the House this week does so. That process, though, is the final step in the procedures established to ensure that our Nation's spending gets careful examination. The first step in that process—and the most important step—is when programs are authorized or reauthorized. Legislation must first be adopted that establishes the programs for which money is subsequently appropriated.

That is an absolutely critical function that ensures Federal programs are constantly being scrutinized and that Congress is asking: Are these programs effective? Are they meeting their goals? Are they worthwhile? Are they worth the money we're paying? Most programs have time limits on them to ensure that these questions are periodically asked.

The legal authorization, then, is the green light to the Appropriations Committee to provide funding for that program. And for that reason, since 1835, the rules of the House have limited appropriations to only those purposes actually authorized by law. Unless and until the program is authorized, the House may not appropriate funds for it under this longstanding rule. Yet this rule is routinely ignored by the Appropriations Committee and by the House.

Last year, the appropriations bills reported out of the committee contained over $350 billion for programs that had either never been authorized or whose authorizations had lapsed years, and sometimes decades, ago. Many of these are vital programs whose reauthorization should be routine, but many are not. For example, the Community Development Block Grant program that paid for a doggy day care center in Ohio and a day at the circus for Nyack, New York, lapsed 18 years ago; and yet every year we keep funding it lavishly.

Most of the outrageous wastes of taxpayer money that end up in various pork reports stem from these lapsed programs. They're established, then they're forgotten, and the spending keeps on year after year.

The excuse for this conduct is that the authorizing committees have simply failed to attend to their duties of keeping authorizations current, including for a number of critical functions, and so the Appropriations Committee takes it upon itself to fund them.

What's to prevent this? The House rules allow any Member the right to raise a point of order against any unauthorized expenditure, but this right is stripped from Members every time an appropriations bill is sent to the House floor, making this rule meaningless and unenforceable.

It has now reached the point that more than one-third of the discretionary spending approved by the House is for purposes not authorized by law. This fact makes a mockery of the leadership's effort to restore regular order to the appropriations process.

I urge the Speaker of the House to direct the authorizing committees to bring the authorizations current for every program within their respective jurisdictions and to give them a year to do so. If, after a full year, the authorizing committees don't believe the programs are worth the time to review, then maybe that's just nature's way of warning us that they're also not worth the money that we continue to shovel at them.

Once the committees have had that year to review these unauthorized programs and to either renew them, reform them, or let them die, I urge the House to restore the right of every Member to challenge unauthorized appropriations on the floor as our rules clearly envision and provide.

□ 1020

Americans elected a House Republican majority with one clear mandate: stop wasting our money. To be worthy of that trust, we can't allow hundreds of billions of dollars to bypass the minimal congressional review that the authorizing process provides.

EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a recent University of California at Davis study on some effects that climate change will have in California. This report looks at habitat and temperature sensitivity for fish species within the State.

California has a diverse and robust ecosystem, as well as the largest estuary in the Western Hemisphere, namely the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The delta and its tributaries are home to an amazing variety of native species that must be protected. The study found that, of 121 native fish species in California, more than 80 percent will be critically endangered as a result of climate change. At the same time, nonnative or invasive species will survive at a much higher rate.

We must take action now to address climate change, which is starting to affect every aspect of our daily lives, including our water quality, flood risk, more severe weather—including hurricanes, tornadoes, and droughts—and the extinction of native species. The destruction posed by climate change to the natural resources we depend on for our daily sustenance is too great.

Global warming is here. It's dangerous, and we need to take action now. The longer we wait, the more difficult and costly the fixes will be, and the more our fellow human beings across the world will suffer.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE OF TAXPAYER INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of this recent IRS scandal, President Obama made this promise to the American people: I'll do everything in my power to make sure nothing like this happens again.

Everything? But what about ObamaCare? In spite of the culture of corruption and coverup at the IRS, the Obama administration is moving full steam ahead with ObamaCare, a law that gives unprecedented new access and powers to unelected government bureaucrats at the IRS and several other major government agencies.

Consider the potential for abuse with ObamaCare's mystery Federal data services hub, the largest personal information database the government has ever attempted, according to The Wall Street Journal. This data hub will function like a Web portal where your personal health insurance, tax and financial information, criminal background, and immigration status will be shared and transmitted between agencies, including the IRS, HHS, DOJ, DHS, and SSA.

While far too many questions still remain about who will have access to what information in the hub, we do know that a woman in charge of the IRS' eight newly created Obama enforcement offices is none other than Sarah Hall Ingram, the former commissioner of the office responsible for tax-exempt organizations during the targeted IRS scandal.

Will the Americans who do not purchase government-approved insurance soon find themselves targeted and harassed through IRS audits? Right now, only time will tell.

With so much personal information going in and out of the hub likely privy to both government employees and contractors, many of whom will have discretion over health care coverage and tax penalties, the potential for abuses is staggering. That's why I have introduced H.R. 2022, the Stopping Government Abuse of Taxpayer Information Act. My bill would require not only the IRS but all government agencies with access to ObamaCare's Federal data services hub to present to Congress—under the penalty of perjury—certification that the American people's personal information has not and will not be used for targeting any individual or group based on their beliefs.

With full implementation of ObamaCare only months away, the IRS scandal underscores why we must not only continue fighting to repeal the health care law, but we also have the responsibility to demand safeguards, accountability, and oversight measures to be put in place to shield Americans from further targeting and misuse of their personal information.

The question is: Will the President honor his promise to the American people to do everything in his power to ensure that nothing like the IRS scandal happens again?

Mr. President, join me in supporting my bill, H.R. 2022, to safeguard the American people's most personal information.

MAKING COLLEGE AFFORDABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, ensuring students can afford college is vital to ensuring our Nation's competitiveness in a global economy. A majority of new jobs in the next decade will require a college degree, which makes higher education an economic necessity for most Americans. Ensuring all students have the opportunity to go to college will strengthen our economy, grow our middle class, and invest in our future.

Yet, education costs continue to rise year after year, pricing some people out of an education. College costs have dramatically increased. Over the last decade, the cost of attending a 4-year institution has increased 66 percent over the rate of inflation. For 2-year institutions, tuition and fees for students have increased 47 percent beyond the rate of inflation. According to the College Board, the annual cost of attending an in-State public college is now well over $22,000 a year. These rapidly rising costs are pricing hardworking families and students out of an education.

Congress can—and must—act to ensure college remains affordable for hardworking families, and there are things that we can do to do just that.

First, Congress must act immediately to prevent student loan interest rates from doubling on July 1. I've supported the Student Loan Relief Act, which would extend the current student loan interest rate, 3.4 percent, until 2015. Unfortunately, the Republican plan passed last week, the Making College More Expensive Act, would put college out of reach for many of my constituents and students across this country. I opposed the Republican plan, which would create a variable

loan interest rate system, letting student loan rates spike, forcing students to pay higher interest rates.

I continue to believe that students deserve the certainty of a fixed student loan interest rate. An ever-changing rate, as the Republican plan would provide, would create more anxiety and uncertainty for millions of families, and that's just the wrong approach. Hardworking students and parents have already been saddled with $1 trillion of student loan debt. Congress should be working to ease that burden.

It's time that Congress return to regular order and prevent student loan interest rates from doubling at the end of the month. That means doing what we were sent here to do: going to conference to work out the differences between the House-passed version and the expected Senate version of this bill. The clock is ticking, and rates for millions of students will double on July 1 if we don't act.

Congress shouldn't let rigid partisanship get in the way of preventing what equates to a massive tax hike on students and their families. Instead, let's do our job and legislate. Disagreement on parts of a bill is not an excuse for delay.

Second, we should enact legislation to allow families to save more for college. Recently, I introduced a bill with my Republican colleague, Congressman TIM WALBERG, giving greater flexibility to families to save money for tuition, books, and other educational expenses. This bill, the Helping Families Save for Education Act, would increase existing caps on Coverdell savings accounts and allow families to contribute more over longer periods of time.

□ 1030

These types of accounts offer families a tax-advantaged choice to save for a child's educational expenses.

Currently, families or beneficiaries can contribute a maximum of $2,000 a year. Our legislation would increase the maximum contribution annually for most working families. Families and students, under our legislation, would also be able to save for college for an additional 4 years, until the student turns 22 years old.

Third, we must continue to provide and fully support Pell Grants, which provide needs-based grants to low-income students. No one who wants to go to college should be priced out of doing so. So I, along with my Democratic colleagues, stand ready and eager to ensure a college degree remains in reach for every student, no matter what their means.

Finally, we must keep the cost of attending college low by continuing direct State and Federal support to universities. In my home State of Michigan, we are blessed with great public institutions that provide a world-class education to our citizens.

Unfortunately though, in recent years we've seen direct financial support to these universities slashed. Such cuts are then passed on to students and families. If investing in education remains a priority for this Nation, we must invest in college for our students.

I ask a simple question: What's more important than the education of our children?

COMPETITIVE BIDDING FOR CMS SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address a situation that is evolving within this Nation where older adults on Medicare who have the misfortune of experiencing disease or disability and require durable medical equipment, equipment that is designed to allow people to live with dignity and independence in their own homes, we're seeing, through the actions of CMS, through Medicare, of preventing their access.

Medicare is awarding contracts to companies who are not even licensed in States to do business. In the end, it's going to cause a terrible disconnect with people being able to access the equipment that they need.

And not just the equipment. I spent 30 years working rehabilitation services as a therapist, rehab manager, and as a licensed nursing home administrator. I saw what difference this equipment makes, but also what the service makes, the technical assistance means for people who are living at home on oxygen or using wheelchairs or other types of medical equipment.

In the evenings, I actually was a volunteer EMT and firefighter; and frequently I'd find myself in the middle of the night, pager would go off and I'd be out in the community, in neighbors' homes, and be able to witness firsthand how important that equipment is there.

This week the National Association for the Support of Long Term Care and its members are in Washington to represent ancillary providers of products and services in the post-acute care industry. Now, as part of this work, these individuals will be garnering signatures on a letter that calls on CMS, Medicare Administrator Tavenner, to delay implementation of the widely criticized Medicare Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics and Supplies Competitive Bidding Program.

Now, this competitive bidding program—and believe me, it was misnamed when it was passed; there's nothing competitive about it—was intended to reduce Medicare costs, ensure that beneficiaries have access to quality services. In practice, the system denies competition while worsening access to quality goods and services and harming seniors.

In many ways, their mission today in Washington reminds me of one of my favorite movies, and a piece of our history in this country, the Apollo 13 mission. The story of Apollo 13 is that what could have been the worst space disaster in history became one of NASA's most spectacular conquests.

Everything had gone wrong. An oxygen tank exploded in the service module, damaged a nearby oxygen tank, and rocked the command and lunar modules. Mission controllers struggled to isolate the problems, with no success. The mission and the astronauts' lives were in jeopardy.

To conserve power, the astronauts had shut all of the spacecraft systems down except the radio. The carbon dioxide rose to toxic levels, and crew members managed for 6 days with hardly any food, water, or sleep in freezing temperatures. There was clear danger the astronauts might not survive, but they did.

Apollo 13 Flight Director Gene Kranz famously rallied his team to do what is necessary to get the astronauts home safely, declaring ''failure is not an option.''

One of NASA's greatest achievements had become not the next feat in space exploration, but the brilliant rescue of crew members aboard Apollo 13.

Similarly, when it comes to competitive bidding, failure is not an option. CMS' competitive bidding is our damaged spacecraft. Individuals in need of durable medicine equipment for prosthetics or orthotics are the flight crew. They are in danger. We need competent technical support professionals working together to achieve our mission and bring this crew home safely.

After years of bureaucratic delay and mismanagement, we're no closer to a system that works for both providers and beneficiaries—that would be the seniors of our Nation.

Now, it appears providers are being awarded contracts by CMS to provide services for round two competitive bidding that lack the required licensing or accreditation for specific States in which they're supposed to service those seniors.

I'm extremely concerned that mishandling of the bidding process is going to have a devastating impact on beneficiaries. This is a serious issue that warrants a full review of the process and a delay of round two until this fatally flawed program is fixed.

For this reason, I encourage my colleagues to sign on to this letter to Administrator Tavenner requesting a delay through the end of the year so that we can have more time to review how round one was implemented and fix the problems that exist with the administration of the program.

I'm proud to say that, as of today, we have 129 signatures from Members of the House of Representatives; and I encourage my colleagues who have not taken the opportunity to sign on to the letter to do so today.

We need to replace this fatally flawed program with one that's not just labeled competitive, but is competitive

and maintains beneficiary access to durable medical products and quality services.

THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have a major piece of legislation again being considered by this Congress, the farm bill. It expired in the last Congress; and, due to significant political machinations and controversies, we couldn't get it across the finish line because it was too expensive, didn't have enough reform, shortchanged nutrition and, frankly, didn't deal with the conservation elements that Americans care about.

Well, we're at it again, and the big, contentious issues remain. The direct payments appear to be gone, subsidies that go to farmers regardless of whether or not they even farm the land; but the big, contentious issues remain.

The issues of subsidization have simply migrated. There's an effort to have a shallow-loss provision or additional crop insurance subsidies that may actually end up being far more expensive than the direct payments they're supposed to be replacing.

There is an ongoing controversy regarding nutrition. The Senate bill cuts $4 billion at a time when too many Americans are, in fact, food insecure; and food stamps, the SNAP program, plays a vital interest in communities around the country.

The House bill is even worse: $16 billion in additional cuts that families rely upon and, frankly, that provide $1.70 of economic activity for each dollar that is given to beneficiaries.

Well, there is one area that shouldn't be unduly controversial: the conservation title of the farm bill. The farm bill is the most important piece of environmental legislation that will be considered by this Congress. The question is whether it will be a good environmental bill or a poor one.

The conservation title deals with programs that are very, very important but that the private market doesn't provide, a market-based incentive for people to invest in. I'm talking about things that, if you asked the public generally, of course they are concerned about clean air, clean water, soil protection, wetland and grassland preservation.

□ 1040

But these are things that we've seen for the last 60 years. Unless the Federal Government steps in with either subsidy or regulation, we pay a terrible price, dating back to the monstrous soil erosion that was part of the Dust Bowl tragedy.

Here, again, we're in a situation where the conservation title is in the crosshairs. It's the conservation programs that too often have been cut when we are in need of money. They are touted when people are encouraged to vote for the bill, and then those resources dissipate. Funding is diverted to large projects. Large, confined animal feedlot operations take huge amounts of this money to deal with something that should be part of their cost of doing business and large operations that could fund it themselves. It takes away resources from small and medium-size farmers, or drains valuable wetlands.

There's a reason why only one in four of the applications for conservation programs are approved. Because there isn't enough money and too much is diverted. I've introduced H.R. 1890, the Balancing Food, Farms, and Environment Act, which seeks to change those priorities to be able to have more money available, targeted toward small and medium-size farmers and ranchers, and be able to put a premium on longer-term conservation.

We have a bizarre situation now where, because of the amazingly bloated and inefficient farm crop insurance program, people are plowing up land that previously had been in conservation, land that's going to be eroded and that's probably going to fail because it's marginal cropland but they don't care because the Federal Government is going to pay them anyway. And the taxpayer loses twice. They pay through unnecessary crop insurance subsidies and they pay because they lose the water quality, the water quantity, the protection of wildlife habitat—and soil erosion.

By all means, let's have the political tug-of-war over unnecessary subsidization in terms of fighting nutrition, but let's come together on the conservation items, which really ought to be nonpartisan, focused, and economically productive.

U.S.-CHINA RELATIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, China's new President, Xi Jinping, will conclude a tour of the Western Hemisphere by meeting with President Obama in an informal summit in California. The leaders of the Pacific Rim's two most powerful countries will discuss many issues of mutual concern. This important relationship continues to evolve dynamically in spite of the difficulties that we both have. These difficulties spring from some radically different philosophical outlooks on both life as well as governance. These differences deserve both our attention and candor.

Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago, this week, June 3, 1989, a massacre took place in China in a place called Tiananmen Square. Student protesters who were seeking some form of liberty for their interests gathered there. And I remember very vividly two very stark images from that time. One was the homemade replica of the Statue of Liberty that was erected in their midst. The other was a courageous Chinese man who decided to take it upon himself to stand as a silent witness, arms at his side like a soldier at attention, for the cause of human rights. He stood in the street and blocked four tanks as they proceeded on toward the student protesters. The tanks tried to make their way around him. As they did, he would move and stand in front of them. Clearly, there was a dilemma going on in the minds of the young Chinese soldiers who were driving those tanks. Perhaps they didn't want to kill one of their countrymen. So they tried to avoid it. But the young man persisted. For a time, he blocked those tanks, courageously and alone, from carrying out part of what would become the Tiananmen Square massacre. Eventually, some of his friends or other Chinese citizens whisked him away from certain death. Those were two very stark images in my mind that have stayed with me ever since.

In the House Foreign Affairs Committee this week, another one of those student leaders actually spoke. Her name is Chai Ling. She's a courageous new American, one who knows well the tragedy of forced repression—both political repression and the painful, silent repression in China that is not spoken of enough, which is that country's forced abortion policies, its One Child policy, which has, by the way, disproportionately targeted unborn girls.

In her testimony, she spoke clearly about her passion and love for China and her hope that the United States and China can begin a new embrace in a spirit of cooperation rooted in the fundamental respect for human dignity, which transcends both language and culture. She argues that the fear that led to the devastating persecutions of the Cultural Revolution, Tiananmen Square, and more recently, this genocidal One Child policy, which has seriously distorted China's demographic balance, must be transformed by truth. She echoes the spirit of Chen Guangcheng, the blind Chinese activist who stood up so courageously against repression last year in China. When he visited here in Washington, he said this to a small group of us: The intrinsic kindness of persons cannot be defeated by violence and force.

Mr. Speaker, dysfunction in this important bilateral relationship between the United States and China serves neither of our countries, nor the broader world, as the influence of this relationship extends far beyond our respective national borders. China wants our markets, we want their stuff and, perversely, there are incentives for our businesses to seek out their low-cost manufacturing. We want their investment, they want our resources. We sell our enterprises, we also run up our debt, and they buy the debt. In turn, we run down our economy in an endless

chase for near-term gain. This feeds a dysfunctional interdependence that is further aggravated by fundamental disagreements stemming from different world views and perspectives on the individual and the state.

We need to look closely at our notions of self-interest in this relationship, which vividly illustrates some of the challenges associated with global interdependence. But there are also opportunities that we need to grasp, Mr. Speaker. The President recently changed the way in which we talk about the concept of national interest in his State of the Union address, and I agree with him. We should talk about our national conscience in concert with our national interest. The two are inseparable. In conscience, we cannot say that all is well with the U.S.-China relationship.

We can hope for a better day. Hopefully, this meeting between the President and the new President of China will bear lasting fruit which transcends discussions about defense and economics, and looks to that which is fundamentally just and good for all peoples of the world.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Thomas Elliott, Jr., Cannon United Methodist Church, Snellville, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, You are the hope and end of all creation. Through Your love and mercy, You give us life and freedom. You bless us with an abundance of resources. You invite us to faith.

We thank You for Your presence and pray that You will guide us in the work You seek to accomplish.

Forgive us our indulgences and selfishness. Remove the prejudice, hatred, and contempt that divide us. Govern our thoughts with liberty and justice for all. Make us mindful of the needs of all peoples. Transform our economic woes. Influence our decisions. Free us from terrorism and war. Reveal Your will to us.

Today, we pray for our Nation, our President, and this Congress, the military and citizens, the less fortunate and peoples of the Earth.

Turn our hearts to You that we may serve this day with compassion, justice, courage, and peace.

In Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it's my great pleasure this morning to introduce my colleagues to Dr. Tom Elliott. Not only is he our guest chaplain today and the senior pastor at Cannon United Methodist Church in Snellville, in my district, he was also my youth minister growing up in Decatur, Georgia. For over 30 years, I've known Tom.

He's here today with his wife, Kelly. He is surrounded in love by his daughter, Lucy, and his son, Thomas. He has a love of the Lord, and that's a love that he shares in the pulpit on Sunday morning, and a love that you can find expressed in music at coffeehouses around the district in his Wild at Heart band nights during the week.

It's my great pleasure to have Tom with us today. I thank you for your service to our community, Tom, and I thank you for your service to the Lord.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISION ON DNA COLLECTION

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

Mr. MASSIE. I rise today in strong opposition to the recent Supreme Court decision in Maryland v. King. As Justice Scalia warned in his brilliant dissent, a consequence of this week's ruling is that your DNA can now ''be taken and entered into a national DNA database if you are ever arrested, rightly or wrongly, or for whatever reason.''

On the day I was sworn in, I pledged that I would be a staunch defender of individual liberties and of our Constitution, an unwavering advocate for freedom. This includes upholding the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution that protects us against unreasonable searches and seizures.

I strongly disagree with the five Justices in this case who held that DNA collection is just ''another metric of identification,'' like ''a name or a fingerprint.'' It is not. It's an intrusive invasion of privacy and property that should never be allowed before a person has even been tried, convicted, or served a warrant.

As my Senate colleague TED CRUZ warned, ''unchecked government power and intrusive personal databases . . . pose real risks to our liberty.''

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act, yet too many women continue to struggle. Too many women still don't receive equal pay for equal work.

Fifty years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, women still earn only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. That is not only wrong, it's bad for our economy.

Working families often rely on two incomes, and more and more households have women as the primary source of income. That means women's take-home pay must cover the rent, the groceries, the doctor's visits. And when women succeed, our families succeed; so does our economy.

I was proud to cast my first vote in Congress for the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which restored women's right to challenge unfair pay in court, but there's more work to do. Over the past 50 years, the Equal Pay Act has never been updated or strengthened. That's where the Paycheck Fairness Act comes in. It strengthens and closes loopholes in the law.

So let's get this done and send an important message that work is work, no matter who is doing it. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the great State of Utah and Salt Lake City. Forbes Magazine recently rated Utah as the best State in the Nation for business and careers. Salt Lake City was recently ranked as the best city in the country for new graduates.

But while the State of Utah is doing very well, the rest of our Nation is not. As a small business owner, I know that government does not create jobs; the private sector creates jobs. And businessmen all over this Nation are asking—no, they're even begging—for one thing: Get government out of the way. Allow our economy to grow. Create new American jobs. Expand opportunity; don't expand government.

There are, right now, 4.4 million Americans that have been jobless for more than 6 months, and this is completely unacceptable.

We must simplify our Tax Code. We need to become energy independent. We need to move forward with projects such as the Keystone pipeline. We need to reform health care and entitlement programs, which account for the vast majority of our deficit and debt spending.

Americans deserve better. We can do better.

□ 1210

PASS THE JOBS ACT NOW

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 885 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. This Congress is pretending our unemployment crisis is completely over. This Congress is acting as though surface scandals and a now rapidly shrinking budget deficit are the only issues that matter to this country. Try telling that to any of the 12 million unemployed Americans, who are today struggling to keep their homes and to pay for their food and health care. Try telling that to any of the 3 million Americans who have been unemployed for more than a year and are facing the indescribably painful possibility that they will never work again.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is the Nation's true deficit. Let's pass the Jobs Now Act and the President's American Jobs Act to end it. The mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS

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

Mr. MESSER. The First Amendment is under attack in Madison, Indiana. One of my constituents, Bill Grote, is a profile in courage as he litigates against the government's attempt to force him to violate his First Amendment rights and comply with ObamaCare's contraceptive mandate. Churches deserve protection from this mandate, but private businesses and business owners deserve protection, too.

Mr. Grote is not alone. Some businesses may choose to close their doors instead of complying. Others may be fined out of business. Ask yourself: If the Federal Government can make Mr. Grote purchase products in violation of his religious beliefs, what can it do to you?

I applaud Mr. Grote's courage and urge the House to pass the Health Care Conscience Rights Act to stop this attack on religious liberty.

WE NEED A COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYEE NONDISCRIMINATION ACT

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

Mr. POCAN. This June, as we celebrate LGBT Pride Month, LGBT Americans have much to celebrate. Every day this country moves closer and closer towards embracing full equality for all of its citizens. And yet the path to equality and justice saw a setback last week when one of our Nation's largest companies chose to deny fundamental workplace protections for its employees.

For the 14th year in a row, ExxonMobil's shareholders voted to strike down a proposal that would specifically prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. This is a company that has received more than $1 billion in government contracts over the last decade. Simply put, the government should not be in business with companies that discriminate.

Exxon's decision makes it part of a shrinking minority: 88 percent of Fortune 500 companies specifically ban employee discrimination based on sexual orientation. BP doesn't discriminate, Chevron doesn't discriminate, Shell Oil doesn't discriminate. But ExxonMobil does. Their anti-equality policies should start to hurt their bottom line.

Unfortunately, it is still legal to fire someone in 29 States based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. ExxonMobil's backwards decision highlights why we need to pass a comprehensive employee nondiscrimination act.

PASS THE FAIR TAX

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are aware how our current Tax Code is too complex and punishes people who save, invest, and achieve economic success. However, the recent news coming from the IRS illustrates another pressing reason for tax reform. Our current Tax Code puts too much power and potential for abuse into the hands of unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats.

The American people deserve a tax system that cannot be a political weapon to be used against them. That is why I'm a proud cosponsor of the Fair Tax. The Fair Tax would eliminate the IRS by replacing the current Tax Code with a simple consumption-based tax. The Fair Tax would be collected equally from all Americans, with no opportunity for the government to attack or discriminate against innocent citizens.

The Fair Tax is a reform measure that offers a rare chance to unleash economic growth, create good jobs, and at the same time protect the rights of American people. I urge this body to swiftly pass the Fair Tax.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, the Equal Pay Act passed in Congress with strong bipartisan support. That should be no surprise. It makes sense.

Back in 1963, 201 Democrats joined with 160 Republicans to support equal pay for equal work. Only 9 Members voted ''no.'' Back then, women earned just 59 cents for every dollar men earned. And today, we're still 23 cents short on the promise of equal pay. Half a century later, women earn 77 cents for every dollar men make for the same work. The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen the Equal Pay Act, giving women the paychecks they deserve and have earned. It would eliminate the loopholes and carve-outs that have denied women basic fairness for decades.

As we celebrate the passage of the Equal Pay Act, let's hope for a return to bipartisanship and common sense. Let's make sure that women are paid what they deserve and pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. Equal pay was bipartisan 50 years ago. It should be bipartisan today.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our top priority in Congress should be to promote job creation and a healthy economy. Too many Americans are struggling. The unemployment rate remains too high, the labor force participation rate continues to drop, and the national debt still is nearly $17 trillion. This is due to the administration's failed economic and overreaching regulatory policies. Wasteful government spending and higher taxes are not the answers the American people are looking for. America needs real solutions for economic recovery.

In order for all Americans to thrive, we need jobs. Over 60 percent of new jobs are generated by small businesses,

which have always been the backbone of our economy. Many small business owners are holding off hiring new workers because they're uncertain of higher taxes, more government red tape, more regulations.

We must remove unnecessary regulations. We need to promote real solutions that heal our economy and create new jobs. Americans share the same goal: a healthy economy and positive future. We need to keep the American Dream alive for future generations.

RETURN BUFFALO TO THE URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will take up Homeland Security appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2014. Unfortunately, this legislation, once again, limits the number of cities in the Urban Area Security Initiative program to 25. This is unacceptable. It excludes many cities that have been determined to be a high risk of a terror threat.

The Buffalo-Niagara region, which I represent, includes four international border crossings and the busiest passenger crossing along the northern border with Canada; the largest electricity producer in New York State; and is within a 500-mile radius of 55 percent of the American population and 62 percent of the Canadian population. Recently, authorities thwarted a terror plot in which the target is thought to have been a bridge in Niagara Falls. It is unthinkable this bill should continue to exclude Buffalo from this important program it was once eligible for.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the homeland should be a Federal Government priority. We should be doing more, not less, to protect our most vulnerable cities, including returning cities to this program and ensuring we maintain the capabilities gained under the program.

FREE SPEECH

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment of our Constitution is first because nothing is more important to secure liberty and freedom of speech and freedom of the press than our First Amendment.

There are currently two scandals that put into question the President's commitment to this sacred freedom, with the Justice Department secretly obtaining phone records of reporters at the Associated Press and Fox News, and the IRS targeting certain groups because of their political beliefs.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee held a hearing with the victims of the IRS abuse, and we learned that IRS officials not only asked many inappropriate questions to members of these groups, like what books they read or what was in their prayers, but also tried to tell free Americans who they could not protest against, and even illegally released private tax records to groups with opposing viewpoints.

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press should never be in question in this Nation, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, we can all agree that units of the Federal Government should never use their powers to punish Americans simply because of their ideas. This House will get to the bottom of this issue by following the facts. These free people, our great patriots, deserve no less.

□ 1220

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act, and I rise to urge my colleagues to strengthen that law by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I'm a proud cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act because, even today, working women in my district in Georgia and across the country earn, on average, 77 cents for every dollar that men earn for the same work. That's because the penalties under the current law aren't strong enough to deter employers from breaking the law. And the current law doesn't protect employees from retaliation for sharing salary information with coworkers. The Paycheck Fairness Act will plug these loopholes in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand here today with so many of my colleagues to call for the passage of these long-overdue improvements in this landmark law. Every day we ignore the shortcomings of the law is another day we deny women their rights under the law, and that should end right now.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss ObamaCare's assault on jobs and full-time employment. The law is costing wages that are important to families in these tough economic times.

I received an email from a constituent in my district who is a teacher's assistant. Because of the 30 hours that is considered full-time employment in the Affordable Care Act, her hours have been cut to 28 hours a week, along with all of her colleagues. She stated:

I don't even need health insurance, I get it through my husband's employment. But because of this bill, I will be losing money that my family needs and depends on.

Indiana is also home to over 300 medical device companies, with an economic impact of over $10 billion a year. Companies in Indiana, like Cook Medical, have already scrapped plans for expansion in the State, citing the 2.3 percent medical device tax.

Yesterday, I discussed with Secretary Sebelius the vote in the Senate, 79–20, and the vote in the last House Congress, 270–146—including 37 Democrats—to repeal the law, but the administration sticks by the fact that they do not want that part of the law repealed.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has been telling Americans for the last 5 years that they are trying to create jobs, but they're refusing to acknowledge the jobs that are being lost because of their health care bill.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, by 2018, 63 percent of all American job openings are going to require some sort of post-high school education. Workers who hold bachelor's degrees make, on average, double the people who don't have bachelor's degrees.

Now, if we fail to take responsible action this month, student loan rates are going to double on 7.4 million American students. At a time when other interest rates are at historic lows, this body passed H.R. 1911, a bill that would make college more expensive.

I urge this body to pass H.R. 1433, to hold interest rates where they are in order to broaden opportunities and allow everybody a piece of the American Dream.

HONORING DR. JOSEPH COX

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an educator, leader, author, and role model for young men in Pennsylvania.

This week, Dr. Joseph Cox will preside over his final commencement ceremony as headmaster of the Haverford School, a secondary school for boys in Haverford Township, Delaware County.

Dr. Cox took office as Haverford's headmaster in 1998; and since then, he has led the school and its faculty with his firm belief that teachers and boys must be ''firm, fair, funny, focused, and friendly.'' These qualities were the backbone of Dr. Cox's philosophy of teaching.

Dr. Cox has set a long example for men outside the classroom as well. He's a 30-year Army veteran, serving his country in Vietnam, commanding a battalion of the famous 101st Airborne Division and retiring as a colonel.

A warrior, a poet, a cultivator of the minds of young men, and a sculptor of their character by his example, he leaves the institution not just better than he found it, but he leaves the lives he has touched so much richer for the experience of working with him and learning by his side.

Dr. Cox, you are in every measure what it means to be a teacher. Your community thanks you.

MOLOKAI MIDDLE SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Ms. GABBARD. I rise today to recognize a very talented group of students from the beautiful island of Molokai in my district.

Last week, I had a chance to meet with the Molokai Middle School's Golden Eyes robotics team. Beating out 52 other teams, the Golden Eyes took first place at the Hawaii FIRST LEGO League Championship in December 2012, and recently attended a national invitational.

The FIRST LEGO League is a robotics program created to get students excited about science and technology. The team members included Erik Svetin, Lily Jenkins, Noah Keanini, Katy Domingo, Caele Manley, and Kaitlin DeRouin, with great coaches David Gonzales and Jennifer Whitted.

Together, they researched and developed conceptual glasses, using face-recognition software, to help the elderly remember the people that they met. They researched age-related memory loss and put in 600 hours of research and practice to prepare for the competition, and they're now applying for a patent.

I am so proud of these young people, as they represent the great talent that exists in our State of Hawaii. They are who give me hope for our bright future.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF VIOLA ERGEN

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commemorate the life of an outstanding American, Viola Ergen, who passed away on May 21. She was an American whose life has touched and will touch many Americans for generations to come.

Mrs. Ergen was the daughter of Finnish and Swiss immigrants. She graduated high school at age 15 and was the first female to earn a BAA in accounting from the University of Minnesota. After graduation, she and her husband Bill moved to Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in 1947.

As a dedicated mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother, she was still volunteering well into her 97th year. Her commitment to excellence in everything she did is reflected in the lives of her five children and 15 grandchildren, who span this Nation as business leaders, doctors, and volunteers in a number of fields. It is impossible to measure the number of people whose lives will be touched by her time on Earth.

Her work over 40 years in helping Oak Ridge Children's Museum become one of the Nation's finest museums reflects her commitment to helping others.

Mrs. Ergen was an extraordinary person who excelled in an extraordinary generation. She was a great Tennesseean, who gave her life tirelessly to her family, friends, and community.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of equal pay for equal work for women.

June 10 marks the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. In 1963, when the Equal Pay Act was passed, women made 59 cents to the dollar that men made. Fifty years later, women are still paid significantly less than men for their same work. Today, women earn 77 cents for every dollar men make.

Equal pay should not only be viewed as an issue of fairness; it is also an economic issue. The yearly gap of $8,200 the Sacramento women face could have been put to use paying off student loans, as part of a down payment for a new home, or invested for their retirement.

Paycheck fairness puts the money that women have rightfully earned into their pockets where it belongs. That's why I support the Paycheck Fairness Act and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation as well.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Education and the Workforce heard testimony from Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. Despite a mountain of facts to the contrary, she told the committee that the concerns employers have with the health care law are mere speculation. I don't know who the Secretary is talking to in Washington, but the reality for employers out in the real world is there is no speculation when it comes to the job-crushing effects of ObamaCare.

Where I live in North Carolina, ObamaCare is destroying jobs and forces full-time workers to accept part-time hours, and that's just the start. I recently hosted a field hearing in my district where I heard from a business owner who, prior to ObamaCare, was able to offer some of the best medical, dental, and vision care in the area at a cost of only 20 percent to his employees. Sadly, this same company is now subject to higher premiums, higher Medicare taxes, higher investment taxes, and greater administrative burdens. All of this will divert resources from new training, new equipment, and better wages.

Mr. Speaker, what I see are the facts and not speculation. That's why I'm adamant that we need to repeal this terrible law.

□ 1230

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. This law was the very first step to closing the gender wage gap. It was also a statement about our values—that women and men deserve equal pay for equal work. But 50 years later, women continue to be devalued.

Equal pay is not only a women's issue, it's a family issue. Families rely on women's wages to make ends meet, and the extra $11,000 a woman would make each year if she was fairly compensated has real value. It could pay for a year and a half of child care, or feed a family of four with money to spare. Every dollar matters for hard-working women and families.

What's better than the Equal Pay Act's 50th anniversary? A Paycheck Fairness Act birthday. It is time the Paycheck Fairness Act got a vote.

U.S. SUGAR REFORM

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the need for reforming our current sugar program. This uncompetitive, outdated policy is stunting job creation and is harmful to families, candy companies, and food manufacturers that are forced to pay a higher cost for any product made with sugar. Recent data suggests that without reform, the program puts 600,000 jobs in the sugar-using industries at risk. I became all-too-aware of this negative economic impact during a visit at a leading confectioner located in my district.

Headquartered in Bryan, Ohio, Spangler Candy Company is a family-owned business that has been providing consumers with Dum Dums, candy canes, and other confections since 1906. This company currently has over 400 employees, but if it could purchase sugar at world market prices, instead of at an inflated price, the number of

employees would be closer to 600. That is a difference of 200 manufacturing jobs in a single midwestern town. Imagine the positive economic growth that would result from sugar reform nationwide. I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 693, the Sugar Reform Act. Reform to the sugar program will restore fairness in the sugar market, encourage investment, and spur job creation in our local communities.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA KNUDSON

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Patricia Knudson, the first Latina to be promoted to the rank of chief deputy in Riverside County. Instrumental in fostering relationships within our community, Patricia has served at the Riverside County Sheriff's Department for 24 years.

Patricia started her law enforcement career at the Robert Presley Detention Center. For the last two decades, she's continued to serve in a variety of roles within the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. She now moves from her current position as the commander of the Robert Presley Detention Center to become the chief deputy of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department.

Always actively engaged in the community, Chief Deputy Knudson founded ''Life Path Vision,'' a group that works with Riverside Police Foundation to mentor youth. Never ceasing to help those in need, Patricia also volunteers and serves on boards and committees of a number of nonprofit organizations in the community.

As a role model and mentor herself, Chief Deputy Knudson firmly believes it's everyone's responsibility to mentor youth to be successful adults. With her unparalleled passion for service, Patricia Knudson is a role model for us all.

IMPACT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during a hearing on the Education and Workforce Committee, Secretary Sebelius dismissed concerns regarding the impact that the Affordable Care Act will have on small businesses as ''speculation.''

But in my district—and all across this country—the negative impact of this law is a sad reality. I've held field hearings in Indiana, Pennsylvania, and most recently North Carolina to hear directly from job creators about how they will have to cut hours or hire fewer employees because of the Affordable Care Act.

Just this past Sunday, my hometown paper, the Johnson City Press, ran an advertisement from a Burger King franchisee owner announcing he was being forced to close one of his stores as a result of, among other things, ''a law so unfriendly to business and workers it forces the business to limit hardworking Americans to less hours and lower pay at a time of high unemployment and less opportunity for people to prevail.''

This entrepreneur wants to grow his business, not shrink it. But instead, we are limiting his opportunities and those of Tennesseans that he would employ. Speculation? I hardly think so. We can—and must—do better.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, when women succeed, our economy grows, our communities prosper, and our Nation thrives. And yet, 50 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, some in Congress seem content to let the pay gap between men and women continue.

Back in 1963, women earned 59 cents on average for every dollar a man took home. President Kennedy called that ''unconscionable.'' Meanwhile, about 1 in 10 mothers were their family's primary breadwinners. Five decades later, the number of female breadwinners has quadrupled. And yet women take home only 77 cents for every dollar a man earns for the same job. In 50 years, we've made 18 cents of progress.

Congress hasn't updated the Equal Pay Act since President Kennedy signed it into law. The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen that law, adapt it to a much different American workplace than what we had in the sixties, and put us back on a pathway to pay equity in the workforce.

Equal pay isn't just a women's issue—it's a family issue, it's an economic issue, it's a community issue, and it's also an issue that Congress has ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Paycheck Fairness Act and help guarantee equal pay for equal work.

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, we have a jobs crisis in this country. Millions of Americans are out of work, and yet many jobs go unfulfilled. This is especially true among young people.

Part of the problem is that young Americans are faced with uncertainty when investing in college education due to government price-fixing of student loan interest rates. While some in this Chamber think that's a good thing, others do not. We passed a bill on that just 2 weeks ago.

That is why House Republicans have passed the Smarter Solutions for Students Act. It stops student loan rates from doubling in July, fixes the student loan process long-term, and takes politicians out of the business of setting interest rates by moving to a market-based system. As a member of the Budget Committee, I'll note that these are many of the same—actually, the very same—principles the President called for in his own budget plan.

We are offering the President a perfect opportunity for a true bipartisan victory. Not only is it a bipartisan victory, it is a real solution to a real problem.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy signed the bipartisan Equal Pay Act, which requires equal pay for equal work. A great idea, but 50 years later women earn 77 cents for every dollar men make—a yearly gap of over $11,000 between working men and women. Women of color earn even less.

Does anyone think that if this Congress were a majority of women, that this bill would still be stonewalled from even being debated in this House and by this Republican majority? We would debate the Paycheck Fairness Act right away.

Since most American families rely on women's wages, the pay gap means $11,000 less every year for their groceries, rent, and doctors' visits. And the effects last a lifetime, resulting in lower pensions and Social Security benefits.

Fifty years—a half a century—is far too long for women to wait for paycheck fairness. Here is a little warning: women may not be a majority here now, but we are a majority of voters.

Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

□ 1240

THE SAVE ACT

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, every day, we talk about the need to cut spending and government waste in order to promote economic stability and to grow our economy. That's why I've introduced a bill to do just that.

The SAVE Act would cut $200 billion over 10 years by eliminating the duplicative and inefficient spending within the government. This bill has already received bipartisan support. In fact, these cuts were outlined in the President's own GAO report. They include: cutting $137 million by eliminating duplicative catfish studies; saving taxpayers $33 billion by reducing Medicare and Medicaid fraud and abuse; and forcing government agencies to act more

like the private sector with contract bidding, saving taxpayers $80 billion.

These are commonsense and practical cuts, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the SAVE Act.

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. TRIFON LASKARIS

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

Mr. TONKO. I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable individual and prolific inventor whose pioneering research into medical imaging has helped to transform modern-day medicine.

Dr. Trifon Laskaris, a chief scientist at General Electric's Global Research Center, was recently awarded his 200th United States patent. It is a benchmark previously reached by only one other GE researcher—the inventor of the lightbulb and founder of the company's research center, Thomas Edison.

For the past four decades, Dr. Laskaris has worked at GE Global Research on technology to advance magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI. Without the work of Dr. Laskaris and his team, MRI would not be where it is today—a vital diagnostic tool used in hospitals around the world. There is no telling how many millions of people are leading healthier lives today because of the technology that Dr. Laskaris developed.

I congratulate Dr. Trifon Laskaris on this milestone achievement; and on behalf of this body and the citizens of the 20th Congressional District of New York, I thank him for his lifelong dedication to scientific research in the service of humanity.

OBAMACARE IS NOT ABOUT CARE

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

Mr. RADEL. Certainty and stability are really all that our businessowners are asking for from us here in the government so that they can grow and create jobs. Instead, we handed them ObamaCare—a nightmare for people who own businesses or who are trying to start up their own businesses. Worse, it is a nightmare for you and your family. It's not fair for you, for your kids, for your grandkids. ObamaCare will and is cutting your wages, your hours—it may even cost you your job—and it is weakening our social safety net.

In the big picture, ask yourself: When it comes to your health care, who knows how to care for you and your family most—you or some stranger here in Washington?

ObamaCare is bad for business, putting 3 million American jobs in jeopardy—and that is not speculation, Secretary Sebelius. It's plain and simple. The Affordable Care Act is not affordable. It's not about your health; it's not about care—and it is not fair. It's not fair to our seniors, our kids, our grandkids, or to you.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Over the last 50 years, women have broken barriers in business, science, education, and government. Today, they also account for half of the workers in the country, but still they earn less for equal work.

In Nevada, the average woman still makes only 85 cents for every dollar that men earn, amounting to a yearly gap of $6,300 between full-time working men and women. Collectively, Nevada women are losing some $2.3 billion each year due to this pay gap. The pay gap not only harms individual women, but it hurts their families and our communities. It is an economic drag, a social calamity, and a moral injustice.

In a country where we strive for equal opportunity, this is simply unacceptable. That's why it's so important that we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. This critical piece of legislation would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act and help women fight wage discrimination.

The issue is simple: women should receive equal pay for equal work, and the Paycheck Fairness Act would provide the tools to reach that goal.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the consideration of H.R. 2217 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 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. 2217.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1245

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. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROE of Tennessee 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. CARTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

It was 69 years ago this Thursday that more than 9,000 Allied soldiers were killed or wounded during the D-day invasion in Normandy, France. That courageous operation, as well as the sacrifice of so many brave individuals, serves as a sobering reminder that freedom and security are, in fact, not free.

It is with this solemn commitment to both freedom and security that I respectfully present to the people's House the fiscal year 2014 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. Similar to our subcommittee's work over the past 3 fiscal years, this bill demonstrates how we can fund vital security programs and enforce the law while also reducing discretionary spending overall. So this bill is about our security and fiscal priorities and getting them right.

The President's fiscal year 2014 budget proposal for DHS presents a harmful budget for our frontline homeland security agencies, diminishing their operational workforces and undermining mission capabilities. The end result of the President's budget proposal would, undoubtedly, be a less capable DHS. That's why our subcommittee, on a bipartisan basis, strove to significantly improve the flawed budget request through this bill before the House today.

First, this bill targets the very programs and systems displayed during and after the recent horrific attack at the Boston Marathon. It does this by a nearly 20 percent increase above the request for FEMA's first responder grants; substantial increases above the request and last year's level for CBP's targeting, TSA's Secure Flight, and ICE's visa enforcement programs, including the phase-in of 1,600 additional CBP officers; doubling the Department's Bombing Prevention program, substantially increasing counter-IED training and applying the lessons learned from our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and a nearly 40 percent increase in the program If You See Something, Say Something.

In addition, the bill restores virtually all of the unjustified proposed cuts to DHS' operational programs, to include restoring the cuts to ICE's mandated 34,000 detention beds and vital investigative programs; restoring cuts to the Coast Guard's operational expenses, including aviation and flight hours, as well as restoring the President's truly harmful cuts to recapitalization and acquisitions of cutter and aviation assets; restoring the proposed cuts to CBP air and marine operating hours and procurement, as well as mission support functions; restoring the proposed long-term cuts to Secret

Service staffing and financial crime investigations; and providing these restorations while also strongly supporting the Department's disaster relief, cybersecurity and research programs, including the full-year construction increment for the National Agro-and Bio-Defense facility in Kansas.

□ 1250

This bill also considers our Nation's fiscal crisis by invoking real fiscal discipline and efficiency, including a more than $613 million—or more than 1.5 percent—reduction below fiscal year 2013 to the Department's annual budget; a 15 percent cut below the request to DHS headquarters staffing; a nearly 25 percent cut below the request to departmental administrative expenses and bureaucratic overhead; denial of the President's request to increase bureaucracy by creating three new headquarters offices; termination of funding for ineffectual offices and programs and substantial oversight requirements, ranging from withholding funds to statutory mandates to reporting requirements on everything from major acquisitions to ammunition inventories, purchases, and usage.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not represent a false choice between fiscal responsibility and security. Both are urgent priorities, and both are vigorously addressed by this bill.

I must note that DHS did a shameful job in complying with statutory requirements enacted into law FY13. Those failures are certainly addressed in this bill. We are serious about compelling the Department to both enforce the law and comply with the law, and we will not tolerate further failures in this regard, a point I think we make clear in this bill through 50 percent withholdings to the Department's executive offices and 50 percent reductions to offices that are delaying the review and submittal of needed, factual information requested by Congress.

On a final and regrettably sober note, my staff and I have been regularly talking with our dear friend and my classmate, TOM COLE, and doing all that we can to help the good people of his Oklahoma district get back on their feet from the devastating tornado that hit the town of Moore and surrounding communities.

So, in addition to the nearly $11 billion that is currently in FEMA coffers, this bill fully supports the known requirements of $6.2 billion for the disaster relief fund in FY14. These funds, combined with our continued oversight, will help ensure disaster assistance rapidly gets to those who've lost so much. Mr. Chairman, we send TOM and his constituents our sincere condolences and wish them a speedy recovery.

In closing, let me first thank Ranking Member PRICE for his statesmanship and partnership. I sincerely thank him and his dedicated professional staff for their input and notable contributions to this bill.

In addition, let me thank the thoughtful Members of this body. We received program submissions from 222 Members, and their input was critical to our oversight work over the past few months, as well as the production of this bill. I know that my staff and I made every effort to accommodate virtually every Member's submission we received, and that has only made this a stronger product.

Finally, I must thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full committee, Chairman ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY. Their input and support for the bill is genuinely appreciated.

I sincerely believe this bill reflects our best effort to address our Nation's urgent needs: security, enforcement, and fiscal restraint.

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

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental Operations					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary	4,282	4,128	3,492	-790	-636
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	2,092	1,822	1,536	-556	-286
Office of the Chief of Staff	2,173	2,200	1,084	-1,089	-1,116
Executive Secretary	7,584	7,603	3,740	-3,844	-3,863
Office of Policy	43,706	27,815	29,998	-13,708	+2,183
Office of Public Affairs	5,470	8,661	9,326	+3,856	+665
Office of Legislative Affairs	5,794	5,498	4,625	-1,169	-873
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs	2,378	2,518	2,120	-258	-398
Office of General Counsel	21,137	21,000	17,691	-3,446	-3,309
Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties	21,618	21,678	18,272	-3,346	-3,406
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman	5,644	5,344	4,501	-1,143	-843
Privacy Officer	7,992	8,143	6,861	-1,131	-1,282
Office of International Affairs	---	7,626	---	---	-7,626
Office of State and Local Law Enforcement	---	852	---	---	-852
Private Sector Office	---	1,666	---	---	-1,666
Subtotal	129,870	126,554	103,246	-26,624	-23,308
Office of the Under Secretary for Management:					
Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Management	3,097	2,735	2,305	-792	-430
Office of the Chief Security Officer	68,931	66,025	55,799	-13,132	-10,226
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer	71,928	66,915	56,459	-15,469	-10,456
Subtotal	143,956	135,675	114,563	-29,393	-21,112
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	24,946	22,276	18,771	-6,175	-3,505
Human Resources Information Technology	9,670	9,213	7,815	-1,855	-1,398
Subtotal	34,616	31,489	26,586	-8,030	-4,903
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	34,278	30,793	26,004	-8,274	-4,789
Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC)	5,443	4,729	4,020	-1,423	-709
Subtotal	39,721	35,522	30,024	-9,697	-5,498
Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management	218,293	202,686	171,173	-47,120	-31,513
DHS Consolidated Headquarters Project	---	105,500	---	---	-105,500
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	51,449	48,779	41,242	-10,207	-7,537
Office of the Chief Information Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses	117,882	117,347	99,397	-18,485	-17,950
Information Technology Services	27,572	32,712	25,612	-1,960	-7,100
Infrastructure and Security Activities	55,944	100,063	45,863	-10,081	-54,200
Homeland Secure Data Network	42,090	77,132	39,863	-2,227	-37,269
Subtotal	243,488	327,254	210,735	-32,753	-116,519
Analysis and Operations	321,958	309,228	291,623	-30,335	-17,605
Total, Departmental Operations	965,058	1,120,001	818,019	-147,039	-301,982

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General:					
Operating Expenses	121,043	119,309	113,903	-7,140	-5,406
(by transfer from Disaster Relief)	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
Total, Office of Inspector General	145,019	143,309	137,903	-7,116	-5,406
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations	1,086,101	1,239,310	931,922	-154,179	-307,388
(by transfer)	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS					
U.S. Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters, Management, and Administration:					
Commissioner	17,398	---	25,288	+7,890	+25,288
Chief Counsel	43,035	---	45,022	+1,987	+45,022
Congressional Affairs	2,565	---	2,482	-83	+2,482
Internal Affairs	153,954	---	162,568	+8,614	+162,568
Public Affairs	12,550	---	12,920	+370	+12,920
Training and Development	77,643	---	76,512	-1,131	+76,512
Tech, Innovation, Acquisition	25,978	---	22,972	-3,006	+22,972
Intelligence/Investigative Liaison	68,088	---	61,105	-6,983	+61,105
Administration	414,259	---	293,091	-121,168	+293,091
Rent	564,306	407,898	407,898	-156,408	---
Management and Administration, Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation	---	620,656	---	---	-620,656
Management and Administration, Border Security and Control Between Ports of Entry	---	592,330	---	---	-592,330
Subtotal	1,379,776	1,620,884	1,109,858	-269,918	-511,026
Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation:					
Inspections, Trade, and Travel Facilitation at Ports of Entry	2,715,935	2,837,294	2,887,718	+171,783	+50,424
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection (trust fund)	3,271	3,274	3,274	+3	---
International Cargo Screening	71,416	72,260	71,961	+545	-299
Other International Programs	24,774	24,740	24,596	-178	-144
Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT)	43,026	40,183	41,960	-1,066	+1,777
Trusted Traveler Programs	10,800	6,311	6,311	-4,489	---
Inspection and Detection Technology Investments	117,447	112,526	112,504	-4,943	-22
Automated Targeting Systems	113,712	109,944	132,932	+19,220	+22,988
National Targeting Center	68,059	65,474	65,106	-2,953	-368
Training	34,811	47,651	40,703	+5,892	-6,948
Subtotal	3,203,251	3,319,657	3,387,065	+183,814	+67,408
Border Security and Control Between Ports of Entry:					
Border Security and Control	3,628,164	3,700,317	3,723,502	+95,338	+23,185
Training	73,865	55,928	55,558	-18,307	-370
Subtotal	3,702,029	3,756,245	3,779,060	+77,031	+22,815
Air and Marine Operations	---	286,769	---	---	-286,769
US-VISIT	---	253,533	---	---	-253,533
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	8,285,056	9,237,088	8,275,983	-9,073	-961,105
Appropriations	(8,281,785)	(9,123,814)	(8,272,709)	(-9,076)	(-851,105)
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund	(3,271)	(3,274)	(3,274)	(+3)	---
COBRA FTA spending authority (Sec. 541a3)	---	(110,000)	---	---	(-110,000)

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Small Airport User Fee (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation)	---	5,000	5,000	+5,000	---
Automation Modernization:					
Information Technology	393,946	---	367,860	-26,086	+367,860
Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS)	138,655	140,830	140,762	+2,107	-68
Current Operations Protection and Processing Support (COPPS)	186,545	199,275	199,275	+12,730	---
Subtotal	719,146	340,105	707,897	-11,249	+367,792
Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology (BSFIT):					
Development and Deployment	188,627	160,435	160,435	-28,192	---
Operations and Maintenance	135,148	191,019	191,019	+55,871	---
Subtotal	323,775	351,454	351,454	+27,679	---
Air and Marine Operations:					
Salaries and Expenses	283,286	---	292,791	+9,505	+292,791
Operations and Maintenance	397,002	353,751	392,000	-5,002	+38,249
Procurement	117,919	73,950	117,950	+31	+44,000
Subtotal	798,207	427,701	802,741	+4,534	+375,040
Construction and Facilities Management:					
Facilities Construction and Sustainment	176,038	385,398	385,398	+209,360	---
Program Oversight and Management	57,292	86,101	85,880	+28,588	-221
Subtotal	233,330	471,499	471,278	+237,948	-221
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Direct Appropriations	10,359,514	10,832,847	10,614,353	+254,839	-218,494
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee	(568,790)	(764,267)	(764,267)	(+195,477)	---
Immigration Enforcement Fines	(1,093)	(773)	(773)	(-320)	---
Electronic System for Travel Authorization Fee	(46,318)	(55,168)	(55,168)	(+8,850)	---
Land Border Inspection Fee	(35,935)	(42,941)	(42,941)	(+7,006)	---
COBRA Passenger Inspection Fee	(419,352)	(694,627)	(694,627)	(+275,275)	---
APHIS Inspection Fee	(329,000)	(355,216)	(355,216)	(+26,216)	---
Global Entry User Fee	(13,743)	(34,835)	(34,835)	(+21,092)	---
Puerto Rico Collections	(96,367)	(98,602)	(98,602)	(+2,235)	---
Small Airport User Fee	(8,318)	---	---	(-8,318)	---
Virgin Island Fee	---	(11,302)	(11,302)	(+11,302)	---
Customs Unclaimed Goods	---	(5,992)	(5,992)	(+5,992)	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts	(1,518,916)	(2,063,723)	(2,063,723)	(+544,807)	---
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection	11,878,430	12,896,570	12,678,076	+799,646	-218,494
Appropriations	(10,359,514)	(10,832,847)	(10,614,353)	(+254,839)	(-218,494)
Fee Accounts	(1,518,916)	(2,063,723)	(2,063,723)	(+544,807)	---
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters Management and Administration:					
Personnel Compensation and Benefits, Services and Other Costs	219,824	192,236	209,755	-10,069	+17,519
Headquarters Managed IT Investment	160,304	141,294	151,132	-9,172	+9,838
Subtotal	380,128	333,530	360,887	-19,241	+27,357
Legal Proceedings	206,834	204,651	205,921	-913	+1,270
Investigations:					
Domestic Investigations	1,685,172	1,599,972	1,710,172	+25,000	+110,200

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International Investigations:					
International Operations	115,007	100,544	100,187	-14,820	-357
Visa Security Program	34,526	31,630	31,541	-2,985	-89
Subtotal	149,533	132,174	131,728	-17,805	-446
Subtotal, Investigations	1,834,705	1,732,146	1,841,900	+7,195	+109,754
Intelligence	78,374	75,448	74,908	-3,466	-540
Detention and Removal Operations:					
Custody Operations	2,022,991	1,844,802	2,038,239	+15,248	+193,437
Fugitive Operations	145,180	125,771	134,802	-10,378	+9,031
Criminal Alien Program	216,293	291,721	289,155	+72,862	-2,566
Alternatives to Detention	96,460	72,435	96,460	---	+24,025
(transfer out to Department of Justice)	---	---	---	---	---
Transportation and Removal Program	269,932	255,984	276,925	+6,993	+20,941
Subtotal	2,750,856	2,590,713	2,835,581	+84,725	+244,868
Secure Communities	138,111	20,334	25,264	-112,847	+4,930
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	5,389,008	4,956,822	5,344,461	-44,547	+387,639
Automation Modernization:					
IT Investment	---	---	8,400	+8,400	+8,400
TECS Modernization	22,977	34,900	23,000	+23	-11,900
Detention and Removals Modernization	6,993	---	---	-6,993	---
Electronic Health Records	3,497	---	3,500	+3	+3,500
Subtotal	33,467	34,900	34,900	+1,433	---
Construction	4,995	5,000	5,000	+5	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Direct Appropriations	5,427,470	4,996,722	5,384,361	-43,109	+387,639
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee	(116,869)	(135,000)	(135,000)	(+18,131)	---
Breached Bond/Detention Fund	(75,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(-10,000)	---
Student Exchange and Visitor Fee	(120,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(+25,000)	---
Subtotal	311,869	345,000	345,000	+33,131	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement	5,739,339	5,341,722	5,729,361	-9,978	+387,639
Appropriations	(5,427,470)	(4,996,722)	(5,384,361)	(-43,109)	(+387,639)
Fee Accounts	(311,869)	(345,000)	(345,000)	(+33,131)	---
Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation Security:					
Screening Operations:					
Screener Workforce:					
Privatized Screening	147,542	153,190	163,190	+15,648	+10,000
Screener Personnel, Compensation, and Benefits	3,075,630	3,033,526	2,972,715	-102,915	-60,811
Subtotal	3,223,172	3,186,716	3,135,905	-87,267	-50,811
Screener Training and Other	224,759	226,936	203,057	-21,702	-23,879
Checkpoint Support	115,089	103,377	103,309	-11,780	-68
EDS/ETD Systems:					
EDS Procurement and Installation	99,830	83,987	83,845	-15,985	-142
Screening Technology Maintenance, Utilities	308,691	298,509	298,509	-10,182	---
Subtotal	408,521	382,496	382,354	-26,167	-142
Subtotal, Screening Operations	3,971,541	3,899,525	3,824,625	-146,916	-74,900

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Aviation Security Direction and Enforcement:					
Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement	367,887	354,650	358,187	-9,700	+3,537
Airport Management and Support	561,787	590,871	555,242	-6,545	-35,629
Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew Training	24,705	---	12,353	-12,352	+12,353
Air Cargo	121,647	122,990	122,332	+685	-658
Subtotal	1,076,026	1,068,511	1,048,114	-27,912	-20,397
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Total, Aviation Security (gross)	5,047,567	4,968,036	4,872,739	-174,828	-95,297
Aviation Security Fees (offsetting collections)	-2,070,000	-2,120,000	-2,120,000	-50,000	---
Additional Offsetting Collections (leg. proposal)	---	-105,000	---	---	+105,000
Total, Aviation Security (net, discretionary)	2,977,567	2,743,036	2,752,739	-224,828	+9,703
Surface Transportation Security:					
Staffing and Operations	36,317	35,433	35,262	-1,055	-171
Surface Transportation Security Inspectors and Canines	87,977	73,898	73,356	-14,621	-542
Subtotal	124,294	109,331	108,618	-15,676	-713
Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing:					
Secure Flight	106,828	106,198	108,198	+1,370	+2,000
Crew and Other Vetting Programs	85,404	74,419	74,419	-10,985	---
TWIC Fees	(47,300)	(36,700)	(36,700)	(-10,600)	---
Hazardous Materials Fees	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	---	---
Alien Flight School Fees (by transfer from DOJ)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Air Cargo/Certified Cargo Screening Program	(7,200)	(5,400)	(5,400)	(-1,800)	---
Commercial Aviation and Airports/Secure Identification Display Area Checks	(8,000)	(6,500)	(6,500)	(-1,500)	---
Other Security Threat Assessments	(120)	(50)	(50)	(-70)	---
General Aviation at DCA	(100)	(350)	(350)	(+250)	---
Subtotal	271,952	246,617	248,617	-23,335	+2,000
Direct Appropriations	(192,232)	(180,617)	(182,617)	(-9,615)	(+2,000)
Fee Funded Programs	(79,720)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(-13,720)	---
Transportation Security Support:					
Headquarters Administration	275,846	284,942	265,712	-10,134	-19,230
Information Technology	416,779	455,484	389,750	-27,029	-65,734
Human Capital Services	215,613	212,554	201,643	-13,970	-10,911
Intelligence	45,085	44,809	44,561	-524	-248
Subtotal	953,323	997,789	901,666	-51,657	-96,123
Federal Air Marshals:					
Management and Administration	792,992	714,669	709,254	-83,738	-5,415
Travel and Training	113,857	111,853	111,853	-2,004	---
Subtotal	906,849	826,522	821,107	-85,742	-5,415
Total, Transportation Security Administration	7,553,985	7,398,295	7,202,747	-351,238	-195,548
Offsetting Collections	(-2,070,000)	(-2,225,000)	(-2,120,000)	(-50,000)	(+105,000)
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Fee Funded Programs	(79,720)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(-13,720)	---
Total, Transportation Security Administration (net)	5,154,265	4,857,295	4,766,747	-387,518	-90,548

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Coast Guard					
Operating Expenses:					
Military Pay and Allowances	3,411,766	3,425,306	3,440,053	+28,287	+14,747
Civilian Pay and Benefits	785,793	784,097	779,011	-6,782	-5,086
Training and Recruiting	213,969	181,617	216,588	+2,619	+34,971
Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance	1,092,799	1,061,567	1,065,083	-27,716	+3,516
Centrally Managed Accounts	350,721	318,856	319,307	-31,414	+451
Intermediate and Depot Level Maintenance	958,913	983,940	1,019,374	+60,461	+35,434
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	254,000	---	---	-254,000	---
Subtotal	7,067,961	6,755,383	6,839,416	-228,545	+84,033
(Defense)	(593,660)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(-253,660)	---
(Nondefense)	(6,474,301)	(6,415,383)	(6,499,416)	(+25,115)	(+84,033)
Environmental Compliance and Restoration	13,138	13,187	13,164	+26	-23
Reserve Training	132,395	109,543	112,991	-19,404	+3,448
Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements:					
Vessels:					
Survey and Design-vessel and Boats	2,498	1,000	1,000	-1,498	---
Response Boat-medium	7,992	---	---	-7,992	---
In-service Vessel Sustainment	---	21,000	21,000	+21,000	---
National Security Cutter	678,621	616,000	603,553	-75,068	-12,447
Offshore Patrol Cutter	29,970	25,000	25,000	-4,970	---
Fast Response Cutter	334,665	75,000	205,000	-129,665	+130,000
Cutter Small Boats	3,996	3,000	3,000	-996	---
Medium Endurance Cutter Sustainment	15,984	---	---	-15,984	---
Polar Ice Breaking Vessel	7,992	2,000	2,000	-5,992	---
Subtotal	1,081,718	743,000	860,553	-221,165	+117,553
Aircraft:					
Airframe Replacement (CGNR 6017)	13,986	---	30,000	+16,014	+30,000
Maritime Patrol Aircraft	54,945	---	---	-54,945	---
Long Range Surveillance Aircraft	89,910	16,000	107,710	+17,800	+91,710
HH-65 Conversion/Sustainment Projects	31,469	12,000	12,000	-19,469	---
Subtotal	190,310	28,000	149,710	-40,600	+121,710
Other Acquisition Programs:					
Program Oversight and Management	14,985	10,000	10,000	-4,985	---
Systems Engineering and Integration	---	204	204	+204	---
C4ISR	40,460	35,226	50,226	+9,766	+15,000
CG-Logistics Information Management System	2,498	1,500	1,500	-998	---
Nationwide Automatic Identification System	5,994	13,000	13,000	+7,006	---
Subtotal	63,937	59,930	74,930	+10,993	+15,000
Shore Facilities and Aids to Navigation:					
Major Construction; Housing; ATON; and Survey and Design	29,970	2,000	2,000	-27,970	---
Major Acquisition Systems Infrastructure	49,362	---	---	-49,362	---
Minor Shore	4,995	3,000	3,000	-1,995	---
Subtotal	84,327	5,000	5,000	-79,327	---
Military Housing	9,990	---	18,000	+8,010	+18,000
Personnel and Related Support:					
Direct Personnel Costs	112,969	114,747	114,080	+1,111	-667
Core Acquisition Costs	599	439	439	-160	---
Subtotal	113,568	115,186	114,519	+951	-667
Subtotal, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements	1,543,850	951,116	1,222,712	-321,138	+271,596
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	19,671	19,856	9,928	-9,743	-9,928

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Health Care Fund Contribution (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation)	202,797	201,000	201,000	-1,797	---
Retired Pay (mandatory)	1,423,000	1,460,000	1,460,000	+37,000	---
Total, Coast Guard	10,402,812	9,510,085	9,859,211	-543,601	+349,126
Appropriations	(10,148,812)	(9,510,085)	(9,859,211)	(-289,601)	(+349,126)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
(mandatory)	(1,423,000)	(1,460,000)	(1,460,000)	(+37,000)	---
(discretionary)	(8,979,812)	(8,050,085)	(8,399,211)	(-580,601)	(+349,126)
United States Secret Service					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Protection:					
Protection of Persons and Facilities	854,381	841,078	848,263	-6,118	+7,185
Protective Intelligence Activities	68,057	67,782	67,165	-892	-617
National Special Security Event Fund	4,496	4,500	4,500	+4	---
Presidential Candidate Nominee Protection	57,902	---	---	-57,902	---
Subtotal	984,836	913,360	919,928	-64,908	+6,568
Investigations:					
Domestic Field Operations	299,390	316,433	330,391	+31,001	+13,958
International Field Office Administration, Operations and Training	30,940	30,958	30,811	-129	-147
Support for Missing and Exploited Children	8,358	---	8,358	---	+8,358
Subtotal	338,688	347,391	369,560	+30,872	+22,169
Headquarters, Management and Administration	174,160	177,282	188,964	+14,804	+11,682
Rowley Training Center	55,542	55,552	55,118	-424	-434
Information Integration and Technology Transformation	1,132	1,029	1,019	-113	-10
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	1,554,358	1,494,614	1,534,589	-19,769	+39,975
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses:					
Facilities	4,426	5,380	5,380	+954	---
Information Integration and Technology Transformation	52,268	46,395	46,395	-5,873	---
Subtotal	56,694	51,775	51,775	-4,919	---
Total, United States Secret Service	1,611,052	1,546,389	1,586,364	-24,688	+39,975
Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations	32,955,113	31,743,338	32,211,036	-744,077	+467,698
Appropriations	(32,701,113)	(31,743,338)	(32,211,036)	(-490,077)	(+467,698)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
(Fee Accounts)	(1,910,505)	(2,474,723)	(2,474,723)	(+564,218)	---
TITLE III - PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY					
National Protection and Programs Directorate					
Management and Administration:					
Administrative Activities	50,170	64,725	50,522	+352	-14,203

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Infrastructure Protection and Information Security:					
Infrastructure Protection:					
Infrastructure Analysis and Planning	58,910	57,975	66,144	+7,234	+8,169
Sector Management and Governance	66,994	60,477	60,335	-6,659	-142
Regional Field Operations	56,362	56,708	56,550	+188	-158
Infrastructure Security Compliance	77,867	85,790	77,104	-763	-8,686
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection	260,133	260,950	260,133	---	-817
Cybersecurity and Communications:					
Cybersecurity:					
Cybersecurity Coordination	3,982	4,338	4,320	+338	-18
US Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) Operations	92,834	102,636	102,486	+9,652	-150
Federal Network Security	235,756	199,769	199,725	-36,031	-44
Network Security Deployment	328,680	406,441	382,367	+53,687	-24,074
Global Cybersecurity Management	25,929	19,057	19,037	-6,892	-20
Critical Infrastructure Cyber Protection and Awareness	62,685	73,043	73,013	+10,328	-30
Business Operations	6,205	5,125	5,089	-1,116	-36
Subtotal, Cybersecurity	756,071	810,409	786,037	+29,966	-24,372
Communications:					
Office of Emergency Communications	38,615	36,516	36,446	-2,169	-70
Priority Telecommunications Services	53,212	53,412	53,372	+160	-40
Next Generation Networks	24,475	21,160	21,158	-3,317	-2
Programs to Study and Enhance Telecommunications	12,917	10,102	10,074	-2,843	-28
Critical Infrastructure Protection Programs	10,949	9,445	9,409	-1,540	-36
Subtotal, Communications	140,168	130,635	130,459	-9,709	-176
Subtotal, Cybersecurity and Communications	896,239	941,044	916,496	+20,257	-24,548
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security	1,156,372	1,201,994	1,176,629	+20,257	-25,365
Federal Protective Service:					
Basic Security	271,540	271,540	271,540	---	---
Building-specific Security	509,056	509,056	509,056	---	---
Reimbursable Security Fees (Contract Guard Services)	521,228	521,228	521,228	---	---
Subtotal, Federal Protective Service	1,301,824	1,301,824	1,301,824	---	---
Offsetting Collections	-1,301,824	-1,301,824	-1,301,824	---	---
Office of Biometric Identity Management	232,190	---	232,190	---	+232,190
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (gross)	2,740,556	2,568,543	2,761,165	+20,609	+192,622
Offsetting Collections	(-1,301,824)	(-1,301,824)	(-1,301,824)	---	---
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (net)	1,438,732	1,266,719	1,459,341	+20,609	+192,622
Office of Health Affairs					
BioWatch	85,305	90,609	79,534	-5,771	-11,075
National Biosurveillance Integration Center	12,987	8,000	13,000	+13	+5,000
Chemical Defense Program	1,998	824	824	-1,174	---
Planning and Coordination	5,402	4,995	4,995	-407	---
Salaries and Expenses	26,675	27,369	25,072	-1,603	-2,297
Total, Office of Health Affairs	132,367	131,797	123,425	-8,942	-8,372

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Administrative and Regional Offices	257,152	240,735	229,213	-27,939	-11,522
Office of National Capital Region Coordination	(4,289)	---	---	(-4,289)	---
Preparedness and Protection	178,868	293,684	174,766	-4,102	-118,918
Response	179,249	171,665	170,837	-8,412	-828
Urban Search and Rescue Response System	(35,145)	---	---	(-35,145)	---
Recovery	55,244	55,530	55,121	-123	-409
Mitigation	29,784	25,882	25,808	-3,976	-74
Mission Support	157,376	144,580	148,744	-8,632	+4,164
Centrally Managed Accounts	114,472	110,306	110,306	-4,166	---
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses	972,145	1,042,382	914,795	-57,350	-127,587
(Defense)	(57,942)	(77,000)	(67,000)	(+9,058)	(-10,000)
(Nondefense)	(914,203)	(965,382)	(847,795)	(-66,408)	(-117,587)
Grants and Training:					
State and Local Programs:					
Discretionary State and Local Grants	188,743	---	1,264,826	+1,076,083	+1,264,826
State Homeland Security Grant Program	346,253	---	---	-346,253	---
Operation Stonegarden	(46,553)	---	---	(-46,553)	---
Urban Area Security Initiative	499,876	---	---	-499,876	---
Nonprofit Security Grants	(9,990)	---	---	(-9,990)	---
Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance	97,403	---	---	-97,403	---
Amtrak Security	(9,990)	---	---	(-9,990)	---
Port Security Grants	97,403	---	---	-97,403	---
Subtotal, Discretionary Grants	1,229,678	---	1,264,826	+35,148	+1,264,826
Education, Training, and Exercises:					
Emergency Management Institute	17,787	---	17,805	+18	+17,805
Center for Domestic Preparedness	64,926	---	64,991	+65	+64,991
National Domestic Preparedness Consortium	92,907	---	93,000	+93	+93,000
National Exercise Program	32,346	---	32,378	+32	+32,378
Continuing Training	26,973	---	27,000	+27	+27,000
Subtotal	234,939	---	235,174	+235	+235,174
National Preparedness Grant Program	---	1,043,200	---	---	-1,043,200
First Responder Assistance Program:					
Emergency Management Performance Grants	---	350,000	---	---	-350,000
Fire Grants	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Training Partnership Grants	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Subtotal, First Responder Assistance Program	---	1,080,000	---	---	-1,080,000
Subtotal, State and Local Programs	1,464,617	2,123,200	1,500,000	+35,383	-623,200
(Defense)	(46,553)	---	---	(-46,553)	---
(Nondefense)	(1,418,064)	(2,123,200)	(1,500,000)	(+81,936)	(-623,200)
Subtotal, State and Local Programs (net)	1,464,617	2,123,200	1,500,000	+35,383	-623,200
Firefighter Assistance Grants:					
Fire Grants	337,163	---	337,500	+337	+337,500
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants	337,163	---	337,500	+337	+337,500
Subtotal	674,326	---	675,000	+674	+675,000

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Management Performance Grants	349,650	---	350,000	+350	+350,000
Subtotal, Grants and Training	2,488,593	2,123,200	2,525,000	+36,407	+401,800
Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program	-1,443	-1,272	-1,272	+171	---
United States Fire Administration	43,956	41,306	42,162	-1,794	+856
Disaster Relief Fund:					
Base Disaster Relief	607,318	594,522	594,522	-12,796	---
Disaster Relief Category	6,400,000	5,626,386	5,626,386	-773,614	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund	7,007,318	6,220,908	6,220,908	-786,410	---
(transfer out to Inspector General)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund (net)	6,983,342	6,196,908	6,196,908	-786,434	---
Flood Hazard Mapping and Risk Analysis Program	95,234	84,361	95,202	-32	+10,841
National Flood Insurance Fund:					
Salaries and Expenses	21,978	22,000	22,000	+22	---
Flood Plain Management and Mapping	148,851	154,300	154,300	+5,449	---
Subtotal	170,829	176,300	176,300	+5,471	---
Offsetting Fee Collections	-170,829	-176,300	-176,300	-5,471	---
National Predisaster Mitigation Fund	24,975	---	22,500	-2,475	+22,500
Emergency Food and Shelter	119,880	100,000	120,000	+120	+20,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	10,750,658	9,610,885	9,939,295	-811,363	+328,410
(Appropriations)	(4,350,658)	(3,984,499)	(4,312,909)	(-37,749)	(+328,410)
(Disaster Relief Category)	(6,400,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-773,614)	---
(Transfer out)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
Total, title III, Protection, Preparedness, Response and Recovery Directorate	12,321,757	11,009,401	11,522,061	-799,696	+512,660
Appropriations	(5,921,757)	(5,383,015)	(5,895,675)	(-26,082)	(+512,660)
Disaster Relief Category	(6,400,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-773,614)	---
(Transfer out)	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---
TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES					
United States Citizenship and Immigration Services					
Appropriations:					
E-Verify Program	111,812	114,213	114,213	+2,401	---
Immigrant Integration Programs	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Subtotal	111,812	124,213	114,213	+2,401	-10,000
Fee Accounts:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations	(1,313,702)	(1,510,836)	(1,536,880)	(+223,178)	(+26,044)
(Immigrant Integration Grants)	(7,500)	---	---	(-7,500)	---
Service Center Operations	(524,788)	(550,653)	(578,393)	(+53,605)	(+27,740)
Asylum, Refugee and International Operations	(196,584)	(236,494)	(236,710)	(+40,126)	(+216)
Records Operations	(86,774)	(94,039)	(94,039)	(+7,265)	---
Business Transformation	(269,216)	(183,464)	(183,464)	(-85,752)	---
(Digitization Program)	(29,000)	---	---	(-29,000)	---
Subtotal	2,391,064	2,575,486	2,629,486	+238,422	+54,000
Information and Customer Services:					
Operating Expenses	(89,011)	(96,409)	(96,409)	(+7,398)	---
Administration:					
Operating Expenses	(382,334)	(339,421)	(339,421)	(-42,913)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)	(20,048)	(29,937)	(29,937)	(+9,889)	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts	2,882,457	3,041,253	3,095,253	+212,796	+54,000
H1-B Visa Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
Service Center Operations	---	(13,000)	---	---	(-13,000)
H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations	---	(26,044)	---	---	(-26,044)
Asylum and Refugee Operating Expenses	---	(216)	---	---	(-216)
Service Center Operations	---	(14,740)	---	---	(-14,740)
Subtotal	---	41,000	---	---	-41,000
Total, Fee Accounts	2,882,457	3,095,253	3,095,253	+212,796	---
Total, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services	(2,994,269)	(3,219,466)	(3,209,466)	(+215,197)	(-10,000)
Appropriations	(111,812)	(124,213)	(114,213)	(+2,401)	(-10,000)
Fee Accounts	(2,882,457)	(3,095,253)	(3,095,253)	(+212,796)	---
(Immigration Examination Fee Account)	(2,834,907)	(3,041,253)	(3,041,253)	(+206,346)	---
(H1-B Visa Fee Account)	(12,550)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(+450)	---
(H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account)	(35,000)	(41,000)	(41,000)	(+6,000)	---
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Law Enforcement Training	197,806	210,818	198,317	+511	-12,501
Management and Administration	29,134	28,420	28,228	-906	-192
Accreditation	1,299	1,306	1,300	+1	-6
Subtotal	228,239	240,544	227,845	-394	-12,699
Acquisitions, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses	28,357	30,885	30,885	+2,528	---
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	256,596	271,429	258,730	+2,134	-12,699
Science and Technology					
Management and Administration	131,868	129,608	129,000	-2,868	-608
Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations:					
Research, Development, and Innovation	450,104	467,000	---	-450,104	-467,000
Apex R&D	---	---	15,013	+15,013	+15,013
Border Security	---	---	31,580	+31,580	+31,580
Chem/Bio/Radiological/Nuclear/Explosives Defense	---	---	194,294	+194,294	+194,294
Counterterrorist R&D	---	---	24,561	+24,561	+24,561
Cyber Security	---	---	70,829	+70,829	+70,829
Disaster Resilience	---	---	130,723	+130,723	+130,723
Subtotal, Research, Development and Innovation	450,104	467,000	467,000	+16,896	---
Laboratory Facilities	164,767	857,785	547,785	+383,018	-310,000
Acquisition and Operations Support	47,936	41,703	41,703	-6,233	---
University Programs	39,960	31,000	40,000	+40	+9,000
Subtotal	702,767	1,397,488	1,096,488	+393,721	-301,000
Total, Science and Technology	834,635	1,527,096	1,225,488	+390,853	-301,608
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office					
Management and Administration	39,610	37,510	37,353	-2,257	-157

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research, Development, and Operations:					
Systems Engineering and Architecture	29,970	21,222	21,222	-8,748	---
Systems Development	27,972	21,243	21,243	-6,729	---
Transformational Research and Development	74,691	75,291	75,291	+600	---
Assessments	32,967	39,918	39,918	+6,951	---
Operations Support	35,465	30,835	30,835	-4,630	---
National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center	25,538	22,701	22,701	-2,837	---
Subtotal	226,603	211,210	211,210	-15,393	---
Systems Acquisition:					
Radiation Portal Monitor Program	1,354	7,000	7,000	+5,646	---
Securing the Cities	21,978	22,000	22,000	+22	---
Human Portable Radiation Detection Systems	28,072	13,600	13,600	-14,472	---
Subtotal	51,404	42,600	42,600	-8,804	---
Total, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office	317,617	291,320	291,163	-26,454	-157
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training, and Services	1,520,660	2,214,058	1,889,594	+368,934	-324,464
(Fee Accounts)	(2,882,457)	(3,095,253)	(3,095,253)	(+212,796)	---
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
USCIS Immigrant Integration Grants	2,498	---	---	-2,498	---
NSSE Reimbursement Fund	4,995	---	---	-4,995	---
Data Center Migration	54,945	---	34,200	-20,745	+34,200
DHS Consolidated Headquarters Project	28,971	---	---	-28,971	---
Community Disaster Loans	12,987	---	---	-12,987	---
Rescission of NPPD IPIS Unobligated Balances	-1,683	---	---	+1,683	---
Working Capital Fund (rescission)(defense)	---	---	-9,000	-9,000	-9,000
Working Capital Fund (rescission)(nondefense)	---	---	-241,000	-241,000	-241,000
Visa Lottery Fee	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	---
Analysis and Operations (rescission)	-1,800	---	---	+1,800	---
CBP BSFIT (rescission)	-73,232	---	---	+73,232	---
ICE Construction (rescission)	-9,516	---	---	+9,516	---
TSA Surface Transportation (rescission)	-21,667	---	---	+21,667	---
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 111-83)	---	-14,500	-14,500	-14,500	---
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 112-10)	---	-9,000	-21,612	-21,612	-12,612
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 112-74)	---	-18,500	-41,000	-41,000	-22,500
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)(P.L. 113-6)	---	---	-32,479	-32,479	-32,479
U.S. Coast Guard AC&I (rescission)	-154,500	---	---	+154,500	---
Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission)	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Predisaster Mitigation Fund (rescission)	-12,000	---	---	+12,000	---
Rescission of Legacy Funds	-7,680	---	---	+7,680	---
Rescission of Unobligated Balances	-24,922	---	---	+24,922	---
Total, title V, General Provisions	-202,604	-92,000	-475,391	-272,787	-383,391
Appropriations	(104,396)	(-50,000)	(-15,800)	(-120,196)	(+34,200)
Rescissions	(-307,000)	(-42,000)	(-459,591)	(-152,591)	(-417,591)
TITLE ___ - OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2).					
Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	1,667	---	---	-1,667	---
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	855	---	---	-855	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2014 (H.R. 2217)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Coast Guard					
Acquisitions, Construction and Improvements (emerg.)..	274,233	---	---	-274,233	---
United States Secret Service					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	300	---	---	-300	---
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster Relief Fund (disaster relief category).....	5,379,000	---	---	-5,379,000	---
Disaster Relief Fund (emergency).....	6,108,735	---	---	-6,108,735	---
Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account:					
Direct Loan Subsidy (emergency).....	296,000	---	---	-296,000	---
Administrative Expenses (emergency).....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Science and Technology					
Research, Development, Acquisition and Operations (emergency).....	3,249	---	---	-3,249	---
Domestic Nuclear Detention Office					
Systems Acquisition (emergency).....	3,869	---	---	-3,869	---
Total, title __ - Other Appropriations.....	12,071,908	---	---	-12,071,908	---
Grand Total.....	59,752,935	46,114,107	46,079,222	-13,673,713	-34,885
Appropriations.....	(41,334,027)	(40,529,721)	(40,912,427)	(-421,600)	(+382,706)
Rescissions.....	(-307,000)	(-42,000)	(-459,591)	(-152,591)	(-417,591)
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,692,908)	---	---	(-6,692,908)	---
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.....	(254,000)	---	---	(-254,000)	---
Disaster Relief Category.....	(11,779,000)	(5,626,386)	(5,626,386)	(-6,152,614)	---
(Fee Funded Programs).....	(4,792,962)	(5,569,976)	(5,569,976)	(+777,014)	---
(by transfer).....	(23,976)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24)	---
(transfer out).....	(-23,976)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24)	---

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2014 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill and am pleased that we're bringing this bill to the House floor under an open rule. I want to commend Chairman CARTER for the open, collaborative, and bipartisan process he has led this spring. There's a long history of bipartisan cooperation on this subcommittee that's critical for allowing us to focus on the Nation's domestic security needs.

The funding allocation provided to the subcommittee hews closely to the overall spending figure requested by the President for the Department of Homeland Security, but I don't believe either number is fully adequate to provide DHS with the resources it needs to help keep the Nation safe. We have been able to fill a number of significant holes in the President's budget request, but that has necessitated creating some shortfalls in other areas.

I want to make clear, however, that my support of Chairman CARTER's efforts are in no way an endorsement of the overall discretionary spending caps adopted by the majority in the House budget resolution. Sequestration was intended to be a mechanism to force the parties to come together to address our long-term fiscal challenges. It was never meant, in itself, to be a tool for deficit reduction, and it certainly was never meant to be the basis for a discretionary spending cap on a budget resolution.

While not quite sufficient, our allocation is still better than most of the other domestic appropriations bills, which will struggle to appropriately fund critical priorities, such as medical and energy research, law enforcement and the justice system, and investments in education and infrastructure. Our Homeland Security bill is not the only bill that deals with our country's strength and security, and the allocations provided to these other subcommittees by the Ryan budget will put that strength and security at grave risk.

That being said, and given the low 302(b) allocation this subcommittee had to work with, I applaud the chairman and the staff for addressing a number of Democratic priorities, including first responder and antiterrorism grants, as well as providing increases above the request for frontline DHS employees so that they can continue to conduct critical operations along our borders, protect our Nation's airports, seaports, and land ports of entry, and respond to natural disasters across the country.

Right before last year's markup, we were reminded of the threats facing our Nation when the intelligence community thwarted an attempt to place a nonmetallic improvised explosive device on an aircraft bound for the United States.

This year, following the terrorist attacks in Boston, we're forced to confront the tragic reality that these threats remain constant, that terrorists remain determined to attack the homeland and they will devise more and more perverse ways to kill and harm innocent people. This requires DHS and the intelligence community and local first responders to remain vigilant and to strive continually to optimize their scarce resources. That's why I'm pleased this bill increases funding for critical grant programs, while once again rejecting the administration's insufficiently articulated proposal to reengineer the grant structure, a proposal that has not been authorized.

Specifically, the bill includes $1.5 billion for FEMA State and local grants, an increase of $35 million over the FY13 appropriated level, and it keeps both fire grants and emergency performance grants level with FY13. The bill also doubles the requested funding for the Office of Bombing Prevention to accelerate planning, training, and awareness programs to help detect and respond to IEDs and other explosive devices.

Equally important, the bill provides a $16.9 million increase in funding for research and development efforts at the Science and Technology Directorate. When you combine this funding with what was included in the final FY13 bill, we've made significant progress since FY12, providing funding for high-priority research efforts and some new projects, as well.

The bill also provides substantial funding—$404 million—for construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, a laboratory that's essential to our ability to help prevent and respond to animal disease threats.

The bill also increases funding for critical Coast Guard and CBP air and marine acquisitions to recapitalize aging assets while also bringing the latest aviation and vessel technologies online to ensure our frontline personnel can operate more effectively, improving on the administration's request on each of those fronts.

□ 1300

I am also pleased that the bill provides funding for an additional 1,600 Customs and Border Protection officers requested by the administration and for substantially strengthened cybersecurity protective efforts. These efforts are absolutely necessary to monitor and detect intrusions to our Federal networks and protect them from foreign espionage and cyber attacks.

Finally, I commend Chairman CARTER for providing the requested amount, $6.22 billion, for the Disaster Relief Fund, which will ensure that there are sufficient disaster relief resources moving into the coming fiscal year. And I echo the chairman's pledge of support for Representative TOM COLE, for his constituents and the other people of Oklahoma to fully address their needs.

I also want to remind my colleagues, however, that should emergency disaster relief funding become necessary beyond what we have budgeted, Congress must respond immediately and effectively, without distracting fights over budget policy.

I do have some concerns with the bill, notably, some of the immigration provisions. The bill once again sets an arbitrary minimum of 34,000 ICE detention beds, denying ICE the flexibility it needs to manage its enforcement and removal resources in response to changing circumstances and to use cheaper, alternative forms of supervision when appropriate.

The bill also unnecessarily and wastefully continues the 287(g) program, which was designed to secure local law enforcement participation in immigration enforcement. In addition to being seriously flawed, this program has become obsolete with the full implementation of the Secure Communities program.

I also must note my concern with some of the withholdings in the bill. I understand the need to give incentives to the Department to respect reporting deadlines established by the committee, but I hope we can temper some of these withholdings as we move through the process, as they have the potential to seriously undermine the Department's management functions.

The bill also provides no funding for the new DHS headquarters, despite $105 million in the request. We have been told repeatedly by the administration that deferring these investments will greatly increase the project's costs and eventually it's bound to affect frontline operations, and I believe they're correct on both counts.

I also want to note my strong objection to three general provisions related to abortion services for detainees that were added to the bill in full committee. While they have no impact on ICE policies, they unnecessarily interject a divisive issue into the bill, distracting us from what should be our focus and straying far outside the lines of the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

So while I support the bill as reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee and believe it represents an improvement over the budget request, it still falls short of the bill I believe we would want to craft were we operating under a more adequate allocation.

Let me also express the hope, going into this debate, that this year we can avoid loading the bill up here on the floor with controversial and unnecessary policy riders. There will be a time and place to debate immigration reform, and the Homeland Security appropriations bill should not be caught up in that process.

In closing, I, too, want to express my appreciation for the hardworking and dedicated staff on both sides of the aisle. In the course of just 2 months, they have diligently wrapped up the fiscal 2013 bill, digested and analyzed the President's fiscal 2014 request, and

crafted the bipartisan measure before us. Thanks to Ben Nicholson, Kris Mallard, Corenell Teague, Valerie Baldwin, Pam Williams, and Hilary May on the majority side, and of course, Darek Newby and Justin Wein on our side of the aisle.

With that, I urge approval of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is the former founding chairman of this subcommittee and a former great prosecutor from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

First, I'd like to thank our colleagues for their careful consideration yesterday of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, which, as you know, passed overwhelmingly in the House. There were only four Members who voted against that bill, and I'd like to ask all of the supporters of that bill to continue on this bill today. It's a very conscientious piece of legislation that I believe can and should pass this body on a bipartisan basis.

The bill before you, as the chairman and the ranking member have said, provides $38.9 billion for the Department of Homeland Security. In such austere budget times, this bill rightly prioritizes spending on programs that save American lives. Frontline protection, terrorism prevention and response, disaster recovery, and a strong and secure border, all of these are paramount to the safety and security of our homeland.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly reminded that we can't let our frontline security efforts lapse. The terrible attack at the Boston Marathon underscored the need to support key readiness programs, provide heroic first responders with the funding and equipment they deserve, and improve intelligence and threat-targeting activities so we can help avoid terrible attacks like Boston in the future.

With this bill, we are tightening security at our borders with funding increases for Customs and Border Protection and ICE that preserve the highest totals of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers and the highest detention bed capacity in history. We've targeted funding to combat human trafficking, child exploitation, cyber crime, and drug smuggling. And we're protecting our shores and access points with adequate funding for the Coast Guard and TSA.

This bill also fully supports the known requirements from the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund, which provides assistance to localities overwhelmed by catastrophic natural disasters like the recent tornadoes in the Midwest. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the victims of those disasters that have ravaged our Nation, like Oklahoma.

To that end, this bill provides an additional $6.2 billion for that Disaster Relief Fund. That's for fiscal 2014. Right now, though, as the chairman has said, combined with the approximately $11 billion kitty that FEMA has on hand, there is sufficient funding for the immediate response needs in Oklahoma and other affected areas.

Our committee stands at the ready to reassess any further needs as a fuller picture of the damage becomes clear. It's our duty as Members of Congress to provide this critical assistance to communities that are suffering from such unexpected and devastating natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, strong national security comes at a price. And as we all know, tax dollars for these programs are in limited supply these days, so we can't let any of the funding that we appropriate to the Department of Homeland Security go to unproven or wasteful programs. Across the Department, we've made careful reductions that bring total funding in this bill to $617 million less than the fiscal year 2013 enacted level. We've enforced strict reporting requirements and other oversight tools to guarantee that DHS is spending its dollars wisely, and we've prevented funding from being used on risky or controversial efforts like transferring detainees from Guantanamo Bay or another Fast and Furious-type program.

Before I conclude, let me extend my appreciation to Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE, former chairman of the subcommittee, for their hard work in crafting this bill. As has been said by both sides, this is a nonpartisan bill. It always has been that way.

□ 1310

We've attempted to work from the very beginning of this subcommittee's existence to work across the aisle, to be sure that the homeland is adequately protected. That takes cooperation across the middle aisle, and it's happened over the years, and it's happened this year. And I want to thank these two gentlemen, especially, for working together, as they have.

This is JOHN CARTER's first bill as a cardinal. He's making his maiden voyage, and I think the ship is sailing through. He says he hopes so.

And we want to thank, of course, the staff of the subcommittee for their tireless hours dedicated towards crafting this bill of great importance to our national security.

So I'm proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that I stand before you in 100 percent support of this bill. It represents all that makes our country great and the security that will keep our country great. And I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to share the very gracious remarks on the part of the chair of the full committee, the chair of the subcommittee, the outstanding ranking member, and all the staff for the important work you did on this bill.

Over the past year, we have experienced the devastation of Hurricane Sandy, heartbreak in Moore, Oklahoma, tragic acts of terror in Boston. Disasters, natural or manmade, pose risks to our communities, which must be matched with the resources of the Federal Government and, in particular, the Department of Homeland Security.

The bill before us, which is approximately $35 million below the administration's request, does a good job of meeting these tasks, yet inadequately funds other programs such as operational accounts, which face cuts so severe that they cannot realistically be implemented.

I do thank the chairman and ranking member for including several priorities, providing $1.5 billion for FEMA State and local grants which were underfunded in the request, prioritizing high-risk areas in our grant programs, continuing the Securing the Cities program to prevent radiological or nuclear attacks, making needed investments in cybersecurity, and including language to help stem sexual assault in the Coast Guard, which has become a significant and outrageous problem in the military.

However, the bill before us ignores the dangerous impact of sequestration, putting off difficult choices that must be made if we are to enact responsible spending bills for FY14.

With the majority's unworkable 302(a) allocation, which is $92 billion below the President's request, and less than the amounts agreed to under the Budget Control Act, this is one of the few bills that will have sufficient funding to garner bipartisan support.

The budget resolution and appropriations process under way harm our ability to invest in education, medical research, transportation infrastructure, energy development, all of which we need to grow our economy and build a competitive workforce for the future.

I was very proud to serve on the Homeland Security Subcommittee and appreciate, again, the chairman and ranking member's efforts, as well as the professional staff, in writing this bill. This subcommittee has a history of working across the aisle; and if we avoid poison pill riders during this debate, we will likely pass a bipartisan bill to provide responsible funding levels for the agencies tasked with vital security functions.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the great State of Texas, (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the full Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my dear friend and colleague

from Texas, the great State, Judge CARTER, and commend him for a fine job on this legislation.

The recent Boston attacks serve as a stark reminder that the terrorist threat to America remains constant. Despite the President's dangerous narrative downplaying the radical jihadist threat to America, al Qaeda and its affiliates and those they inspire have not given up their quest to attack us.

In today's challenging fiscal climate, it is more important than ever that every dollar spent on national security be linked to results. Our safety depends on the strategic funding of programs and technologies that provide us with valuable defenses and measurable outcomes. This bill demands that those criteria be met.

As chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I'm pleased to see that this bill provides appropriate funding for our frontline efforts, reins in wasteful spending, and ensures that tax dollars are accounted for by enacting important reporting requirements for the Department.

I will soon introduce a cybersecurity bill defining the Department's role in ensuring the real-time flow of information to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure, data, intelligence, and financial systems. This bill provides the necessary funding needed for DHS to fulfill its important cybersecurity mission.

I recently introduced H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act, requiring DHS to implement a strategy to gain operational control of our borders. The appropriations bill presented here today supports a strong commitment to secure our borders by providing over $350 million to the Border Technology account and supports the refinement and adaptation of proven technology needed to monitor the border and support our boots on the ground.

The bill provides for an additional 800 CBP officers, $387 million for ICE operations, and funding for ICE's 34,000 detention beds, despite the administration's plan to reduce that number and release hundreds of dangerous criminals into our communities.

It also restores cuts to our Coast Guard, which will strengthen our interdiction efforts in the Western Hemisphere.

And, finally, the bill applies lessons learned from the recent Boston attacks. For example, the bill rejects the President's proposed 39 percent cut to Bombing Prevention programs, and increases funding for visa security and overstay enforcement programs by $10 million.

This bill reflects the right priorities and insists on accountability from DHS. It will help to ensure that America is safe, secure, and protected; and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), an outstanding member of our subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their bipartisan efforts in the drafting of this bill.

Unfortunately, with the refusal of the House leadership to go to conference on the budget, this year's appropriations process will be at the expense of essential funding for critical programs such as education, research, transportation, and infrastructure.

Nonetheless, this bill will help make our Nation stronger and more secure. It robustly funds grants to provide our first responders with the resources they need to protect the public when disaster strikes.

The bill also funds the highly effective Alternatives to Detention program at $24 million above the President's request. While I believe ATD should be significantly expanded, I was pleased to see the increased allocation for this proven program.

In addition, the bill provides a $16.9 million increase in funding for the Science and Technology Directorate, which will enable DHS to develop new tools to detect and deter terrorists before they attack.

However, there are still aspects of the bill that are of concern. For example, the bill continues to mandate that every night ICE maintain 34,000 detention beds, even when they are not needed. This needless quota restricts ICE's flexibility in using the smartest, most cost-effective means of enforcing our immigration laws by limiting ICE's ability to base detention decisions on whether or not an individual poses a threat to our country.

□ 1320

The bill also increases funding for the ineffective and unnecessary 287(g) program, which encourages racial profiling and undermines confidence in law enforcement in our minority and immigrant communities. These scarce resources could be better spent addressing serious threats like cyber warfare and cyber crime. Instead, the bill underfunds this critical national priority by more than $24 million below the President's request.

In spite of these weaknesses and given the limited resources allocated to the subcommittee, I do believe Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE have done their best to enable DHS to protect the American people in an increasingly dangerous world. For that reason, I support the bill in its current form. However, I understand some Members will try to pass anti-immigrant amendments, which would make it impossible for me to support this bill. These efforts are contrary to the bipartisan spirit in which this bill was written and the bipartisan spirit in which this House has always approached issues of national security. If introduced, I urge my colleagues to reject these irresponsible amendments.

Again, I thank Chairman CARTER, Ranking Member PRICE, and the subcommittee's hardworking staff for putting together this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a former chairman of this subcommittee and currently chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I rise today also in support of the FY 2014 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. I want to commend Chairman CARTER and also Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work in making sure that they set up the right priorities during a very difficult budget time here in this Nation.

The bill provides the resources that are needed to meet our most essential obligations, while at the same time maintaining fiscal responsibility and also greater oversight. It is $617 million below last year's spending level. As has been mentioned, the bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to CBP operations and the Coast Guard and increases funding for critical programs such as the TSA Secure Flight Program and the FEMA first responder grants.

The bill maintains the needed number of beds for ICE detention. It also includes a substantial amount of funding for NBAF. This important asset provides our Nation with critical capabilities to conduct research and develop vaccines and other countermeasures in a time when we would most need it.

Again, I want to congratulate Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their hard work on this bill. I would urge my colleagues that this is a good bill and a measure that should have their support.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to another outstanding subcommittee member, Mr. CUELLAR of Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. I rise in support of this appropriations bill, which includes the hiring of 1,600 new CBP officers. Those are the men and women in blue that man our ports of entry. These 1,600 CBP officers will be a huge and historic step in addressing the congested ports of entries. And I thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their leadership and a bipartisan approach to this very important issue.

In FY 2012, CBP processed more than 350 million travelers and facilitated $2.3 trillion worth of trade at ports of entry. America's ports of entry are vital hubs of economic activity. As high volumes of goods and persons move through our ports of entry, port security is an urgent priority. Therefore, this new increase of CBP officers will achieve the goal of facilitating trade and travel and boost economic development.

The southern border is one of the fastest-growing regions in North America. In fact, every day there's $1.2 billion of trade between the U.S. and Mexico. My hometown of Laredo handles about 45 percent of all the trade between the U.S. and Mexico. In fact,

every day about 12,000 commercial trucks cross the bridges in Laredo. These 1,000 men and women in blue will help facilitate trade and travel at our ports of entry and will help our economy. Again, I want to thank both the chairman and ranking member for this effort.

We also have to do some enhancements to infrastructure at our critical ports. That's also very necessary. If we limit the Federal funding at our ports of entry, we need to be innovative and think outside the box. In fact, it's essential that the Federal Government explore the use of public-private partnerships, which allows the Federal agencies to partner up with local governments and private stakeholders to help fund the land port, seaport, or airport infrastructure projects. These innovative financing mechanisms, with the proper safeguards that we will add, will adequately staff, supply, construct, and rehab our ports of entry and, in turn, will make our ports more secure and more efficient.

I've been working with my colleagues, both the Democrats and Republicans, to encourage the use of public-private partnerships. In fact, I reached out to our colleague in the Senate from the Homeland Security Subcommittee, the chairwoman, MARY LANDRIEU, and she supports this particular concept. I look forward to working with my good friend, the judge from Texas. Both he and I agree that these are not Federal handouts but they actually allow the local government to partner up with the Federal Government and allow us to make our ports more efficient, more effective. I look forward to working with you, Chairman CARTER, and with Ranking Member PRICE and the staff as we address this conference committee.

I ask you to support this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I rise in support of the 2014 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill being debated this afternoon. I certainly want to applaud the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROGERS, and certainly the chair of the subcommittee, Mr. CARTER, as well as Ranking Member PRICE and the ranking member of the full committee, Mrs. LOWEY, for carefully piecing together a bill that appropriately addresses the evolving threats that face our Nation. This bill strikes a proper balance of fiscal responsibility while fulfilling the mission of vital security programs and providing the resources to enforce current law.

Regarding fiscal restraint, we're considering a bill today that provides for a reduction in the Department's annual budget by $613 million, eliminating ineffectual programs. Yet the legislation was crafted in such a way that agencies and programs will receive the resources and flexibility they need to meet the security needs facing communities across the country day in and day out.

For example, in the wake of the Boston bombings this spring, the bill before us restores DHS' Bombing Prevention program and increases counter-IED training. The Disaster Relief Fund, or the DRF, is robustly funded and will meet the disaster needs of Oklahoma, as well as those who were affected by the hurricanes in the Northeast, such as Hurricane Sandy.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DENT. The FEMA first responder grants, including fire grants, will receive a 20 percent increase. Further, these SAFER grants will continue to provide additional flexibility to allow communities to use grants to retain or rehire firefighters facing layoffs. As an aside, I want to thank again Ranking Member PRICE as well as Chairman ROGERS for working with me on this critical issue once again.

The bottom line is this is a smart, responsible bill that practices fiscal restraint while addressing our most pressing needs in securing our homeland. I urge support of the underlying bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. At this time I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. At this time I yield 2 minutes to a very distinguished member of our subcommittee from the great of State of Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal 2014 Homeland Security appropriations bill.

First, I would like to thank Chairman CARTER and the subcommittee staff for all the work that they have done in preparation for this legislation.

□ 1330

This bill is a perfect example of what happens when real time and thought is put into how taxpayer dollars will be spent.

As I have often said, budgeting is about prioritization, and this is exactly what this bill does. The legislation before us today exercises fiscal discipline. As a whole, we will reduce discretionary spending, while ensuring that programs vital to our national security are properly supported.

This bill also recalibrates the President's pernicious budget proposals for the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that we are getting the most out of every taxpayer dollar. We must ensure the protection of Americans by strengthening security at and within our borders.

By streamlining select programs within DHS and implementing stringent oversight, Chairman CARTER and committee staff, with help from Ranking Member PRICE, have produced a bill that adequately funds our highest security priorities and eliminates waste, fraud, and abuse.

Again, I thank the subcommittee for their diligence in crafting this legislation that pays equal heed to the protections of our taxpayer dollars and the security of our citizens.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who is the chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Subcommittee of the full committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, it is my pleasure to rise today in very strong support of H.R. 2217.

Earlier this year, the President released a fiscal year 2014 budget that would cut funding for the Coast Guard by nearly 10 percent below current levels. This is the second year in a row that this President has asked the Coast Guard to sacrifice mission readiness and success to pay for his questionable spending at other agencies.

The President's budget would slash the service's acquisitions budget by 42 percent below current levels and would severely undermine efforts to recapitalize the service's aging and failing legacy assets, increase acquisition costs for taxpayers, and seriously degrade mission effectiveness. The President's proposed budget points to a future in which a downsized Coast Guard would fail to be able to accomplish even its most basic missions, and the cost could be measured in lives. Fortunately, the bill Chairman CARTER has put before us totally rejects the massive cuts proposed by the President and ensures the Coast Guard is provided with the resources needed to carry out its very critical missions.

I want to thank Chairman CARTER, Ranking Member PRICE, and staff for their tremendous efforts and for their commitment to the men and women of the Coast Guard and the safety of the maritime community.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Ranking Member PRICE.

First, let me commend both Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE on a strong, bipartisan bill. But let me especially recognize their leadership for adding language to this legislation to protect our most vulnerable constituents—our children.

This language that I refer to will effectively fence off $20 million in funds for child exploitation investigations

and forensics within Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Child Exploitation Investigations Unit at the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Chair, there is no question that our children need our support now more than ever. With the proliferation of the Internet and wireless technology, the spread of child pornography online must be addressed now. We don't have a moment or an opportunity to waste.

The Department of Justice estimates that at any moment there are more than 1 million pornographic images of children on the Internet—think about that, 1 million—with an additional 200 images being posted every day, and more than one-third of the world's pedophiles involved in organized pornography rings worldwide live in the United States.

The Internet allows these images to be disseminated indefinitely, victimizing that child again and again with each click of the mouse. Because let's not forget that these aren't just heinous images, they are crime scene photos. Every face in those photographs is the face of a child who needs our support in order to escape a living hell of constant abuse and exploitation.

Since the 1970s, before we even had a Federal child pornography statute, ICE—which was then called the U.S. Customs Service—was a leader in the fight to protect our children. That is still true today. Last year, there were more than 1,600 criminal arrests relating to child exploitation, and 2,600 worldwide investigations were launched, setting new records for Homeland Security investigations. Already this year, there have been 1,382 criminal arrests relating to child exploitation. Their efforts are second to none, and I know they will continue to put these resources to good use.

But for every child rescued, hundreds more remain trapped in a current of abuse, the horrors of which none of us can truly imagine. We need the absolute best personnel going into the fight to rescue these children. That's why it's my hope that some of these funds will be used to employ our wounded warriors, in addition to the experienced agents already fighting these battles. And I thank the chairman and ranking member for adding report language in the bill to encourage the hiring of these valued veterans.

Our armed services have already protected us abroad, so naturally our veterans are a perfect choice to protect our most precious resources at home. In fact, retired Army Master Sergeant Rich Robertson is already fighting child exploitation at the ICE field office in Tennessee. In his words, ''Who better to hunt child predators than someone who's already hunted men?''

I am enthusiastic about this initiative because I know of the immense skills and motivation of our returning servicemen and -women, and the skills that they possess could be the key to our most successful affront on child exploitation yet. Child predators won't stand a chance.

By harnessing the abilities of our wounded warriors, we not only ensure that their skills, dedication, and drive are put to good use back at home, we give them the most dignifying thank-you of all: a job that truly makes a difference.

Mr. Chair, let me be clear: with the inclusion of this language, we are putting predators on notice. Their reign of terror is coming to an end—you can bet on it.

I thank my colleagues on the committee for committing to fight until every American child can live free from terror and exploitation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA). He is the chairman of the committee that authorizes FEMA.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Chairman CARTER for putting together a bill that supports communities' ability to prepare for natural disasters in this very difficult fiscal environment.

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over FEMA, I want to thank them for including all three of my committee recommendations in the bill:

Thank you for continuing the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, which saves money in future disaster assistance;

Thank you for preserving the FEMA administrator's authority for directing Federal disaster response by limiting the role of the principal Federal official;

Finally, thank you for funding the Emergency Management Performance Grants, or EMPG. With a 50 percent match requirement, EMPG grants leverage twice as many preparedness dollars as any other Federal program. For 60 years, EMPG has been focused on building local and State emergency management capability. There are plenty of programs that buy equipment and other things, but they won't do much good in a major disaster without qualified local emergency managers.

We have all seen the photos of evacuation buses flooded and useless in New Orleans because they didn't have a good hurricane evacuation plan. Emergency managers develop the plans to get people out of harm's way and to bring help from outside to the disaster area. The EMPG program helps buy that capability, and FEMA needs to keep the EMPG grant guidance focused on building local government emergency management capacity.

Again, let me thank Chairman ROGERS and Chairman CARTER for a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of very important report language included in the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which will sustain inland Border Patrol stations in states along our nation's southern border.

In 2012, the U.S. Border Patrol proposed to close nine interior Border Patrol stations as part of a cost-savings proposal. Six of the nine proposed closures are located in Texas, including one located in my district in the city of Amarillo. The U.S. Border Patrol made this announcement without first ensuring that local law enforcement agencies will have the necessary resources to deal with the serious illegal immigration problems in our area. The inland stations proposed for closure apprehend hundreds of illegal aliens every year. If these closures are allowed, several hundred illegal aliens would have to be let go due to the lack of federal presence.

Since the proposal was unveiled last year, I have repeatedly heard from numerous local law enforcement officials who have serious concerns about the detrimental effect this would have on our local communities. They also believe this impact could reverberate throughout the country.

You do not have to be on—or even near—the border to see and feel the effects of illegal immigration on our local communities, and that is something we want to make sure the folks in Washington understand. Enforcement of our immigration laws does not stop at the border. Interior enforcement is essential as well. The Supreme Court has confirmed that it is the federal government's job to enforce these laws.

The Border Patrol cited ''cost-saving measures'' as a reason for this proposal, but it is simply penny-wise and pound-foolish. Although the agency anticipates closing these nine stations could save $1.3 million, they admit it will cost $2.47 million to transfer all the agents to other stations.

When I first brought these concerns to the U.S. Border Patrol, I was told time and time again that the agency was working with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to develop a transition plan to ensure that someone from the federal government will be there to pick up the phone when local law enforcement needs their help. To date, I have seen no evidence of a viable plan. There appears to be no draft plan or even an outline of a plan. There are simply too many unanswered questions to allow these inland border patrol station closures to proceed.

Any country must be able to control who and what comes across its borders. A government that cannot or will not do so fails in one of its most basic responsibilities.

I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and Subcommittee Chairman CARTER for including this important language. I look forward to continuing to work together to ensure that our country is not left with a gaping hole in the enforcement of our immigration laws.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my disappointment that the DHS Appropriations bill provides $68 million in funding for 287(g)—a redundant, controversial immigration enforcement program.

I will be offering an amendment later today to cut $10 million from this unnecessary program and use those funds to increase CBP staffing at our nation's airports.

I would like to express my frustration that the legislation we are considering today, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, provides $68 million for the 287(g)—a superfluous and controversial program that allows local police to act like federal agents.

It does not make any sense to waste $68 million on a program that will not help us fix our immigration system nor secure our country.

Because of this, today, I will be proposing an amendment that will cut $10 million from this program and use that money to increase the number of customs agents in our airports.

This would reduce long lines and unacceptable delays, promoting commerce and tourism and furthering our economic recovery.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bill, though not in support of the process that brought it to the House floor.

I am pleased that the overall committee process that produced this bill was bipartisan. For the first time in several years, this bill actually provides slightly more money for the State and Local Grant program, which funds such critical community grant programs like SAFER, AFG, and the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. Specifically, the bill provides $1.5 billion for State and Local Grants, which is $456.8 million above the request and $35.4 million above the FY2013 enacted level. This is still far less than what our firefighters, EMS and other first responders need to replace aging equipment and hire needed additional personnel, but it is nonetheless movement in the right direction.

Unfortunately, that positive development is offset by the failure of this bill to reverse the effects of sequester. TSA is addressing its sequestration-related funding shortfalls in part with a reduction in overtime and a freeze on hiring of new transportation security officers, which will lead to longer checkpoint lines at airports during peak summer travel season. CBP reduced overtime for CBP Officers, leading to significant increases in wait times at air, land, and sea ports of entry for citizens and international commerce. Coast Guard drug and migrant interdiction efforts have been reduced substantially, increasing the flow of narcotics into the United States. Sequestration cut $928 million from FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund (DRF), threatening to reduce funds available to help future victims of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other natural disasters recover and rebuild. This is no way to run a government, and I again urge the House majority to bring a bill to the floor that permanently overturns sequester. The American people want it, they need it, and we should do it today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, before us is H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for FY 2014. Although this legislation is far from perfect, I rise in reluctant support of the bill because ensuring that our first responders and those who work on the frontline protecting our borders have adequate resources to protect our homeland and keep our citizens safe.

I strongly disapprove of the method employed by the House Republican to discharge the House's fundamental responsibility to reach a budget agreement with the Senate establishing the framework governing the appropriations process. The Republican majority brought to the floor and passed a rule that ''deems'' adopted the draconian spending limits imposed by the Ryan Budget resolution rather than a resolution that realistic and responsible limits that is to be negotiated and agreed to by House and Senate budget conferees.

Indeed, the Republican House leadership has refused for months to appoint conferees empowered to reach a budget agreement that is fair, balanced and would end sequestration.

I agree with President Obama that prior to consideration of appropriations bills the House and Senate should first reach agreement on an appropriate framework for all appropriations bills and one does not harm our economy or require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities.

Without such an agreement, House Republican appropriation bills will result in: hundreds of thousands of low-income children losing access to Head Start programs, tens of thousands of children with disabilities losing federal funding for their special education teachers and aides, thousands of federal agents who will not be able to secure the border, enforce drug laws, combat violent crime or apprehend fugitives; and thousands of scientists without medical grants to conduct research to find new treatments and cures for diseases like breast cancer and Alzheimer's.

The Ryan Budget that the House majority deemed adopted and incorporated in the rule governing consideration of this legislation assumes that the draconian funding levels established under sequestration will remain in place for the next several years.

Sequestration has been an unmitigated disaster for the American people, especially for Texas and the people I represent in Houston. Let me identify just a few of the ways my constituents are being adversely affected by sequestration:

Teachers and Schools: Texas will lose approximately $67.8 million for primary and secondary education, putting around 930 teacher and aide jobs at risk. In addition about 172,000 fewer students would be served and approximately 280 fewer schools would receive funding.

Education for Children with Disabilities: Texas will lose approximately $51 million for about 620 teachers, aides, and staff who help children with disabilities.

Head Start: Head Start and Early Head Start services would be eliminated for approximately 4,800 children in Texas, reducing access to critical early education.

Military Readiness: In Texas, approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around $274.8 million in total.

Law Enforcement and Public Safety Funds: Texas will lose about $1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Job Search Assistance: Around 83,750 fewer Texans will get the help and skills they need to find employment as Texas will lose about $2,263,000 for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning.

Child Care: Up to 2,300 disadvantaged and vulnerable children could lose access to child care, which is also essential for working parents to hold down a job.

Vaccines for Children: In Texas around 9,730 fewer children will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for vaccinations.

Violence Against Women Grants: Texas could lose up to $543,000 to provide services to victims of domestic violence, resulting in up to 2,100 fewer victims being served.

Public Health: Texas will lose approximately $2,402,000 to help upgrade its ability to respond to public health threats including infectious diseases, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological events. In addition, Texas will lose about $6,750,000 in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,800 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs. And the Texas State Department of Public Health will lose about $1,146,000 resulting in around 28,600 fewer HIV tests.

Regarding the merits of the legislation before us, let me say that there is much in the bill that should command bipartisan support. For example, the bill includes $1.5 billion for FEMA State and Local Grants, which is $35.4 million above the FY 2013 enacted level. These grants fund critical programs such as the Homeland Security Grant Program, which primarily fund first responders, and the Urban Area Security Initiative.

The bill also provides $10.6 billion for Customs and Border Protection and includes funding for the additional 1,600 Customs and Border Protection Officers requested by the President.

The bill also makes needed investments in cybersecurity, providing $786 million to help protect federal networks from foreign espionage and cyber attacks. The bill also provides a total of $6.2 billion for disaster relief, as requested by the President.

A major improvement to the bill was the adoption by the House of the Jackson Lee-Markey-Grimm-Reed Amendment which prohibits the Transportation Security Agency from changing its Prohibited Items List (PIL) to permit knives on planes. Adoption of my amendment enhances the security of air travel and protects TSA workers, flight attendants, pilots, and federal air marshals.

I am also pleased that H.R. 2217 incorporates several program funding recommendations I made to the Committee, especially the funding provided for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant and the Staffing for Adequate Emergency Response Grant (SAFER) programs. The tragic loss of four firefighters last week in Houston reminds us again of the dangers faced daily by first responders and the necessity of providing them the resources and support required to keep them safe. Specifically, the bill funds in full or substantial part the following programmatic requests I submitted to the Appropriations Committee:

1. $337,500,000, which is 100% of the amount requested, for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program. This program is critical to ensuring that our nation's first responders are adequately trained and equipped to safely and effectively respond to emergencies in their communities.

2. $337,000,000 for the SAFER Program, which is 100% of the amount requested. The SAFER Grant Program provides much-needed funding for career and volunteer fire departments to hire new firefighters and recruit and

retain volunteer firefighters. This program is critical to the thousands of fire stations across the country that are currently operating short of staff and to those seeking to retain current first responders in the face of the economic downturn and recovery.

3. $11,002,000, 91 percent of my request, for the Citizenship and Integration Grant Program, which awards funding to organizations that help legal immigrants prepare for citizenship. Since the current immigration system does not always meet the comprehensive needs of immigrants, integration grants provide culturally sensitive and intentional services to uplift AAPI immigrants. Integration grants are critical as they prevent integration barriers, such as precluding applicants from registering to vote or to secure jobs that require U.S. citizenship.

4. $111,590,000, 86.4 percent of my request, for Alternatives to Detention. These programs provide alternate detention options for low-priority AAPIs where detention is neither mandated nor appropriate. While some immigrants need to be detained because they pose a public safety or flight risk, many immigrants do not need to be jailed and should be placed in less costly supervision programs. A recent report reveals that 40% of individuals held in detention in October 2011 had no criminal history.

It is critical that this legislation continue to undergo further improvement and refinement before it is presented to the President for signature. As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I will continue working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the Senate to ensure that our firefighters and other first responders have the resources needed to keep the American people safe.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the proposal in the President's budget request, which is included in this bill, to shift the responsibility for exit lane staffing from TSA to airport operators across this country.

Since November 2001, TSA has assumed responsibility for staffing exit lanes under the authority of Aviation and Transportation Security Act. Citing budget constraints, in the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request, TSA has sought to shift the responsibility and costs for exit lane staffing to airport operators.

This move raises a number of concerns ably described by the Committee in the report accompanying this bill. Particularly troubling is TSA's intention to continue to collect money for performing this function through the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee while passing the buck along to airports.

Like many of my colleagues, I have heard from my local airport—Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport—about the devastating impact this unfunded mandate would have on airport operators. Mineta airport is already paying $200,000 per year to staff one exit lane because TSA decided it was not ''colocated'' with the checkpoint screening area, and it cannot absorb the additional costs for more exit lane staffing—over the last few years, the airport has already reduced staff by more than 50 percent due to budget constraints.

At the end my statement is the text of a letter I received from the City of San Jose, CA's director of aviation on behalf of Mineta San Jose Airport outlining these concerns in greater detail.

Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE, I know that you were faced with a challenging task, working within the allocation given and trying to fill holes left by the budget request. And I know from the language you included in the report that you regret being unable to fill this hole in the budget.

I thank you for including language in the report directing TSA to work with airport operators to assess the impact of this change and consider delaying or at least phasing in this shift of responsibility until TSA can certify effective technology solutions that would reduce the cost for airport operators.

I hope that as we move this bill to the Senate and into conference, we will have a more favorable allocation to work with that will allow us to reject this ill-conceived proposal and protect already strapped airports from an unfunded mandate to perform duties that they have never had the responsibility for and which TSA is receiving fees to carry out.

MAY 30, 2013.

Hon. MIKE HONDA,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HONDA: I am writing to express my strong concern over the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) plan to shift responsibility—without funding—for monitoring passenger exit lanes onto airport operators. While all levels of government face tough budget decisions in the current economic environment, we need your help to prevent TSA from shifting this unfunded mandate onto our airport. TSA should also explain to the Congressional appropriators why shifting its security function to airports and airlines is not an abdication of its Federal responsibility under current law.

It is unconscionable that a Federal agency that is responsible for national security make a unilateral decision to shift a security responsibility and the associated costs to airport operators, particularly as there currently exists no regulation or other requirement which specifically assigns the responsibility for monitoring sterile area exit lanes to airport operators. Notably, this regulatory option does not ''take into account benefits and costs, both quantitative and qualitative,'' as stipulated by Presidential Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review.

Congress, through the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (ATSA), delegated the responsibility for passenger and baggage screening to the TSA following the tragic events of September 11. It was decided by Congress that aviation security was a matter of national security and should be provided by the federal government.

Through the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee (ASIF), based on the airlines' calendar year 2000 costs for passenger and property screening, TSA collects money from airlines to offset the cost of monitoring exit lanes. In fact, TSA provided to air carriers for use in determining their ASIF fee amount, ''Calendar Year 2000 Costs for Passenger and Property Screening'' (Appendix A to 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1511), which specifically includes, at line item ''2'', the air carrier's costs for ''Exit Lane Monitors''.

The TSA, with no Congressional review or legislation, has decided to impose the responsibility for exit lane monitoring on airports. Although the agency proposes to do this through an amendment to airports' Airport Security Programs, which the TSA unilaterally controls, industry will be afforded the opportunity to submit comments. However, TSA is neither required to consider those comments nor make any changes based on industry input.

It is time to take a close look at ATSA to see if its provisions are still appropriate or need some modifications or enhancements. This review should be done in a very thoughtful and deliberate way by the appropriate Congressional Committees, not by an agency that can make unilateral and arbitrary decisions. At minimum, TSA needs to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking and seek legislative changes to promulgate a requirement for airport operators to assume responsibility for monitoring exit lanes.

The cost implications of exit lane monitoring are significant for all airports, and in many cases, these costs will be passed on to airlines. Based on reports from some airport operators, the cost would range from approximately $160,000 per year for a smaller airport to as much as $2.5 million for a larger airport to monitor exit lanes in accordance with the way the TSA performs the function today. At Mineta San Jose the cost to take on the exit lane responsibility is now estimated at $180,000 to $200,000 a year. The Airport cannot absorb these costs through further reductions in staff and services. (Through the Great Recession of the past 4–5 years, the Airport has gone from a staff of 400 in 2008 to just 187 staff members today.) Accordingly, this additional cost would have to be passed on to the airlines through the Airport's rates and charges structure and ultimately be paid by passengers, who are already paying a fee to the airlines as part of their ticket, for security-related costs.

We ask that your office take action to put a stop to this unfunded mandate and require TSA to explain why shifting a security function and the associated costs to airports and airlines is not an abdication of its Federal responsibility under current legislation.

Members of my staff will be in touch with your office shortly to arrange for an opportunity to discuss this issue with you or your staff in more detail. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. SHERRY, A.A.E.,
Director of Aviation.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2217

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security

Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, $103,246,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, with the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, expenditure plans for the Office of Policy, the Office for Intergovernmental Affairs, the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman, and the Privacy Officer.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,346,000)''

Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

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

□ 1340

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014. My amendment is intended to restore the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to fiscal year '13 levels by transferring $3,346,000 into the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management. The amendment is wholly offset. It is budget-neutral.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is an integral part of ensuring that our rights and values are carried out through the Department of Homeland Security. Today, it is even more important than ever to ensure that this Office is adequately funded.

While this body continues to increase funding for immigration enforcement—and we expect even more funding and personnel to be added in any comprehensive immigration reform bill that we adopt—it is essential that we maintain adequate safeguards to protect our rights and liberties.

I offered a similar amendment last year that sought to provide the office funding that it requested to adequately review 287(g) and Secure Communities programs, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for directing $2.39 million to be used for review of these 287(g) programs.

As I mentioned last year, I remain gravely concerned about any 287(g) programs that have been found to facilitate racial profiling in our communities or enforcement programs that make it harder for immigrants, especially women victims, to get help from the police.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to insist on fully funding 287(g) programs, as they do here in this bill—$44 million above the President's budget request and cited as one of the reasons for a White House veto—at the very least, we should have rigorous safeguards and oversight. And I'll tell you, I must question whether or not we're on a path that recognizes that oversight is paramount as we continue to allow local police to act as Federal immigration officers. The bill increases these programs for review of 287(g)s, but I question whether or not we really get it.

I am here today because I disagree with the approach of the bill. Specifically, the bill would cut the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties by 15.5 percent and then direct the office to pay for this increase of reviews for the 287(g) and Secure Communities programs by making further internal cuts to other essential areas of their mission.

In addition to oversight of 287(g) and Secure Community programs, the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties provides Homeland Security officials with advice on the full range of civil rights and civil liberties issues.

The office engages with communities that are disproportionately impacted by Homeland Security policies and activities. In 2005, the Office had regular roundtables with Arab Americans, Sikhs, Muslims, and other ethnic minorities. Today, they work in 13 core centers around the country.

The office investigates detention facility violations through site visits to ICE detention facilities to investigate civil rights violations.

Complaints from the public, oversight of intelligence collection, and, as I mentioned, comprehensive immigration reform has a chance of becoming a reality. And we know there's going to be a vast increase of enforcement funding and personnel for this Department, but we can't continue to balance essential rights with the security of our country if we play these zero-sum games. It is essential that we adequately fund the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to implement changes to our immigration law in a way that respects our values that the country was founded upon.

Again, my amendment is budget-neutral, Mr. Chairman. It only transfers a very small amount, which is vital funding, to this $21.6 million office.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary since the bill already includes ample funding for necessary oversight of ICE's 287(g) program. In fact, on page 11 of the bill's accompanying report, it states:

Included within the amount recommended for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is a total of $2,394,000 for reviews of 287(g) agreements and ICE's Secure Communities. These funds are in addition to the ongoing work of ICE's Office of Professional Responsibility and the DHS Office of Inspector General, who reviews 287(g) agreements for compliance.

So, while I certainly support robust oversight and also demand ICE's compliance with all applicable laws and standards therein pertaining to civil liberties and civil rights, I cannot support additional bureaucracy.

Furthermore, the offset to this amendment will cut CBP's Automation Modernization account—a cut that will impede CBP's processing of trade and result in longer wait times at our ports of entry, which are detrimental impacts to our economy which none of us can afford to accept.

Finally, I think I need to remind Members that the President's budget request decimated operational staffing and enforcement programs. This bill reversed that flawed approach and is holding DHS headquarters' resources in check. Therefore, I cannot support an amendment that increases headquarters staffing beyond what is necessary or what can be afforded, and does so at the expense of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline, support economic growth, and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of this amendment by our colleague from Wisconsin to restore funding for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

The bill before us provides $18.3 million for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, which is $3.4 million below the budget request and $3.3 million below current year funding. The amendment would simply restore funding for the Office to the fiscal 2013 enacted level.

Now, I want to commend Chairman CARTER for fully funding the much-needed oversight activities related to the troubled 287(g) program and to the Secure Communities program. Oversight of these programs is probably the highest priority for this office. But with just a little more funding, as provided in this amendment, we can go further to ensure the protection of civil rights and civil liberties across the Department's many functions, programs, and activities.

The Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is the key mechanism at the Department of Homeland Security for ensuring that the proper balance is maintained between measures to protect the country and the personal freedoms that we cherish. So I thank the

gentlewoman for offering the amendment. It's a good amendment, a reasonable amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,838,000)''.

Page 42, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,838,000)''.

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

□ 1350

Mr. REICHERT. I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2217, and I thank the chairman and Mr. DELANEY.

As a former law enforcement officer, I know very well the needs of first responders. That is why I am proposing that we increase funding for the United States Fire Administration by $1.8 million.

This would restore total funding for the administration to the fiscal year 2013 level of $44 million. My amendment is offset by cutting $2.8 million from the Secretary of Homeland Security's departmental operation and administrative account. According to the CBO, the amendment would reduce net budget authority by $1 million and will have no impact on fiscal year 2014 outlays.

Continued funding for the brave men and women who protect American citizens by fighting fires is extremely critical, as we all know. The fire death rate in the United States is one of the highest in the industrialized world. We can prevent deaths by ensuring that the USFA has better resources. Data collection, public education, research, and training are all ways the USFA works to reduce the Nation's fire death rate.

Last year, my district experienced record devastation from forest fires, fires that quickly burned out of control and threatened both homes and entire communities. Tens of thousands of acres were destroyed, and it took over 1,000 firefighters and volunteers to get them under control. Hundreds of families lost their homes, and it was only due to the valiant efforts of our fire personnel that more were not lost.

One of the key roles of the USFA is to work to prepare and prevent those types of fires from happening. They do this by working directly with the local communities and stakeholders. They work to promote the adoption of local codes, protection plans, preventative measures, and much more. They are also a key component of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group, which coordinated wildland fire prevention, preparedness, mitigation, and response programs of various Federal agencies. They do all of this, not just to fight a common natural menace, but to protect lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment, which is endorsed by the International Association of Firefighters, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute. Together, we can ensure the safety of our first responders and the American people they serve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DELANEY. I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank Mr. REICHERT for his work on this amendment and for his care on this issue. This is a bipartisan and commonsense amendment. It ensures that we fully fund the USFA so that our firefighters receive world-class training.

Fires are not limited to Republican districts or to Democratic districts. Fires do not discriminate against rural or urban districts. Fires do not choose between districts on the coast or in our heartland—and, thankfully, neither do our firefighters. Firefighters serve us all. Across the Nation, when crisis strikes and when the flames begin, our brave firefighters rush in. They risk their lives to save ours. We should do everything we can to make sure that firefighters are trained well. That investment will directly result in more saved lives and fewer tragedies.

Mr. REICHERT has spoken very eloquently and with great care about the benefits of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that one of the keystones of our firefighter education system is the National Fire Academy, located at the National Emergency Training Center in Emmitsburg, Maryland. This training center in Emmitsburg is a world-class facility and is one of the most important assets in our public safety infrastructure. This is the only Federal facility of its kind. This facility is a tremendous public safety asset for our country. Thousands are trained in Emmitsburg each year. In western Maryland, we are proud to train heroes—heroes who save lives from Maine to Washington State, from Minnesota to Texas.

This amendment restores funding for our critical training facilities to pre-sequester levels at no cost to the taxpayer. I truly thank my colleague for his work on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I want to applaud Chairman CARTER for funding the Fire Administration at a level higher than the administration's request, but the bill before us still provides a slight decrease in funding when compared to the current year. I believe this increase is warranted. The Fire Administration, as we all know, plays a critical role in training our first responders, in enhancing the security of our infrastructure, and in better preparing the response capabilities of our communities.

I do want to register a concern, Mr. Chairman, about the offset for this amendment in that the money is taken from the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, and this is at a time when departmental management funding is already in this bill—$302 million below the request and $147 million below the fiscal 2013 pre-sequestration level.

In dealing with this on the way to conference, we are going to have to pay attention to that offset. However, this is an important amendment, as the Fire Administration is important to all of us, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I want to congratulate Mr. REICHERT for his amendment. I think it is necessary, and I approve of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, under ''Departmental Management and Operations__Departmental Operations__Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,359,200)''.

Under ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement__Salaries and Expenses''—

(1) after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $43,592,000)''; and

(2) after the sixth dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,400,000)''.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the 287(g) program has become increasingly controversial and increasingly recognized as a costly failure.

By allowing local police officers to effectively act as Federal agents and immigration officials, it not only increases crime by taking local cops off the beat and not only costs taxpayers money at a time when we have an over $600 billion deficit, but it also creates fear in Latino communities and in other immigrant communities. 287(g) exacerbates tensions and interferes with community policing and the efforts of law enforcement to gain the trust of people in the communities that they need in order to be able to do their jobs well. In effect, it has trained local law enforcement officials to use racial profiling, asking community members where they are born or if they are in this country legally.

Now, the 287(g) program has become infamous because of the implementation in Maricopa County under Sheriff Joe Arpaio and his racial profiling. The practices sanctioned under 287(g) have led to an unprecedented civil rights investigation by the Department of Justice and an independent civil suit. Even Sheriff Arpaio has acknowledged that the Department of Homeland Security directed him and his officers to use racial profiling as part of their policing practices in identifying individuals for deportation.

You know that, if Sheriff Arpaio is citing a Federal expenditure as the justification for his actions, there must be a problem with that Federal expenditure—and in fact there is.

In the fiscal year 2014 bill, the House Appropriations Committee has funded 287(g) at $44 million above the White House request. The White House has even threatened to veto the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, listing as one of its concerns that, in fact, the 287(g) program has been largely replaced by other enforcement mechanisms, like Secure Communities. Now, we don't all agree on Secure Communities, but there is increasing consensus on all sides of the aisle that 287(g) has no place in our communities or in our budget. It doesn't help combat illegal immigration. In fact, it makes it worse, and it increases crime in our communities.

□ 1400

This amendment will allocate 10 percent of that funding to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and 90 percent toward deficit reduction. By seeking to cut the funding for a program that relies on racial profiling and increases crime, we're sending a clear message that we won't tolerate any more Arpaios, we care about the budget deficit, and we want to cut wasteful government spending.

Programs like 287(g) have created mistrust between Latinos and other immigrant communities throughout this country and local law enforcement and interfered with community policing. Eliminating 287(g) once and for all will begin to repair the trust that's been lost over the last decade. It will help local law enforcement fight crime, instead of trying to implement failed Federal laws, and will be a step forward in the ultimate goal of this Congress of fixing our broken immigration system and restoring the rule of law so that we can grow our economy and decrease crime.

This amendment is very simple. It would save $44 million from a wasteful government spending program, allocate just over $4 million of that to address some of the cuts that have been made to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and use the bulk of that for the deficit reduction account.

Let's come together, Democrats and Republicans, to go after wasteful government spending and counterproductive government spending, as it is in this case.

With that, I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Robust enforcement of our immigration laws is critical to our national security. Clearly, the 287(g) program supports that goal.

Under the 287(g) program, ICE enters into a partnership with State and local enforcement agencies and authorizes them to remove criminal aliens who are a threat to local communities. In effect, the program acts as a force multiplier and ensures more resources to enforce immigration laws and policy. In fact, since January of 2006, the 287(g) program is credited with identifying more than 279,311 potentially removable aliens, mostly at local jails.

ICE's cross-designation of more than 1,500 State and local patrol officers, detectives, investigators, and correctional officers allows them to pursue a wide range of investigations, such as human smuggling, gang/organized crime activity, and money laundering. In addition, participating entities are eligible for increased resources and support in more remote geographic locations.

Currently, ICE has 287(g) agreements with 75 law enforcement agencies in 24 States. Utilizing these funds as an offset takes resources from local sheriffs, police officers, and other first responders and puts it in the hands of a bureaucrat at DHS headquarters.

And while I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion that the deficit is too high, I reject his choice of balancing the budget by jeopardizing public safety and law enforcement.

To his point that the deficit must be reduced, let me point my colleagues to other provisions in the bill that instill fiscal discipline by cutting departmental administrative expenses and bureaucratic overhead by nearly 25 percent and by denying the President's request to create three new offices.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment, urge Members to join me in opposition, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Colorado's amendment.

The gentleman's amendment eliminates increased funding in the bill for the critically flawed 287(g) program, and it increases funding for the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. I want to support the gentleman on both of these fronts.

As our colleague has noted, the 287(g) program designed to facilitate cooperation between Federal and local authorities and immigration enforcement, is, in fact, prone to serious abuse. It's fundamentally flawed in the way it blurs the line between Federal and local roles in immigration enforcement.

Moreover, it simply wastes money. It is very costly. The cost to the taxpayer per removal in the task force model of 287(g) is especially outrageous: $32,789 per removal. Compare that to only $1,500 per removal under the more workable and more appropriate Secure Communities program. So not only is 287(g) flawed and prone to abuse, it's also simply a waste of taxpayer dollars, and it's increasingly redundant as the Secure Communities program takes effect.

The gentleman is redirecting money, I think, in a useful way to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. The most important activity of that office is to oversee this problematic 287(g) program, as well as secure communities. And the funding level in the bill is short of the request; it's short of the current year's funding. So with a little more funding, we can enable the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to do its job in a much better way.

Ideally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would address other seriously shortchanged areas of the bill. For example, cybersecurity, Coast Guard acquisitions, human trafficking, Secret Service. We can think of a lot. I would like to see some of those things addressed, as well as the deficit reduction item. But I believe this amendment greatly improves this bill both in the money it saves and in the money it redirects.

With that, I urge its adoption and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Polis-Chu-Cardenas amendment to strike Federal funding for the 287(g) program.

287(g) is a misguided program. While it claims to help enforce our immigration laws, it actually diverts critical law enforcement resources and makes our communities less safe. By encouraging the police to do the Federal Government's job, 287(g) breeds mistrust in

local law enforcement. Immigrants worry that they will be punished or deported if they talk to the police. This means that victims will choose to suffer in silence. This means fewer witnesses will come forward to help solve crimes.

And this isn't just about undocumented immigrants being scared to come forward. Citizens and legal residents are holding back too. That's because the 287(g) program is a tool that too often relies on racial profiling. Take the case of Sheriff Arpaio in Maricopa County, Arizona. Just a few weeks ago, a Federal judge ruled that he and his deputies violated the constitutional rights of Latinos by targeting them during raids and traffic stops. It's no wonder that 44 percent of Latinos surveyed across the country said they were less likely now to contact police if they were victims of a crime. That's why 10 percent of the funding for 287(g) in this bill will be transferred to the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties that investigates allegations of racial profiling against immigrant communities.

Law enforcement officials from across the country oppose 287(g) because it's getting in the way of their real job: stopping crime and keeping people safe. The 287(g) program takes cops away from going after violent criminals to focus instead on civil violations. According to FBI and census data, 61 percent of 287(g) localities had violent and property crime indices lower than the national average. Former LA Police Chief Bill Bratton decided not to participate in the 287(g) program because his officers ''can't prevent or solve crimes if victims or witnesses are unwilling to talk to us. Criminals are the biggest beneficiaries when immigrants fear the police.''

As if that weren't bad enough, the Department of Homeland Security's own inspector general couldn't tell if the 287(g) money was being used for its intended purpose. In the same 2010 program, the IG cited insufficient oversight and supervision of the 287(g) program by ICE, an ineffective complaint system for abuse, and a lack of focus on their local partners' civil rights issues.

To keep our neighborhoods safe, we need the entire community to come together to solve crimes. Without it, the LAPD would never have solved the murder of Juan Garcia, a 53-year-old homeless man who was brutally killed in an alley just west of downtown Los Angeles in 2009.

□ 1410

At first, the police were stumped. There were no known witnesses and few clues. Then a 43-year-old undocumented immigrant who witnessed the crime came forward and told the homicide detectives what he saw. Because of his help, a suspect was identified and arrested a few days later while hiding on skid row. Because the witnesses were not afraid to contact the police, an accused murderer was taken off the streets, and we are all a little bit safer. We need to end this program today and ensure that no murder, no theft, no assault goes unsolved because of misguided policies like 287(g).

I urge you to vote in favor of the Polis-Chu-Cardenas amendment and end funding for 287(g). It's time to let police fight crime, not illegal immigration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), $171,173,000, of which not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $4,020,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and $7,815,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary for Management shall, pursuant to the requirements contained in House Report 112–331, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'' under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank you, and I want to thank Judge CARTER as well.

This amendment is relatively simple. It started back in March of 2010. On March 27, 2010, a rancher by the name of Rob Krentz was on his own property about 20 miles north of the Arizona-Mexico border, and he was murdered. Even now 3 years later, the killer or killers have not been captured. When he was found by the people who lived there, his wife, Sue, was convinced one of the reasons he was murdered was he was in a certain area of his ranch that's a dead zone. Dead zones, Mr. Chairman, exist along the Arizona-Mexico border, the Texas-Mexico border, and are areas where there is no cell phone service. Ranchers rely many times on short-wave radios to communicate with each other and law enforcement. Basically, Rob Krentz could not call for help before he was murdered.

This legislation first started when Gabby Giffords was here in Congress. She proposed in 2010 that we fix that problem by taking about $10 million from the Office of the Under Secretary of Management of DHS and move it to the Border Security, Fencing, Infrastructure and Technology account with the purpose of allowing the ranchers to have access to cell phone service so they can call for help when they're in trouble. The legislation has passed twice, but has not passed the Senate and become law.

So this legislation is being brought to the House again for the third time. I appreciate the support from my friend, HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, Texas. It's commonsense legislation. There are portions of the border that are not secure, and those portions, those dead zones, let's help the ranchers so they can call for help when they are in trouble. That's what this legislation does.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to accept this amendment from my colleague and friend, Judge POE, which provides $10 million for CBP to procure additional equipment for surveillance and detection at both the southern and northern borders.

Some of the technological solutions CBP procures for border security include integrated fixed towers, tactical communication, and tethered aerostat radar systems. All these systems increase situational awareness and assist law enforcement personnel as they identify and resolve illegal activity. In effect, they become a workforce multiplier, freeing agents to focus on other vital tasks like identifying, tracking, interdicting, and resolving events along the border.

For these reasons, I accept the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 4, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 35, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $22,000,000)''.

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I have come to the floor today, along with my colleague, Mr. HORSFORD, to offer a very simple amendment because we must do everything we can to protect our cities, towns, and communities.

The Urban Area Security Initiative, according to the Department of Homeland Security, dedicates funds to:

> Address the unique planning, organization, equipment, training and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism.

However, due to a recent change in qualification criteria, a number of major metropolitan areas will be going without UASI funds despite being qualified for such funds last year. Those areas that will be without funds to prevent and respond to threats include Riverside, California; Portland, Oregon; Orlando, Florida; Indianapolis, Indiana; New Orleans, Louisiana; San Antonio, Texas; Kansas City, Missouri; and Las Vegas, Nevada. Now, if those sound like high-threat, high-density locations to you, you'd be correct. They are. Yet despite recent events, they are not going to be receiving UASI funds this year.

Now, I cannot speak for all of these areas, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell you that Las Vegas, which holds more high-profile, highly attended events than any city in the country, is worthy of UASI funding.

In Las Vegas, law enforcement has to not only defend the Las Vegas metro area, which includes the fabulous Las Vegas Strip with more densely packed hotel rooms than any other city in our country, but also has high-threat areas outside the city, like the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, which holds 140,000 people, and the Hoover Dam, which is not only a popular tourist attraction, but a source of electrical power for more than 1 million people across the southwestern United States.

So today, I have a very simple amendment to the bill. The amendment decreases funding under four different accounts as outlined previously and redirects those amounts to the Urban Area Security Initiative for the purpose of funding the program to the top 35 eligible metropolitan areas.

Now I recognize that as our debt continues to increase, we must work to rein in wasteful spending, and I recognize that all of the funding in the world isn't going to prevent every attack. But in this case, don't we think the safety and well-being of our cities and communities, our families and our children, are a worthy expense? Don't we believe they deserve our support?

My amendment goes to the very heart of the core functions of our democratic government, Mr. Chairman. Our Constitution states that our Federal Government must ''insure domestic tranquility'' and ''provide for the common defense.'' That is the issue at hand with my amendment.

As someone who has worked on the front lines of homeland security as a SWAT physician and emergency preparedness consultant, as well as someone who has worn the uniform in the U.S. Army Reserve, I believe that overlooking the risks faced by the top 35 cities would be a mistake, and we should provide them the funding they need. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment that I am offering along with Congressman HECK would help address some of our concerns about the calculations in the Urban Area Security Initiative funding formula. UASI provides critical funding to cities that are at risk for a terrorist attack.

□ 1420

As a member of the authorizing committee for the Department of Homeland Security, I want to work with the appropriators on this concern.

I have become deeply concerned about how the formula currently being used by the Department of Homeland Security will determine eligibility for this funding. The formula sometimes counts multiple buildings as a single site, something that shortchanges the Las Vegas Strip. It also punishes cities for successfully implementing anti-terror programs. Well, we should not be the victims of our own success.

As it stands now, critical anti-terror programs for major tourist destinations around the country are being defunded, including for Las Vegas, New Orleans, and Orlando, to name a few. That's the Las Vegas Strip, the site of Mardi Gras, and Disney World.

This is not an issue of budget cuts. It's an issue of prioritization. It's an issue of a faulty policy that completely ignores some major international tourist destinations and the threat posed to them.

During a recent House Homeland Security Committee hearing, I asked Boston Police Commissioner Edward Davis about the value of the UASI program in responding to the tragic events of the Boston Marathon attack.

Commissioner Davis told the committee that if it were not for UASI ''there would have been more people who would have died in these attacks. It is critical that we maintain that funding to urban areas.''

He stressed that this is not a frivolous expenditure. It's something that works. It's something that our sheriff is asking for, it's something that our mayor of Las Vegas is asking for, and it's something the people on the ground, the first responders, desperately need.

I visited the Southern Nevada Counter-Terrorism Center recently. They do incredible work in keeping the 2 million residents and the 40 million tourists who come to southern Nevada safe.

In studies on terrorist targets, however, the RAND Corporation has stated that Las Vegas ''stands out in having a high proportion of high-likelihood targets compared to the Nation as a whole.''

The same study also reports that the unique composition of hotels, casinos, and skyscrapers ''increases the overall attack probability in Las Vegas relative to other cities in the same likelihood tier.''

Yet, in my home State of Nevada, Mr. Chairman, we face reduced UASI funding because of flaws in the Relative Risk Profile model that has inappropriately dropped Las Vegas' ranking as a likely terrorist target.

We need a serious reevaluation of the funding formula for UASI. It is wrong that Las Vegas has dropped in ranking, and it is wrong that we will face reduced funds because of faulty calculations.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I look forward to continuing to work with the appropriators on addressing this very important concern to the safety of our domestic homefront.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. The bill before us today was born out of a need for reform. It consolidates disparate grant programs, provides discretion to the Secretary while balancing fiscal discipline.

In total, this bill provides for $2.5 billion for Homeland Security First Responder Grants. This is $400 million above the President's request for fiscal year 2014 and $35 million above fiscal year 2013.

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

This does not mean lower-risk cities will lose all funding. It means the funds will come from other programs,

such as State homeland grants that are risk-and formula-based.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman in opposing this well-intentioned amendment.

The amendment would cannibalize various administrative accounts throughout the bill, the Office of the Secretary for Executive Management, the Chief Financial Officer, the CBP Salaries and Expenses, FEMA Salaries and Expenses, somewhat obscure accounts, you might say; but, nonetheless, accounts that are vital to the Department's functioning. It would cannibalize these accounts and put $22 million more in grants, presumably for urban grants, UASI.

Now, the grant programs can always use more money. I've championed those programs for years, especially the risk-based UASI program. But we need to think carefully what this amendment is really about.

This is a risky path for this body to go down. It really seems to be about adding cities to UASI, adding cities.

Now, UASI-eligible cities, and there are 25 of them, are picked on a risk basis. There's a formula involving threat and vulnerability and consequence. The estimates are updated every year. This is probably the most strictly risk-based assessment that DHS undertakes.

Do we really want to substitute that for picking these cities on the House floor?

I'm afraid that's what this amendment is all about, or at least it's the path that it could put us on. And so, therefore, I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 41, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, my budget-neutral amendment, authored with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who was going to be here on the floor today but is attending Senator Lautenberg's memorial service this afternoon, supports our Nation's firefighters in two critical ways.

The FIRE and SAFER grant programs are two need-based, Department of Homeland Security-administered programs that go directly to local fire departments throughout the country. This amendment supports volunteer and career firefighters by giving them resources to purchase highly specialized equipment necessary to carry out their mission.

Mr. Chair, we all recognize the budget pressures facing our Federal Government and the need to prioritize where our tax dollars are spent. FIRE and SAFER grants are a very important partnership with local fire departments and invest in our communities and increase the safety of our constituents.

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which helps to ensure firefighters have the resources they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to express support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide $5 million in additional funding for Firefighter Assistance Grants. This funding would be equally divided between the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) programs, which provide equipment and staffing assistance for local fire departments.

In my work to develop the AFG and SAFER programs, I envisioned them as ways to fill needs that local budgets sometimes can't. As we all know, in today's tough budget environment, many states and towns are strapped for cash and have asked their first responders to make sacrifices. These are the times when AFG and SAFER are most important.

These programs put more firefighters on our streets and provide better equipment to keep them safe. For example, in New Jersey's Ninth Congressional District, the towns of Garfield and North Arlington have recently received hundreds of thousands of dollars in AFG assistance for the purchase of electronic accountability systems and Self Contained Breathing Apparatuses. These firefighters are risking their lives to protect our lives and property, and we owe it to them to ensure that they are protected with the best possible equipment.

Earlier this year, my hometown of Paterson received a SAFER grant of almost $7 million to prevent the layoff of 40 firefighters and allow the city to hire 9 new firefighters to replace retirees. This funding goes directly to job creation in our local communities while helping our departments to maintain adequate staffing levels for public safety.

I am relieved that President Obama signed into law reauthorizations for AFG and SAFER this January after the program authorizations had been allowed to lapse. Now we must continue to provide adequate funding. Working together in a bipartisan manner, we have been able to restore over $800 million in proposed cuts to AFG and SAFER over the past 3 years. I am proud that the Fire Caucus gathered the signatures of over 140 on a bipartisan letter to the Appropriations Committee opposing any cuts to these critical programs in FY 2014.

I would like to thank Mr. RUNYAN for his work on this amendment and this issue, as well as Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their work on this bill and for allowing this amendment. Our firefighters are on the front lines of our homeland security. I urge my colleagues to support their local firefighters by supporting this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $7,667,000)''.

Page 35, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $7,667,000)''.

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $7,667,000)''.

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

Mr. GRIMM. I rise today in support of my amendment that would fund the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System at $35.18 million, which is level funding compared to FY 2013 but still reflects a reduction of roughly $6 million from fiscal year 2012.

The National Urban Search and Rescue Response System, or US&R, provides a significant national resource for search and rescue assistance in the wake of major disasters and structural collapse. A typical US&R task force will conduct physical search and rescue operations, provide emergency medical

care to trapped victims, assess and control hazards such as ruptured gas and electric lines, and evaluate and stabilize damaged structures. Due to the critical lifesaving nature of their mission, US&R task forces must be prepared to deploy within 6 hours of notification and must be self-sufficient for the first 72 hours.

These teams have been deployed in responses to the Oklahoma tornadoes, Superstorm Sandy, the Japanese tsunami, the Haiti earthquake, Hurricane Katrina, 9/11 attacks, and many, many other disasters. Current Federal funding for the Nation's US&R teams only provides a fraction of the funds necessary to maintain each task force. It's important to note the recent devastation left in the wake of the Oklahoma tornadoes, as well as Superstorm Sandy, and the subsequent response underscore the importance of the national search and rescue capacity. Providing proper funding for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System will help ensure these highly skilled teams are available to respond to major emergencies without jeopardizing the budget priorities of our local first responders.

I'd also like to thank my colleague and friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who's the lead cosponsor of this amendment and a strong, strong advocate for the Urban Search and Rescue program.

Therefore, I urge you to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and properly fund this critical program, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am pleased to join my colleague once again in sponsoring this important amendment to restore funding to our Nation's elite Urban Search and Rescue teams.

Our modest, simple, straightforward amendment, which has the support of the International Association of Firefighters, would provide level funding, as my colleague just indicated, for the Department to continue supporting the 28 national teams currently spread across 19 States, including our respective home States of New York and Virginia.

When people are trapped in the unstable rubble of a collapsed building, the window of survivability can be measured in hours. Without highly trained responders, rescue attempts can actually imperil victims and rescuers alike. Thankfully, because of this training, we have made strategic investments in specialized research and search and rescue teams. These elite firefighters and emergency medical technicians are not just first responders, though they are that. For people awaiting rescue, they are often the last hope.

As my colleagues are aware, federally supported search and rescue responders were on the scene recently in Oklahoma after the tornadoes there and in New Jersey and New York after Superstorm Sandy last year.

Prior to coming to Congress, Mr. Chairman, I served for 14 years in local government in Fairfax County, Virginia. For 9 of those years, I shared an office with the fire department. I saw daily the selfless dedication of men and women who put their lives at risk in service to others. Fairfax County is home to one of the most elite US&R teams in the country—in fact, in the world. In partnership with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Agency for International Development, FEMA, and Fairfax County government, the team serves American interests both here at home and abroad.

The team is comprised of highly skilled career and volunteer fire and rescue personnel whose daily duties are to serve the community by responding to local fire and medical emergencies. But when called into service, that team, designated as Virginia Task Force One, is mobilized for quick response to domestic disasters, natural or manmade, with special expertise in collapsed building rescue.

Our team was deployed in Oklahoma City in the wake of the terrorist bombing in 1995 and was among the first on the scene at the Pentagon on 9/11. It was also dispatched to Mississippi and Louisiana in response to Hurricane Katrina in 2005. It has answered the call for help in multiple States, including California, North Carolina, Texas, Florida, Kansas, Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to name a few.

When disaster strikes, whether natural or manmade, domestically or internationally, the US&R teams have rushed to the scene, saving countless lives and preserving and protecting property. Their heroic efforts have shown this to be a wise investment that absolutely must be maintained.

I urge my colleagues to support the Grimm-Connolly amendment to ensure that this successful partnership with our local partners and first responders is sustained, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept this good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in qualified support of this amendment. When disasters strike, these Urban Search and Rescue Teams stand ready for FEMA deployment, complete with unique tools and equipment and training.

I do want to register another concern about the cannibalizing of management accounts that this amendment, along with other amendments, is undertaking to do. We're already $302 million below the request and $147 million below our fiscal 2013, pre-sequestration, in this departmental management funding, so we've got to pay attention to this as we take this amendment to conference. We've got to have a better offset.

Having said that, I do think this is a meritorious amendment, well justified. I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,676,000)''.

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $15,676,000)''.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases surface transportation security funding by about $15.6 million, bringing it to the enacted FY 2013 level of $124.3 million. This would be offset by a reduction in a similar amount to the Office of the Under Secretary for Management.

Last April, the United States received a chilling reminder that it remains a target for attacks by terrorists and their sympathizers when two men detonated bombs in my home city at the finish line of the Boston Marathon. Just 1 week later, authorities foiled a plot to attack a passenger train running between Canada and the U.S.

After the September 11, 2001, attacks, we, as a Nation, undertook—and rightly so—a massive effort to strengthen aviation security. We invested significant resources into making our skies safer. I strongly supported those efforts but would also caution that we cannot forget that other forms of transportation remain vulnerable to attack.

Since fiscal year 2002, $69.3 billion in funding has been dedicated to aviation security. However, during that same period, surface transportation security has been funded at about $3.3 billion. Less than 5 percent of our transportation security funding has gone to our transit systems—our rails and buses.

Now it is sometimes said that our military planners are guilty of fighting the last war. I believe that in the war on terror, my fear is that it may be the case here.

□ 1440

Over the last number of years, we have seen buses and passenger rail systems targeted throughout Europe and Asia. I'll just mention a few.

As I mentioned, in April of 2013, there was an al Qaeda-linked plot to attack a passenger train running between New York and Toronto. In July 2006, seven bomb blasts over 11 minutes took place in a suburban railway in Mumbai; 209 were killed and over 700 injured.

In March 2004, coordinated bombings on the Madrid commuter rail system resulted in 191 killed and 1,800 injured. In February 2004, two suicide bombers attacked the Moscow metro stations; at least 40 were killed and over 100 injured. As well in Israel, France and Japan, they have suffered similar attacks on their bus and railway systems.

Many people don't realize that U.S. passenger rail systems carry about five times as many people as do airlines. For a potential terrorist looking to cause as much damage and panic as possible, we cannot ignore the fact that our rails and buses are a target. This amendment is one step to better secure our surface transportation systems that move millions of Americans each and every day.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment. I, too, have concerns about surface rail.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his attention to the very real vulnerabilities of surface rail, his attention to this, and I urge acceptance of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), $41,242,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for financial systems modernization efforts: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Future Years Homeland Security Program and a comprehensive report compiled in conjunction with the Government Accountability Office that details updated missions, goals, strategies, priorities, along with performance metrics that are measurable, repeatable, and directly linked to requests for funding, as described in the accompanying report.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, $210,735,000; of which $99,397,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $111,338,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That the Department of Homeland Security Chief Information Officer shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan, to include each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, for all information technology acquisition projects funded under this heading or funded by multiple components of the Department of Homeland Security through reimbursable agreements, that includes—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $291,623,000; of which not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which $89,334,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $113,903,000, of which not to exceed $300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

TITLE II

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; $8,275,983,000; of which $3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which not to exceed $34,425 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2014, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be $35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase by $10 million the funding for Customs and Border Protection staffing and to decrease by $10 million the funding for the controversial 287(g) immigration enforcement program.

At a time when our economy is just starting to pick up steam, this amendment is intended to promote trade, travel, tourism, and investment through our Nation's airports and ultimately support our economic recovery.

As the busiest airport in the United States for international flights and the Gateway to the Americas, Miami International Airport is a vital economic engine for south Florida and our country. Unfortunately, MIA has been among the worst hit with inadequate

Customs and Border Patrol staffing levels. On the worst peak travel days, we have over 3½ hours of waiting time, and sometimes up to 800 missed connections.

If we want to continue being the top destination for foreign investors, for immigrants, for tourists, for visitors, and for business people, we need to ensure we have adequate CBP staffing to handle our growing number of visitors.

While these personnel shortages are especially acute at MIA, these delays are prevalent at international hubs throughout the country, impeding the trade, travel, tourism, and investment that we need to fuel our economic recovery and create jobs.

This amendment seeks to reduce the funding of the section 287(g) program to enable the increase of funding for CBP staffing. This immigration enforcement program has been controversial and criticized for many years and has been made increasingly redundant by the development and expansion of other questionable programs, like Secure Communities.

While this appropriations bill provides $68 million in funding for 287(g), that amount exceeds the request from the Department of Homeland Security by $44 million, that is, a $44 million increase over the request.

Both the Major Cities Chiefs Associations and the International Association of Chiefs of Police have expressed strong concerns about section 287(g)'s program, which undermine's public safety and diverts limited law enforcement resources, and exacerbates fear and distrust in our communities. And if that wasn't enough, other immigration enforcement programs like Secure Communities have replaced the need for 287(g), and yet we are continuing to fund a practically defunct program. I believe these funds are better spent in promoting American commerce at our Nation's airports and invigorating our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support what I think is a very sensible and important amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Not only do I oppose the increase of $10 million for additional CBP officers; I oppose the offset suggested to pay for the increase.

As drafted, the bill provides for $105 million for hiring 1,600 officers over a 2-year period. In fact, we provide funds sufficient to cover the costs of no less than 21,186 CBP officers, which sets a historical precedent.

The reason we took this incremental approach into hiring 1,600 new officers is because CBP's staffing and deployment plan was not linked to its goals for border security. To address these concerns, the report includes language directing CBP to provide a more complete 5-year staffing and deployment plan.

Furthermore, an internal audit revealed systemic failures within CBP's budget formulation for salaries and benefits of its operational workforce. And though I believe taking a go-slow approach to hiring just makes sense, I oppose the offset, which decreases funds for the 287(g) program.

Under the 287(g) program, ICE enters into partnerships with State and local law enforcement agencies and authorizes them to remove criminal aliens who are a threat to local communities. In effect, the program acts as a force multiplier to ensure more resources to enforce immigration laws and policies. In fact, since 2006, the 287 program has been credited with identifying more than 279,311 potentially removable aliens, mostly from local jails.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it's a positive contribution to the bill. It improves the balance in the bill, both in what it proposes—positively—and also what it cuts. I think we can use the additional funds in CBP for additional officers. And as has been said many times on this floor today, the 287(g) is flawed and wasteful and can well afford this kind of cut.

So I commend the gentleman on both fronts—adding to the right things, cutting the right things—and I urge adoption of his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1450

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for operation and improvement of automated systems, including salaries and expenses, $707,897,000; of which $325,526,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which not less than $140,762,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $7,655,000)''.

Page 49, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,655,000)''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, as I stand here, wildfires are burning in my district and in the State of Colorado. The bark beetle epidemic, rampant drought, intense weather occurrences, and deteriorating forest health have increased the propensity for devastating wildfires throughout the Western United States.

According to the National Interagency Fire Center, last year, more than 9.3 million acres of land burned. That is an area that is approximately the size of Rhode Island, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and Massachusetts combined. These fires tragically claimed 13 lives, destroyed more than 2,000 homes, and led to hundreds of millions of dollars in damages. Nearly 400,000 acres burned in Colorado, alone, with the tragic loss of six lives.

The status quo of addressing a problem when it's too late is no longer good enough. The status quo has given us decades of declining forest health. The status quo has given us years of increasingly catastrophic wildfires. The status quo has put people, communities, and ecosystems at risk. We must do more.

Forests are vital for the Western United States. They provide limitless environmental and economic benefits when healthy. It's our responsibility to be able to preserve this incredible natural resource and do all that we can to be able to restore forest health. And we also need to be able to prevent future loss of life and property to catastrophic wildfire.

I urge this body to be able to join with me and my colleague, Congressman POLIS of Colorado, in taking a step to be able to prevent these tragedies. For far too long we've been working to stop fires once they start and mitigate damage once it has already occurred. As the old saying goes, ''an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.'' That is what this amendment is about: getting ahead of this problem by investing greater resources toward prevention so that we can take a more proactive approach to restoring our forests to a healthy, natural state.

Representative POLIS and I have introduced this amendment to direct $7,655,000 to FEMA's National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, a program uniquely suited to be able to assist in our effort to be able to reduce the occurrence of wildfire, as it would provide funds aimed at mitigating conditions that lead to these fires.

Despite the need for proactive programs such as this in the wake of increased occurrences of extreme weather events, including wildfire, the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund is facing a reduction of nearly $2.5 million this year. Considering the value of this program and the term saving it generates through prevention of destructive fires, I believe there are more

appropriate areas within the Federal Government where it can realize budget savings.

Our amendment is offset by decreasing the same amount of funding in the Automation Modernization account of the Department of Homeland Security, which received an increase of $7,655,000 this year for its IT modernization, despite concerns with transparency of spending within the agency. I share the concerns expressed there.

Senator COBURN's Wastebook provided some troubling findings about wasteful spending within DHS, including the fact that this agency has spent over $35 billion of taxpayers' money in the last 10 years. In fiscal year '10, DHS spent $6.5 billion on IT spending alone. In 2013, DHS planned to spend $4 billion on 68 major IT programs. A third of these programs cost about $1 billion and were identified by the Government Accountability Office as containing waste and not meeting specified commitments.

Besides being replete with wasteful government spending, many programs at DHS have been found to be overlapping, unnecessary, or lacking in transparency. Until these concerns are addressed, I do not believe we should be providing additional resources for these programs at DHS. Instead, we could better use that $7,655,000 to take steps towards proactively reducing the occurrence of devastating wildfires by redirecting those funds to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and safeguard our forests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague, Mr. TIPTON, in bringing forward this important amendment.

Here, in the first year of June, there are already two wildfires that have erupted in my district. Mr. TIPTON and I share northern and western Colorado. Just this last Monday, a wildfire ignited near Evergreen, Colorado. We had an evacuation of several thousand people. These are just the early season fires, and this year's wildfire season could very well be longer and more extreme than ever before. Already, the National Interagency Fire Center has predicted that this summer will bring an increased fire threat to communities in multiple States across the United States.

Unfortunately, last year was a devastating year for fires in my home State. We had two of our most destructive fires in history. In 2012, wildfires destroyed 650 structures, six Coloradans lost their life in wildfires, 384,000 acres of land were burnt and caused over half a billion dollars in property damage.

In addition to wildfires, our country and our State have experienced natural disasters, like droughts and tornadoes. The impacts of these are reminders of how costly and destructive extreme weather can be and how important it is to be prepared and to reduce risks where we can. In total, 11 extreme weather events last year across the country, including hurricanes, tornadoes, and fires, cost taxpayers $96 billion. Extreme weather events have a real impact, a human impact, and a cost.

We have an opportunity in this amendment to reduce and minimize the damage and costs of extreme weather events, like wildfires, by mitigating the threat prior to an event. That is why I join Representative TIPTON in directing $7.6 million to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund. We can spend a penny now to save a dollar later. The National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund is one of the only FEMA programs that reduces fire danger before a fire starts. By increasing funding to mitigate extreme weather events, we can allocate more resources to preventing the impact of these devastating fires, saving lives and saving money.

Unfortunately, the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, absent this amendment, is only funded at $22.5 million, which is actually a reduction of $2.475 million, even though events were occurring at higher rates last year and we have no reason to believe that this year will be different.

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, very simply, is a good investment, Mr. Chairman. The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund investments have already led to significant savings to taxpayers by reducing risks and damages caused by extreme weather.

The amendment is completely offset by reducing the same amount of funding in the Automation Modernization account. In fact, our amendment actually decreases costs in the first year by $4 million. The Automation Modernization account has already been noted by the committee of lacking transparency regarding how the funds are managed. And of course, while I support the DHS modernizing its technology systems, I cannot support increasing that account in this time of fiscal constraint, especially when the result of these disasters could very well cost more than an ounce of prevention now.

So this bill increases the account by $7.655 million that we're directing to the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund to proactively reduce the threat of wildfires and save taxpayer money. Now, we can't stop wildfires, but we can take measures to reduce their impacts on our communities and to save taxpayer money.

That is why I am proud to join Representative TIPTON, and I've offered this commonsense amendment that would allocate $7.655 million in additional resources to the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I would like to accept this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I, too, urge adoption of this amendment.

I want to commend the chairman, though, while I have a moment, for putting in $22.5 million for pre-disaster mitigation into this bill. He did that at my request. We had a proposal for the President, which was quite inadequate in this respect, and so the chairman has put this money in. This is an amendment that would add more to that, and it is money we can quite well use.

□ 1500

I don't believe the offset is ideal. The offset would slow down the IT initiatives at Customs and Border Protection, which are designed to modernize customs processes and risk-based targeting efforts. I don't necessarily think it's the best process for us on the House floor to be establishing carveouts in the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. We need an all-hazards approach. We don't necessarily want to rank the threat of fire higher than the threat of hurricanes and so forth.

Having said that, though, I think this bipartisan pair of cosponsors has made a very compelling case today for the threat that their areas face, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, $351,454,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including salaries and expenses and operational training and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; $802,741,000; of which $292,791,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which $509,950,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been

identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2014 without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under this heading in Public Law 112–74.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, $471,278,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an inventory of the real property of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and a plan for each activity and project proposed for funding under this heading that includes the full cost by fiscal year of each activity and project proposed and underway in fiscal year 2015.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; $5,344,461,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed $11,475 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than $305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than $5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); and of which not to exceed $11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, $15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed $6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, not less than $1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: *Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, not less than $2,835,581,000 is for detention and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, $31,541,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Visa Security Program: *Provided further*, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including operation of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been violated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than ''adequate'' or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, beginning on line 22, strike ''*Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014:''.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike the provision in H.R. 2217, which states:

Funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement has interpreted this provision, which has been in past appropriations bills, to require the maintenance of a daily detention population of 34,000 people. This detention bed mandate ties the hands of ICE and restricts its discretion to make detention decisions even when release could be appropriate. Indeed, this is an unprecedented mandate for law enforcement as no other law enforcement agencies have a quota for the number of people that they must keep in jail.

This detention bed mandate is a drain on ICE's limited resources. On March 19 of this year, I participated in a Judiciary Committee oversight hearing with ICE Director John Morton that addressed this issue. Director Morton explained that ICE had interpreted language in the previous continuing resolution as requiring the agency to keep ''a yearly average daily population of approximately 34,000 individuals.'' Accordingly, ICE has been maintaining an average daily detention population well over 34,000 people with the numbers fluctuating between 35,000 and 37,000 people. Due to this fiscally unsustainable mandate, ICE released more than 2,000 individuals earlier this year to avoid burning through its detention funds.

Detention is extremely costly, and it strains ICE's limited budget in an era of fiscal restraint. Mandating ICE to keep 34,000 detainees in custody each day forces ICE to forgo alternatives to detention that would save taxpayer money. In fact, a single detention bed is approximately $122 per day; and with additional administrative costs, it can rise to $164 a day. Meanwhile, alternatives such as ankle bracelets, parole, telephonic, and in-person reporting, curfews, and home visits can run from 30 cents to $14 per day.

By untying ICE's hands by striking this minimum detention population requirement, we can allow ICE to pursue effective alternatives and make budgetary savings. ICE agents could use these savings when focusing on their many additional responsibilities, such as cracking down on drug smuggling, human trafficking and child pornography—all priorities which are shared by Republicans and Democrats alike.

I would like to thank my friend, Congressman BILL FOSTER, for his dedication to this issue.

Detention takes an enormous toll on our communities, and mandating ICE detain 34,000 individuals a day does not secure our borders or make us safer. The Deutch-Foster amendment would strike this arbitrary provision from the bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. I rise today in support of this amendment, and I would like to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for joining me in the fight on this important issue.

Our amendment would end the costly and inhumane practice of imposing arbitrary immigrant detention requirements by striking the language in this bill which mandates that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, otherwise known as ICE, maintain 34,000 immigrants in detention every single day.

Mandatory detention comes at a high cost both for taxpayers and immigrant families who are needlessly torn apart. Immigration detention costs the United States $2 billion a year. That's $5.4 million a day or $164 per day per detainee. Despite the availability of

other proven cheaper methods, including ankle bracelets and supervised release that cost the Federal Government anywhere from 30 cents a day to $14 a day, we continue to use detention as the primary method for immigrants facing deportation. Not only is this quota fiscally irresponsible, but it makes it impossible for DHS to make rational decisions about detention based on enforcement priorities and needs.

There is also a high human cost. Most immigrants in detention are held in county jails or facilities run by private prison corporations often hundreds of miles from anyone they know. Human rights abuses have been well documented in facilities across the country. Many immigrants in the system have strong ties to their communities and no criminal records; yet they must fight their cases from a distant jail all because of this arbitrary quota. No other law enforcement agencies in our government have such quotas. Rather than a per-day bed quota, ICE's use of bed space should be based on actual need, which is the approach used in every other law enforcement context.

In his letter from the Birmingham jail, Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Mandatory detention quotas distort our system of justice and are a threat to freedom and justice in our country. Mr. Chairman, I rise to end this costly and needless injustice, and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter of support for this amendment that is signed by 66 local, national and State groups, which I submit for the RECORD.

JUNE 5, 2013.

Re H.R. 2217—Support Rep. Deutch's Amendment to Eliminate the Immigration Detention Bed Mandate

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As organizations that work to protect and advance the rights of individuals in immigration detention, we write to encourage bipartisan support of Rep. Deutch's amendment (co-sponsored by Rep. Foster) to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act, H.R. 2217, that would eliminate the immigration detention bed mandate.

Congress has mandated through appropriations that DHS maintain a daily immigration detention level of 34,000 individuals, a micro-managing approach that does not exist in any other law enforcement context. DHS already uses a Risk Assessment Tool to help determine whether an individual presents a risk of flight or a risk to public safety and whether that person should be detained. Yet the bed ''mandate'' precludes the agency from making decisions about detention based on its enforcement priorities, policies, and need. It also makes increased efficiencies, effective alternatives to detention, and other cost-savings efforts for taxpayers impossible—an irresponsible approach for the federal government to take when Washington seeks to reduce federal spending. Alternatives to detention have received bipartisan support for its cost-savings from groups such as the Council on Foreign Relations' Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy, the Heritage Foundation, the Pretrial Justice Institute, the Texas Public Policy Foundation (home to Right on Crime), the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Conference of Chief Justices.

Today, taxpayers pay upward of $2 billion a year to fund immigration detention, approximately $5.5 million each day. Decades ago, criminal justice and correctional experts observed that holding all individuals subject to incarceration in jails or prisons was unsustainable, unnecessary, and a wasteful use of resources. It is common in the criminal justice system to use an array of less costly custody options, such as electronic monitoring and house arrest, to meet pre-trial and post-sentencing needs. The federal sentencing guidelines expressly allow substitution of a prison sentence with alternatives to incarceration. The immigration detention system should follow suit and conform to established best practices.

We urge you to support this important amendment, which will eliminate this arbitrary immigration detention quota and save critical taxpayer dollars. Please feel free to contact Royce Murray with any questions.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Adrian Dominican Sisters.
All of Us or None.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Immigration Lawyers Association.
Americans for Immigrant Justice, formerly Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center.
America's Voice.
Arab American Institute.
Congregation of St. Joseph.
Detention Watch Network.
Human Rights First.
Immigration Equality Action Fund.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Justice for Immigrants.
Justice Strategies.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
Lutheran Immigration Refugee Service.
NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
National Center for Transgender Equality.
National Council of La Raza (NCLR).
National Immigrant Justice Center.
National Immigration Forum.
National Immigration Law Center.
Physicians for Human Rights.
Service Employees International Union (SEIU).
Sisters of St. Francis, Sylvania, OH.
Sisters of St. Joseph, TOSF.
Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, O'Fallon, MO.
Sisters, Home Visitors of Mary.
South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT).
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC).
Southern Poverty Law Center.
The Advocates for Human Rights.
The Center for APA Women.
UC Davis Immigration Law Clinic.
Women's Refugee Commission.

STATE ORGANIZATIONS

Advocates for Survivors of Torture and Trauma.
California Immigrant Policy Center.
Florence Immigrant & Refugee Rights Project.
Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights.
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children.
Maria Baldini-Potermin & Associates, PC.
Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition.
New York Immigration Coalition.
Northwest Immigrant Rights Project.
OneAmerica.
Pax Christi Florida.
Political Asylum Immigration Representation Project.
Scott D. Pollock & Associates, P.C.
Sisters of Mercy West Midwest Justice Team.
Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates.
Voces de la Frontera.

LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Capital Area Immigrants' Rights Coalition.
Dominican Sisters of Houston.
Gesu Immigration Study Group.
Good Shepherd Immigration Study Group.
Gospel Justice Committee Sisters of the Most Precious Blood of O'Fallon, MO.
Immigration Taskforce, SWPA Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
Justice and Peace Committee/Sisters of St Joseph/West Hartford, CT.
Justice for Immigrants, District 4 & 5.
Milwaukee New Sanctuary Movement.
PCUN, Oregon's Farmworker Union.
Reformed Church of Highland Park, NJ.
Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester.
University of Miami School of Law Immigration Clinic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I rise in opposition to this amendment, which strikes the legal requirement for 34,000 detention beds.

The simple fact is that sovereign countries control their borders and have an immigration system with integrity that adheres to the rule of law.

This last Friday, I visited the ICE facility in Houston, Texas. I find it interesting the numbers that they explained to me that were going on today in the Houston-Corpus Christi region, which takes in the entire gulf coast of Texas along with what we call the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. They informed me that we are having a massive encroachment into our country from across the border right now of approximately 100 OTMs a day in addition to the Mexicans who are coming across the border. It's interesting that we talk as to the alternatives to incarceration. In the Houston office alone, 64,000-plus are on alternatives to incarceration, which is almost double the number of detention beds for the entire United States in one office. So I think, with this, we get a better picture of what this invasion is all about.

The attacks of 9/11 taught us that immigration enforcement matters. It matters to our security. The Boston Marathon attacks underscored this sobering lesson. Each year, more than 1 million aliens attempt to illegally enter the United States without proper documentation, or they enter legally but overstay and violate their visas.

Though reasonable people can disagree, I believe detention beds are a

critical component in enforcing U.S. immigration laws with the detention and eventual removal of those aliens who enter this country illegally. Therefore, the bill recommends $2.8 billion to fully fund ICE's obligation to maintain no fewer than 34,000 beds.

□ 1510

In contrast, the President's request provided funds sufficient to support 31,800 beds, justifying the request by saying there's no need to support 34,000 detention beds, even though, as I speak today, those in detention are at 38,000 beds. So it looks like we've got overage, not shortage.

The facts, however, refute this completely.

First, as of last Friday, more than 38,000 illegal immigrants are being held in ICE custody, many of whom meet the mandatory detention requirements.

Second, by the administration's own estimate, there's at least 1.9 million removable criminal aliens in the United States.

There is general acknowledgement of an illegal alien population of approximately 11 million. That estimate goes up to as high as 20 million in some quarters.

Clearly, detention beds are necessary. This bed mandate is needed.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Deutch-Foster amendment, and I commend my colleagues for addressing one of the major problems in this bill.

Once again, this bill sets an arbitrary minimum of 34,000 ICE detention beds, whether or not ICE needs them, whether or not the population it is managing on a given day warrants detention.

This detention bed mandate denies ICE the flexibility it needs to manage its enforcement and removal resources in response to changing circumstances. It prevents ICE from making full use of cheaper alternative forms of supervision when it's appropriate.

The specific number of beds is not the main issue here. The problem is attempting to micromanage detention operations from the floor of this House and doing it, by the way, in a way that wastes money and reduces flexibility. I've never understood why we would want to do that, and yet this keeps appearing in the bill produced by our majority colleagues.

Once again, we need to remove this provision, and I commend Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER for focusing attention on this so effectively.

I urge adoption of their amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER's amendment.

I think it is absolutely astonishing. We can have a conversation about different people who are here undocumented and whether or not they ought to be in detention and whether or not they have a criminal record and whether they're a danger to our country, but to say that 34,000 beds have to be filled no matter what is so un-American. It's so un-American to say we're going to build X number of prison cells and then, no matter what the law says, we're going to fill them. We start with the need to fill the cell?

What the Deutch-Foster amendment would do would be to strike that mandate. It doesn't strike the idea that some people are going to be detained. It just strikes the idea that we have to fill what Janet Napolitano, who is the Homeland Security Secretary, just said is arbitrary. These mandated levels effectively mean that ICE, our immigration system, can't make detention decisions based on risk to our country, to our people, the various agency priorities. Its officers have to focus instead on filling daily quotas. And as a result, growing numbers of immigrants are held in detention. In fiscal year 2011 alone, ICE detained 429,000 people.

Let's talk about those people. Some of them are dangerous criminals, but most are not. Over half of the immigrants detained in 2009 and 2010 had zero criminal history. Of those who did, about 20 percent had only traffic violations. Only 11 percent of the detainees with felony convictions had committed violent crimes.

Included among those detained are victims of trafficking, families with small children, elderly individuals, individuals with serious medical and mental health conditions. Many of those detained have U.S. citizen children or spouses and deep ties to their American families and their communities. Many have potential claims for lawful status, but still are detained for months or even years. Some are even survivors of torture seeking asylum in the United States.

In my district, the Heartland Alliance Marjorie Kovler Center works with survivors of torture and emphasizes that placing these individuals in detention can be particularly traumatic, even replicating the feeling of vulnerability that they experienced during their torture.

And the irony is this: detaining large numbers of immigrants who have no criminal convictions, except immigration charges, does not make us safer. It's not necessary to enforce immigration law—we don't need it to enforce the immigration law—and it represents a major waste of taxpayer dollars. Each detainee costs the government around $164 a day to hold. I understand why the prison industry, the private prisons in particular, would love to see $164 and set this goal of detaining all these people every day.

So we should detain people because they pose a threat to our communities, not to meet congressionally mandated quotas. The criminal justice system does use a range of cheaper and effective custody options: electronic monitoring, house arrest. Alternatives to detention cost between 30 cents and $14 per individual per day, far less than our current spending on detention.

We're making real progress toward immigration reform. The Senate is considering language that would allow undocumented immigrants to come out of the shadows and earn the chance to pursue their American Dream.

Let me tell you, as a first-generation American, I find this policy so offensive to me, and my district is one of the most diverse in the country. To say we have to fill prison beds with these people, whether or not they're criminals, whether or not they pose harm to our country, this is not who we are as Americans. These provisions don't make us safer and they don't solve the immigration challenges we face. They are a waste of taxpayer money.

I urge support of the Deutch-Foster amendment in promoting real immigration reform and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I agree strongly with the impassioned plea by my colleague from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and I'm very grateful for this amendment to be brought forward by Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FOSTER.

This really is an outrage. It's an outrage to our values as Americans, and frankly it's an outrage to taxpayers. The cost of holding an immigrant overnight is $120. We have viable and proven alternatives to detention that we should be using for noncriminal aliens.

Again, what we're talking about here are different folks. When we're talking about criminal aliens, I don't think there's any dispute to the extent that we have criminal aliens. At any given time, this can be approximately 40 percent of the people in detention. When I visited the ICE facility in Aurora, they keep them separate, they wear different colored jumpsuits. They're criminal aliens, and they are—however many we have that have been apprehended for a crime—subject to deportation orders. It's perfectly fair to keep them in some form of detention.

But the majority, 60 percent, are noncriminal aliens. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time. It could have been a tail light out. They could have been going 10 miles over the speed limit. Yet, we as taxpayers are removing noncriminal aliens from their homes, from being the breadwinner for their family, from supporting their kids and being an asset to our country

and instead turning them into a liability for taxpayers to the tune of $120 a day. Again, I don't see how this makes fiscal sense at all. We're paying for free rooms, free board, food, medical services. All of these are being provided at taxpayer cost for folks.

□ 1520

How is this a good deal for Americans? It just doesn't make any sense to me when we have at one-tenth the cost alternatives to detention that include call-ins and ankle bracelets. There's a comprehensive program for noncriminal aliens that can do it at a much less expensive cost. And in detention, many of them remain for a period of months. I've even talked to folks, noncriminal aliens, who'd been in limbo for over a year, some approaching 2 years.

So yes, anybody who opposes this amendment is saying U.S. taxpayers should foot the bill for food and board and health care for someone who is here illegally for 2 years. Why do people want to subsidize our illegal population? It's absolutely absurd.

This is a commonsense measure. However many beds we need for criminal aliens, let's have. However many we need for noncriminal aliens in terms of alternatives to detention, let's do. Obviously, what we really need is comprehensive immigration reform to address this issue. There's no way I don't think people on either side of the aisle think that we should pay for 12 million people to be detained at the cost $120 a day. I can't even add that up in my own mind, but I can tell you, it'd be a deficit buster right there.

So let's start here. Let's address our deficit. Let's make sure that we keep families together. Don't take parents away from kids. Don't force taxpayers to buy medical care and lodging and food for people who aren't even here in this country illegally. We can do that right here, right now by passing the Deutch amendment. I call upon my colleagues to join me in doing so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important amendment, the Deutch-Foster amendment. First of all, this is the right thing to do, but to bring the conversation back to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pivot to in almost every policy discussion we have in this body—cutting spending.

In a budget age where many in this body celebrate the draconian and harmful cuts of the sequester, it seems we've come to accept as the norm indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts that in many cases fall on the backs of the most vulnerable among us. Cutting spending in this Congress no longer equates to targeted cuts to inefficient or duplicative government programs to root out waste. Cutting spending in this budget climate is simply about the bottom line. But it doesn't have to be that way.

This amendment is the perfect example of how we can cut spending in a smart and efficient way while defending those most vulnerable. By ending the arbitrary 34,000-bed mandate for immigration detention, we can cut spending and do the right thing.

How's this for a bottom line: alternatives to immigration detention save money. We're spending more than $5 million a day to detain immigrants, 45 percent of which have no criminal record, according to Human Rights Watch. That equates to roughly $164 per day per detainee for detention and roughly $2 billion per year.

On the other hand, alternatives to detention only cost between 30 cents and $14 per day per detainee, and they have proven to be safe and effective. According to Julie Myers Wood, who ran ICE under President Bush, 96 percent of individuals enrolled in alternatives to detention show up for their final hearing and 84 percent comply with removal orders.

So what's stopping us from putting in place these effective, cost-saving policies? Another harmful appropriations policy rider, mandating a daily detention level of 34,000 immigrants. In no other law enforcement context do we impose such a ridiculous quota. You wouldn't tell a county jail or a State prison that you have to keep ''X'' number of prisoners in that facility.

Mandating such a high level of detention makes absolutely no sense. By doing so, ICE is effectively prohibited from making decisions about detention based on enforcement policies, efficiency, and need.

All-too-often in this body, we look for someone else to blame. But in this case, we have no one to blame for this wasteful policy but ourselves. We have the power to change a policy that does nothing but waste the taxpayers' money and cause undue hardship to immigrant families across the country. I urge my colleagues to vote for increased efficiency and compassion, and urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I have listened to the arguments from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I find it interesting. First, those who cross into our country without and contrary to the laws of this great Nation have committed an illegal act. Calling them not illegal doesn't make them not illegal.

I really would like to point out that we have a curious way to discuss this as a policy; that is, no one here stands responsible for the decision. You know, the alternatives to incarceration were created by judges, and the judicial system stands in a little different situation than the Members of Congress. When one of these people who's let out under alternatives to incarceration in fact commits another criminal act—and believe me, it happens—nothing more than just DWI, when you run over a little kid—the judge, who puts him on that particular forum, is held responsible. And he is now going to read his name in the newspaper that he put that person out that should have been in jail, out on an alternative to incarceration. Or if the person commits another criminal act even more severe—murder, rape, robbery—if it happens when the judge puts him out on alternatives, the judge has to take the heat.

But as we have this great policy debate in Congress, no one who is arguing to release all these people on alternatives is taking any heat at all on what the accomplishments in the criminal realm will be of those we release.

I approve of alternatives to incarceration. I just told you that 64,000 people alone in the city of Houston's jurisdiction, which is the valley all of the way up to Beaumont, were out on alternatives. But detention beds are also full and overflowing. When I visited the ICE unit there, the red uniforms were the majority, and the red uniforms are criminal aliens. They have committed crimes in this country.

And so I think we are being a little bit safe to make these arguments as we stand here in these hallowed Halls. Never is our name going to appear in any newspaper when one of these people commits an act that causes damage to our fellow citizens. And yet we make this argument very passionately. I just want to remind everybody that we are responsible for those criminal aliens that we release, and criminal aliens are right now being released. And, in fact, Ms. Napolitano, after I asked her specifically, Are you releasing anyone from detention, she looked me right in the eye and said, No. And 2 days later, she released 2,300. And of those 2,300, the top two categories were both represented in that release—the most serious and the second-most serious categories of crimes we hold people for.

So this is a policy. This administration continues to have a policy of not enforcing the law, and, quite frankly, we need this availability of beds so we can enforce the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, $34,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs and immigration, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $4,872,739,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which not to exceed $7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $3,824,625,000 shall be for screening operations and not to exceed $1,048,114,000 shall be for aviation security direction and enforcement: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available in the preceding proviso for screening operations, $2,972,715,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for Screener Compensation and Benefits; $163,190,000 shall be available for the Screening Partnership Program; $382,354,000 shall be available for explosives detection systems, of which $83,845,000 shall be available for the purchase and installation of these systems; and $103,309,000 shall be for checkpoint support: *Provided further*, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2014 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $2,752,739,000: *Provided further*, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount made available under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2015: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2014, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 46,000 full-time equivalent screeners: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

Provided further, That Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 20, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $4,872,739,000)''.

Page 15, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $7,650)''.

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,824,625,000)''.

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $1,048,114,000)''.

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,972,715,000)''.

Page 16, line 6, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $163,190,000)''.

Page 16, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $382,354,000)''.

Page 16, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $83,845,000)''.

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $103,309,000)''.

Page 16, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,752,739,000)''.

Page 93, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,872,739,000)''.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would completely eliminate funding for the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, and transfer that money to the spending reduction account, saving taxpayers nearly $5 billion.

Congress intended for TSA to be an efficient, cutting-edge, intelligence-based agency responsible for protecting our airports and keeping our passengers safe and secure, but today it has grown into one of the largest bureaucracies in the Federal Government. They've had a 400 percent increase in staff since they were created. A good portion of those are headquarters employees making six-figure incomes, on the average.

What's worse is that the American passengers aren't getting a good return on the more than $60 billion investment that they've spent on TSA. Reports indicate that more than 25,000—repeat, 25,000—security breaches have occurred in U.S. airports since 2001.

Plus, we have evidence today that terrorists on the no-fly list still have been able to board U.S. aircraft—terrorists boarding U.S. aircraft, in spite of TSA.

Furthermore, we've seen report after report on TSA employees displaying a lack of professionalism, being inadequately trained, and even engaging in theft and other illegal activities.

Just about the only thing that the TSA is consistently good at is using its extensive power to violate American travelers' civil liberties. Veterans, the disabled, the elderly, and even small children have been the victims of overly invasive searches by TSA officers. This is all evidence that the TSA has veered dangerously off course.

I've repeatedly asked that we use our resources to focus on intelligence and technologies that could be more effective when it comes to catching terrorists. I've called for the privatization of TSA, and so have many other of my colleagues. But we still have yet to see the necessary changes made to the TSA personnel or to its procedures that will ensure the safety and security of our airports and passengers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to zero out funding for the TSA forces Congress and the Department of Homeland Security to start from scratch on a leaner, more effective, and more focused and more productive system for protecting our U.S. citizens. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is this amendment is unnecessary and harmful to national security, in my opinion.

Now, am I happy with TSA? No. I have criticism of TSA also. Most people who travel have some criticism of TSA. But zeroing out TSA and leaving our airports unsecured is not the solution to the problem.

If the gentleman's argument is that we're being fiscally responsible to do away with the TSA part of this budget, I would argue the contrary. This bill, quite frankly, has made cuts, and, in fact, for 4 years now we have reduced spending in this bill. That's not a good argument.

It's easy to get mad at somebody that interferes with your life every time you travel, especially when you travel every week, but the reality is, this would be a mistake to national security. This would be a mistake to our country.

And even though we have criticism of TSA, our job is to fix TSA, not abolish TSA. And I know there's plenty of folks that think that abolishing it is a good idea, but, quite honestly, it would be a real tragedy to leave our airports undefended. We need to make them better. And I think one of the things we're doing is the oversight that we've provided in this bill so that we can take a hard look at DHS across the board and come up with solutions where things need to be fixed; and, of course, if TSA's on the radar screen, they ought to be fixed.

But I think this is a mistake. I think it's bad policy. I think it's good grandstanding but bad policy, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I join the subcommittee chairman in strong opposition to this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate entirely the TSA aviation security account from this bill, more than $4.8 million.

Now, I oppose this dangerous amendment on numerous grounds, but I'm most appalled by the fact that it includes no language on who, if not TSA, would be securing our Nation's airports and under what authority, what guidelines.

If this amendment were to pass, not only would the public not worry about bringing knives on planes, but terrorists would be able to bring guns and explosives on planes. So surely the sponsor can't be suggesting that as an acceptable outcome of this amendment.

I just have to say, the job of this subcommittee and of this bill is to provide for the defense of our homeland. That's our bottom-line obligation, and this amendment is in direct contradiction to that obligation. So I urge the resounding defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with an amendment that cuts $4 million from the Transportation Security Administration and provides these resources for small and rural airports, airports that have had important passenger screening devices removed as a result of the Federal Aviation Administration Modernization Act.

Passengers in rural airports in my district, including Yampa Valley, Montrose, Gunnison, Durango, they've all been impacted by unnecessary delays and intrusions because of the removal of security screening devices that were sent to larger airports.

In the interest of protecting passenger privacy, the FAA Modernization Reform Act of 2012 required the use of Automated Target Recognition scanners, or ''Gumby scanners,'' at all airports by June 1 of 2012. While the intent of Congress was admirable and protecting the privacy of passengers should be a priority, TSA's interpretation and implementation of the law has caused numerous problems for passengers traveling from small and rural airports throughout the country.

One of TSA's manufacturers who provided equipment for passenger screening could not comply with the changes in the law and provide new equipment. As a result, TSA decided to remove 174 of these noncompliant machines throughout the country. Rather than waiting for funding for new machines or finding alternative ways to be able to fix this problem, TSA made the arbitrary decision of taking compliant scanners from small and rural airports throughout the country and giving them to larger airports that lost their noncompliant scanners.

□ 1540

One alternative could have been the cost-effective private-Federal alternative screening model that was put forth by then-House Transportation Chairman JOHN MICA that would have saved billions of dollars and not compromised security at small and rural airports.

TSA's implication that security checkpoints at small and rural airports are somehow less critical is inaccurate. Once passengers clear screening at small and rural airports, they typically do not receive additional screening for connecting flights at any other potentially larger airports.

The amendment will assist with reducing unnecessary delay for passengers at small and rural airports by providing funding to be able to speed up the replacement of security equipment removed by the TSA. It is important to note that the funds being redirected from TSA toward improving passenger screening at small airports come from its administrative budget and, as such, do not impact passenger security.

There are numerous concerns with transparency and waste in the TSA budget, including a recent agreement by the TSA to purchase $50 million worth of new uniforms that are unnecessary, wasting approximately $212 million each year on the inefficient SPOT program and billions on the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program. I believe that these resources could be better used to more efficiently screen passengers at small airports, strengthen security, prevent delays and unavoidable intrusions.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I share some of these concerns with the gentleman from Colorado, and I believe that outstanding questions still remain over the timeline for replacing the AIT scanners. I expect TSA to sufficiently answer the question posed here today.

I urge TSA to move forward with the replacement of AIT scanners at the affected airports as soon as possible. I commit to the gentleman from Colorado that the committee will look into this issue further and do everything within its power to fix the problem to the extent that it does not cost the American taxpayers more money. It's my understanding that this amendment will not result in the need for additional TSA screeners.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would suggest that for now we accept this amendment and continue to work on the problems that the amendment highlights. My understanding from TSA is that they have prior-year funding available to replace detection machines that were removed due to the FAA Modernization Act. The machines that were removed didn't meet certain privacy standards and were removed at the cost of the contractor. TSA is currently testing new machines that could be used to replace the roughly 250 that were removed from airports across the country. Clearly, of course, this needs to be done.

So I'll be happy to work with the gentleman to press TSA to move at an expeditious pace to replace these with more advanced machines, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $12,500,000) (increased by $12,500,000)''.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support our amendment which strengthens the Federal Flight Deck Officer program, or FFDO. Our amendment increases funding for the FFDO

by $12.5 million, bringing the total authorized for the program to $25 million, with the Congressional Budget Office reporting no budgetary impact.

Since its creation in 2003, this program has provided training to pilots who are willing to step up and volunteer to protect their fellow citizens by defending the airliners that millions of Americans fly on every year. As part of TSA's risk-based approach to aviation security, which I've strongly advocated for on the Homeland Security Committee, the FFDO program plays an integral role in providing an additional layer of security against a hijacking or terrorist attack.

Since its inception, the FFDOs have protected thousands of flights each day and over 100,000 flights a month, at a fraction of the cost to taxpayers compared to the Federal Air Marshal Service. As the first line of deterrence and the last line of defense, it only makes sense that we should continue to provide adequate funding to the FFDO program. While zeroed out in the President's budget, we believe the FFDO program provides a cost-effective solution in protecting passengers aboard our airliners.

I applaud Chairman ROGERS, Subcommittee Chairman CARTER, and the Appropriations Committee for finding ways to prioritize spending so this program did not meet its demise. With that said, $12.5 million represents more than a 50 percent cut from last year's amount. At this level of funding, the FFDO program would be unable to recertify all the pilots currently in the program, maintain its current management structure, or train any additional officers.

We have offered a responsible and fully offset amendment that moves $12.5 million to the FFDO program to ensure that we are using our resources wisely and in a manner that directly benefits America's safety. The House unanimously agreed to a similar amendment offered in the FY 2013 Homeland Security Appropriations bill, and I hope my colleagues will join me this year in providing the support that such a valuable program deserves.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. It's been nearly a decade since, on a bipartisan basis, against bipartisan opposition, we fought and were successful in creating the Federal Flight Deck Officer program. Since that time, over hundreds of thousands of flights have been protected by armed pilots.

There was controversy at the beginning. Could we trust pilots with guns? Well, we trust them with our lives. We trust them with planes that were used as weapons of mass destruction by the terrorists in 2011. Of course, we can trust them with guns. But they need proper training because it's an unusual environment in which to possess and use a weapon—and use a weapon as the last line of defense—should a plane be taken over by terrorists.

We've done other things to provide security like Federal air marshals, armored flight decks. But still, we know that this program is essential, it's inexpensive, and it is something that pilots want to do. There were openings last year for a few additional training spots. Over a thousand people volunteered for those slots. Many, obviously, were not chosen.

If this program were eliminated, as was proposed in the President's budget, or even if it's cut in half—and I appreciate the fact that the committee has labored to find money to restore half the funding—many officers will not be recertified, new officers will not be allowed to join, and we will lose this last critical line of defense and one that is wonderfully random. A terrorist could never, ever know if the pilots on that plane were armed. It's pretty hard to spot the air marshals, but it's even impossible to know what the pilot has behind that locked flight deck door.

So we're recommending an amendment to our colleagues that would take money out of other parts of the bureaucracy of the TSA at no increase in debt or deficit and fully fund this program so that thousands of pilots can continue to participate meaningfully as the last line of defense against a future terrorist attack.

I think this amendment has tremendous common good sense about it. It's very cost effective. And I would hope that my colleagues will join us on a bipartisan basis in supporting it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

□ 1550

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to thank particularly the committee leadership, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PRICE, and the staff. They've done an excellent job in trying to put into appropriations language, and amount of money expended, reforms that are long overdue in TSA.

I'm pleased to join the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), in this bipartisan amendment to restore the $25 million for the Flight Deck Officer program.

I can't, for the life of me, understand why the Obama administration would propose to Congress that we zero out one of the most cost-effective mechanisms we have to ensure the safety and security of the flying public.

Now, this program costs $25 million, and that's out of a $5 billion expenditure for TSA—$25 million. It is probably the most cost-effective layer of security that we have. Just a few dollars underwriting, again, the expense of training these pilots who have asked for the ability to protect their aircraft themselves and their passengers.

We put this in place—everyone was against it. You heard Mr. DEFAZIO tell the story of this. The Senate was against it. The administration was against it. The airlines were against it. We brought it out here in a demo project, and the House overwhelmingly voted to support this program; and it's done it time and time again because it is cost effective and it's a good layer of security.

Now, let me tell you what these pilots do. These pilots go at their own expense. They're not paid per diem. They're not paid for the flight. I went out to visit the program, and I have to admit, whether it was a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, everybody tried to do the program. And so they put the training facility almost on the border of Mexico. I had to take three flights—one to Denver, one to Albuquerque, and another jumper flight—and then drive almost 2 hours to the border to get to this flight facility. That's what these pilots are doing on their own dollar for a weeklong training program that, again, this is the cost of that training program but the expense is borne by the pilot. I saw men, I saw women, I saw pilots for cargo, passenger all going to get this training.

Why would you want to end a program that is so cost effective and gives us this protection?

So, I don't want to belabor this. Mr. HUDSON and Mr. DEFAZIO have stated the case well. Thousands and thousands of flights are protected, and thousands of pilots participate on their own dime.

I urge the passage of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, moments ago, the TSA Administrator announced that he will reverse his earlier decision to allow knives back onto airplanes. Knives will now continue to be a part of the prohibited items list on our aircraft, making our passengers and our crew more safe. This is positive news.

However, the administration's desire to zero out this FFDO program—allowing our trained pilots to be armed on the aircraft—puts us in a position that will put us more at risk, will put passengers and flight crew more at risk. The TSA not allowing knives on planes, that's just one step for passenger and crew safety when we need a comprehensive approach to keep our passengers and crew safe, which would include not allowing knives on planes, which would include risk-based screening, which would include, as my friends from the other side have talked about, increasing funding for intelligence operations to make sure we know who is getting on these airplanes. But it

would also mean keeping the Federal Flight Deck Officer program fully funded.

This is a program I know about because of a personal friend in Livermore, California, who is a Southwest pilot. I have seen firsthand over the last 7 years how serious he has trained to be ready for this program. As my friend and colleague from the other side just mentioned, they fly down to Texas routinely to train down there, and they are very diligent. They do this many times on their own dime. And a lot of skill and effort is put into their training to make sure that if something dangerous were to happen on that aircraft, they would be prepared. It is a task they take seriously, and it's a task we want them to continue to be supported by in the Federal Government.

So, to have comprehensive airline passenger security, we want to restore the Federal dollars for this, put it back at $25 million. And I appreciate that this amendment was offered.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, as chair of the House Transportation Security Subcommittee, I want to raise my concern about a delay in finalizing a rule to improve the security of FAA-approved domestic and foreign repair stations. This rulemaking, mandated by Congress in 2003 and again in 2007, has languished for almost 10 years.

By way of background, TSA signed off on the rule late last year, and DHS completed consideration early this year. The Office of Management and Budget is currently reviewing the rule. I hope that OMB will complete this rulemaking by June 14, 2013, which is the end of the 90-day clock for their consideration.

At this time, I yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I share the gentleman from North Carolina's concern on that. The House Appropriations Committee included report language asking for final action on this rule. It is well past time to finalize this rule, whose delay has impeded manufacturers in growing critical markets for aviation exports.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague.

At this time I would like to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I very much appreciate my fellow North Carolinian raising this issue.

I agree with his assessment that OMB needs to finalize this rule as soon as possible. It's critical to establish this risk-based security regime for these repair stations. So we do hope for a rapid conclusion of this protracted episode, and I appreciate his raising the matter.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It's Mica amendment 8, designated and preprinted.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,810,000)''.

Page 16, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $31,810,000)''.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, first I want to again thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their excellent work, and again his staff. They have gone through some of the expenditures for TSA not only in the dollar amounts, but also in the language that's contained supporting their appropriations measures, some excellent provisions.

Now, I do offer this amendment, which is no greater increase in spending, but does move some money around from TSA administration to support our private screening partnership program. As you heard earlier from one of the speakers, this program is very successful, it's cost effective, and many airports want to avail themselves of it.

TSA has thwarted all the efforts to increase the private screening under Federal supervision, and they came up with a whole host of excuses. Also, they have cooked the books as far as the cost of operating these private screening operations.

□ 1600

Now, you've got to remember that if you look at this bill, it puts a limit of 46,000 screeners, I believe, in the past. We've increased that from 40,000. Mr. ROGERS and I did that some time ago. Actually, if you go online, you'll find 51,000 screeners. We're not sure exactly what the figure is right now. It may be less than that.

There are a total of 66,000 TSA employees. So that leaves approximately 15,000—even at our most conservative estimate—of the number of people in administration.

Right now, there is close to $1.2 billion spent on nonscreener salaries. That's $1.19 billion, to be exact, in this bill. So this moves a small amount of money—$20-some million—over to, again, the private screening account. I think it's justified. I think we're going to need it.

I have several amendments that I'm going to offer in a minute that I would like to expand, again, on the size of the bureaucracy and what TSA is doing to thwart the privatization effort that could bring cost-effective screening to play and do a better job and save taxpayers money.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would provide an additional $32 million for the Screening Partnership Program. I have no objection to the concept of the Screening Partnership Program. If a local airport authority applies to participate in the program and a private company can provide screening in accordance with TSA standards and costs, then so be it.

In fact, this bill increases funding for the SPP by $15.6 million over current-year levels and $10 million above the request in anticipation of the program's vast expansion. But I am unaware of a surge in demand for participation in the SPP that would warrant a 30-percent increase in funding for this program. The offset for the amendment is aviation security direction and enforcement, which the bill already cuts by $20 million below the request.

Now, Mr. Chairman, should additional demand warrant funding for the SPP above what is already provided in this bill, we could work with the TSA to transfer funding to meet that demand. But it simply makes no sense to provide such a significant increase for the SPP when it is almost certain that those additional funds are going to go unused.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my objections to the limits placed on DHS regarding the UASI Grant program. My district is slated to lose $2 million due to the limit of awards to only 25 UASI grantees. While I believe that counterterrorism funding should go to the places

that need it the most, an arbitrary cap, along with a flawed formula, is not helping our Nation's efforts to prepare for, and respond to, natural disasters and potential terrorist attacks. I have voiced these concerns on a number of occasions over the past few months with DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano, and I appreciate her willingness to work with me on this issue.

I want to acknowledge other Members of our Nevada delegation for joining with me today to work on this issue through a proposed amendment, but I have a number of reservations about their approach. I am concerned about reductions in salary accounts for agencies that are charged with keeping our Nation safe and prepared for all types of emergencies. Furthermore, their amendment provides additional funding, but not additional instruction, so there is no guarantee that additional cities, like Las Vegas, will receive any of this increased funding in the amendment.

I am proud to represent Las Vegas, one of the premier vacation and business destinations in the world. Ensuring that my constituents and millions of visitors who we welcome every year stay safe is a top priority of our local government and law enforcement. Without UASI funding to sustain and enhance our regional capabilities, Las Vegas, as well as our portion of the large FEMA Region IX, will be at a significant disadvantage in preparedness, response, and recovery capabilities.

Hundreds of thousands of people gather in large venues in southern Nevada every day. Fifteen of the world's 25 largest hotels are in my district on the Las Vegas Strip with a total of over 62,000 rooms. In 2012, some 37.5 million visitors came to Las Vegas and over 21,000 conventions are held each year. On any given day, tens of thousands of tourists walk along the 4.2 mile Las Vegas Strip, just a few miles from critical Federal assets, including Nellis Air Force Base and Creech Air Force Base, as well as the National Nuclear Security Site and Boulder Dam.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that counterterrorism funding decisions should be made using forward-looking, risk-based metrics. It is critical that DHS update their decision-making matrix to reflect these principles. DHS does not accurately count expected visitors in their decision-making process. It is important to remember that visitors to our city would need the most assistance in the event of a natural disaster or terrorist attack because they are unfamiliar with the area, as well as with local evacuation and safety plans.

In Las Vegas, we welcomed over 40 million travelers to our city this year, an increase of 400,000 over last year. We are also expecting our local population to continue to grow. Yet despite these increases and increases in other components of our risk profile, Las Vegas actually slipped in DHS' risk rankings. This fall in ranking caused the city to fall out of contention for a grant, and it was announced that we will not receive the funding we need. This is not good planning and should be remedied immediately.

I pledge to work with my colleagues from districts with other tourist destinations and with the Secretary to be sure that the formulas are updated and improved and that the funding goes to where it is truly needed.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,334,000)''.

Page 19, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $23,334,000)''.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have this amendment and I have several others. I'm going to combine my remarks on this amendment and one of the other amendments to expedite this process.

I am very pleased that the previous amendment to take money out of administration—TSA administration—which I believe is extremely bloated, and putting it into, again, the private Screening Partnership Program, that successfully passed. With that passing, I had a second amendment to take a similar amount to put those funds into the transportation security support and intelligence account.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have created this multi-billion dollar bureaucracy that has been unable to connect the dots. Here is almost every terrorist incident. We'll put this in the RECORD. TSA failed every single time. They have never connected the dots. We need to be putting the money not into this huge screening bureaucracy that hassles veterans and little old ladies and children—and you've seen it all.

□ 1610

We have created this unbelievable detriment to the American right to fly and to be a free citizen, and it's so difficult to get this darned thing under control, but I'm telling you that the money needs to be going into security.

When Mr. DEFAZIO and I helped create TSA, the purpose was to connect the dots, so I would move money out of administration. They have 4,000 to 5,000 people just within a mile or two of here who are doing nothing, with most of them making, on average, $104,000. Someone told me who just left there that there were four secretaries in his office making over $100,000 apiece. Do the math. We only have 457 airports in the country. That means you've got about 17 people in administration out there and about nine in Washington in administration overseeing this program. It's totally out of control.

So the Mica amendment that I'm going to ask to withdraw in just a second would take money out of administration and put it into connecting the dots in security. I know that's a dumb idea.

Then the other thing is that the staff has done a great job here. There is some good report language, but TSA is thwarting the intent of Congress to allow the honest competition of the private Screening Partnership Program. We never intended to keep this all bureaucratic. Only Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland have a similar screening model as the United States today.

What they've done is they've packed each of the private screening operations with huge bureaucracies left in place. In San Francisco, there are somewhere between 60 and 85 TSA administrators who, most of them, are making in the $100,000 range and don't have a job. How would you like that position? In Kansas City, there are 51 that they left there of private screening. They don't need these positions. They leave them there to jack up the cost to try to make private screening look more costly.

So, while you have language again in this bill—and it's good language—we need to hold TSA accountable to stop cooking the books and to give us honest accounting, and then allow for the natural process of evolution to private screening under Federal supervision—you don't do away with TSA—then finally getting TSA and Homeland Security to concentrate on security and intelligence and on connecting the dots to stop the terrorists before they ever get to the airport or get to screening.

Date	Target	Description	Arrest location	Suspect(s)	Nationality	Status
22-Dec-01	American Airlines 63	A man was put into custody after attempting to detonate a shoe bomb. Conspirators include a British man, Saajid Badat from Gloucester, England and a Tunisian man Nizar Trabelsi, who is in jail in Belgium in a plot to blow up two airliners bound for the United States, using their shoe bombs.	Paris to Miami	Richard Colvin Reid	British Citizen	Serving a life sentence without parole
8-May-02	?	A man was arrested after returning from Pakistan for allegedly attempting to build a dirty bomb. Arrested by U.S. Customs agents at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport on May 8, 2002, and held as a material witness on a warrant issued in the state of New York stemming from the September 11, 2001 attacks.	Chicago, Illinois	José Padilla	U.S. National	Sentenced to 17 years in prison [4]
Sep-02	?	Reportedly are six naturalized American citizens who were friends from childhood in Yemen; were arrested for allegedly providing material support for al-Qaeda and running a terrorist cell in Buffalo, NY.	Buffalo, New York	Lackawanna Six: Mukhtar Al-Bakri, Sahim Alwan, Faysal Galab, Shafal Mosed, Yaseinn Taher, and Yahya Goba.	Yemen	Each sentenced to 10 years of prison or less[6]
13-Mar-03	Brooklyn Bridge	A man was arrested and accused of giving aid to al-Qaeda and attempting to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge.	Columbus, Ohio	Iyman Faris	Kashmir, entered US in 1994, became US citizen in 1999.	Sentenced to 20 years in Prison [8]
Jun-03	?	Eleven members of the Virginia Jihad Network were arrested and accused of training for holy war around the globe. A federal grand jury indicted 11 people on conspiracy, firearms and other charges, six members have pleaded guilty and received prison sentences. Two others were acquitted of all charges. Ali Al-Tamimi sentenced to life imprisonment, others less than 20 years or less.	Northern Virginia	Ali al-Timimi, Ali Asad Chandia, Muhammed Aatique, Hammad Abdur-Raheem, Ibrahim Ahmed Al-Hamdi, Seifullah Chapman, Khwaja Hasan, Masoud Khan, Yong Kwon, Randall Todd Royer and Donald Surratt.	US Nationals	—
Aug-04	New York Stock Exchange, World Bank,International Monetary Fund.	Security in the United States was put on high alert after a plot surfaces to destroy the New York Stock Exchange and other financial institutions in New Jersey and Washington. Dhiren Barot converted to Islam at age 20. Came to the U.S. on a student visa in August 2000. Returned to UK in 2001, arrested by UK authorities in 2004.	United Kingdom	Dhiren Barot	Indian	Sentenced to life in prison, reduced to 30 years in 2007.
28-Aug-04	Herald Square subway system	Two men were arrested after attempting to bomb the New York subway system on the day before the 2004 Republican National Convention. Over a period of several months in 2004 he was recorded by an FBI informer Osama Eldawoody plotting to plant a bomb in the 34th Street Herald Square station of the New York City Subway.	New York, New York	Shahawar Matin Siraj and James Elshafay.	Pakistani and US National	Sentenced to 30 years in prison [14]
Aug-04	Pakistani diplomat	Two leaders of an Albany Mosque, Mohammed M. Hossain and Yassin M. Aref, conspired with a man who claimed to have ties to Islamic terrorists in laundering $50,000 in payments for a Chinese missile that he showed them. In fact, the contact turned out to be an undercover informer for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the RPG-7 missile was a disabled weapon owned by the federal government.	Albany, New York	Yassin Aref and Mohammed Hossain	Banglideshi and Kurdish	Both sentenced to 15 years in prison
Jun-05	?	In June 2005 Hamid Hayat was arrested and charged with providing material support to terrorists, and of lying about it to FBI agents. The prosecution alleged that Hamid Hayat had spent the better part of two years at an al-Qaeda training camp in Pakistan, returning in 2005 with an intent to attack civilian targets in the United States. Umer Hayat was also arrested and charged with two counts of making false statements to the FBI regarding the investigation of his son and of certain members of the Muslim community of Lodi.	Lodi, California	Hamid and Umer Hayat	Pakistani	Hamid was sentenced to 24 years in prison
Aug-05	Los Angeles-area military bases, synagogues and other places.	Indicted on terrorism charges related to conspiracy to attack military facilities in the Los Angeles area and of attempting to fund their campaign by robbing gas stations in Southern California.	Los Angeles, California	Kevin James, Levar Washington, Gregory Patterson, Hammad Samana.	US Nationals and Pakistani	James sentenced to 16 years in prison
Dec-05	Williams Natural Gas (Wyoming), Transcontinental Pipeline, Standard Oil refinery.	A man was arrested on suspicion that he had plans to destroy several sites. Reynolds was formally charged with a firearms offence for possessing a hand grenade, though a sealed statement from the FBI also stated that he intended to blow up multiple pipelines in the United States in a bid to help further terrorist causes.	Pennsylvania	Michael Curtis Reynolds	US National	Sentenced to 30 years in prison
Feb-06	Troops in Iraq, Toledo, Ohio citizens	Three men were arrested for allegedly planning to build bombs for use by terrorists in Iraq and were arrested and charged with conspiracy to provide material support to terrorists in Iraq and engage in violent jihad in their home town, as well as making verbal threats against the President of the United States. The investigation was conducted by the FBI and the Toledo Joint Terrorism Task Force, with the cooperation of an informant called 'The Trainer' who has a U.S. military background in security.	Toledo, Ohio	Mohammad Zaki Amawi, Marwan Othman El-Hindi, and Wassim Mazloum.	U.S. National, Jordanian	Amawi was sentenced to 20 years in prison, the others 13 and 8 years, respectively.
Apr-06	Washington D.C.-area buildings	Two men from the U.S. state of Georgia, were arrested after videotaping Washington-area buildings and sending the tapes to a London based jihadist website. Ahmed and Sadequee were reindicted by a federal grand jury in December, 2008. Both men were again charged with conspiring to provide material support to terrorists, including trying to join Lashkar-e-Taiba in 2005. According to the new indictment, the videos were passed to another convicted British terrorist, Aabid Hussain Khan, on whose computer they were found subsequent to his own arrest.	Toronto, Ontario	Syed Haris Ahmed and Ehsanul Islam Sadequee.	Pakistani	Ahmed sentenced to 13 years in prison, Sadequee sentenced to 17.[26]
Jun-06	Sears Tower and FBI offices	The charges centered around the group's belief that they were being offered money by someone in Yemen to help their mission in Liberty City, provided they supported the al-Qaeda jihad. The FBI agents represented themselves as representatives of al-Qaeda (but who were actually undercover FBI agents), and persuaded Batiste to provide plans for a stated intention to destroy the Sears Tower in Chicago, the FBI field office in Miami, and other targets.	Miami, Florida, Atlanta, Georgia	Narseal Batiste, Patrick Abraham, Stanley Grant Phanor, Rotschild Augustine, Burson Augustin, Naudimar Herrera, Lyglenson Lemorin.	US National	Five of the men were convicted. Batiste was sentenced to 13 years in prison.
Jul-06	Port Authority Trans-Hudson train tunnels.	Living in Lebanon who was charged with plotting a mission to blow up the PATH train tunnels beneath the Hudson River between New Jersey and lower Manhattan, New York City, United States with a team of suicide bombers with backpack explosives. He was arrested by the Lebanese Armed Forces, a division of the Internal Security Forces (ISF), in the Mouseitbeh area of west Beirut on April 27, 2006.	New York, New York	Assem Hammoud	Lebanon	

Date	Target	Description	Arrest location	Suspect(s)	Nationality	Status
7-May-07	Fort Dix	Six men were arrested after attempting an attack on the Fort Dix military base. The men were arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) on May 8, 2007, and were prosecuted in federal court in October 2008. On December 22, 2008, five were found guilty of conspiracy to commit murder in their intentions to kill U.S. military personnel; four received life sentences, while one received 33 years in prison. The remaining member was thought to have had a minor role in the plot and was sentenced to five years in prison for weapons offenses.	Fort Dix, New Jersey	Dritan Duka, Shain Duka, Eljvir Duka, Mohamad Ibrahim Shnewer, Serdar Tatar and Agron Abdullahu.	Duka family ethnic Albanians from Debar, then in Yugoslavia, currently the Republic of Macedonia. The Duka family entered the United States illegally through Mexico in October 1984. Palestinian, Turkish, and Albanian.	Four of the men received life sentences, one man received five years in prison and the other received 33
3-Jun-07	John F. Kennedy International Airport	Four men were arrested in New York after a plot is revealed to bomb the fuel line of JFK airport. Defreitas was arrested in Brooklyn, New York. Kadir and Ibrahim were arrested in Trinidad on June 3, 2007. Nur surrendered to police two days later in Trinidad.	New York, New York	Abdul Kadir, Russell Defreitas, Kareem Ibrahim, Abdel Nur.	Guyana, Trinidad	
20-May-09	New York City Synagogues/U.S. Military Aircraft.	Four men were arrested In April 2009, Cromitie and his three alleged accomplices chose their targets. They allegedly attempted to both bomb the Riverdale Temple and nearby Riverdale Jewish Center in the Bronx, and, using Stinger surface-to-air guided missiles, shoot down military planes flying out of a nearby air base. The men placed fake bombs wired to cell phones in three separate cars outside the Riverdale Temple and nearby Riverdale Jewish Center, both in the Riverdale community of Bronx. New York City Police Department Commissioner Raymond W. Kelly said one of the suspects placed explosives, while the other three suspects served as lookouts As the men were returning to the vehicle, the signal was given for the arrest. An 18-wheel New York City Police Department vehicle blocked the end of the street. The FBI informer also served as the driver of the suspects' vehicle. Another armored vehicle arrived, and officers from the department's Emergency Service Unit smashed the blackened windows of the S.U.V., removed the men from the vehicle, and handcuffed them on the ground. None offered resistance.	New York, New York	James Cromitie, Onta Williams, David Williams, Laguerre Payen.	US Nationals	All serving 25 year sentences
19-Sep-09	New York Subway System	Zazi, a native of Afghanistan who lived in Colorado, was arrested and convicted of plotting to bomb the NYC Subway system. He was trained by al-Qaeda in Pakistan. 5 others were also indicted on related charges. On September 19, 2009, authorities arrested Zazi, and on September 21 they charged him in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado with making false statements in a matter involving international and domestic terrorism.	New York City, NY	Najibullah Zazi, Adis Medunjanin, Zarein Ahmedzay, Mohammed Wali Zazi, Imam Ahmad Wais Afzali and Naqib Jaji.	Afghanistan	
24-Sep-09	Dallas skyscraper	A 19 year old was arrested on charges that he intended to bomb a downtown Dallas skyscraper. The device was a dud provided by FBI agents posing as al-Qaeda members. Smadi activated a timer connected to the decoy with a cell phone, then rode with an undercover agent and waited to watch the explosion. Instead, the phone rang an FBI number, and Smadi was arrested.	Dallas, Texas	Hosam Maher Husein Smadi	Jordanian	On October 20, 2010, sentenced to 24 years imprisonment and will be deported after serving his sentence.
16-Oct-09	Various overseas targets	Colleen LaRose, also known as JihadJane and Fatima LaRose, is an American citizen charged with terrorism-related crimes, including conspiracy to commit murder and providing material support to terrorists. Lars Vilks was a named target in response to drawings of the Prophet Muhammad. LaRose was arrested on Oct. 16, 2009, at Philadelphia International Airport as she returned from London. She allegedly confessed her role in the plot to kill Vilks to FBI agents shortly after her arrest, according to two people close to the investigation.	Philadelphia, PA	Colleen LaRose, Jamie Paulin-Ramirez, Ali Charaf Damache, Abdul Salam al-Jahani.	Americans, Algerian and Libyan	
25-Dec-09	Northwest Airlines Flight 253	'Underwear Bomber': On Christmas Day 2009, Abdulmutallab traveled from Ghana to Amsterdam, where he boarded Northwest Airlines Flight 253 en route to Detroit. He had a Nigerian passport and valid U.S. tourist visa, and purchased his ticket with cash in Ghana on December 16.	Detroit, Michigan	Abdul Farouk Abdulmutallab	Nigerian	
1-May-10	Times Square	A Pakistani American who attempted the May 1, 2010, Times Square car bombing. He was arrested approximately 53 hours after the attempt,[9] at 11:45 p.m. EDT on May 3, 2010, by U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers after he had boarded Emirates Flight 202 to Dubai. On June 21, 2010, in Federal District Court in Manhattan he confessed to 10 counts arising from the bombing attempt.	New York City, NY	Faisal Shahzad	Pakistani	Convicted and sentenced by a federal judge in New York City to life imprisonment without parole
27-Oct-10	Arlington Cemetery (WMATA station)	A Pakistani-born Virginia man was arrested and accused of casing Washington-area subway stations in what he thought was an al-Qaeda plot to bomb and kill commuters.	Arlington, VA	Farooque Ahmed	Pakistani	Sentenced to 23 years in prison after pleading guilty
28-Sep-11	The Pentagon, United States Capitol Building.	Rezwan Ferdaus is a U.S. citizen, born and raised in Massachusetts, of Bangladeshi descent, who was arrested by the FBI on September 28, 2011, for allegedly plotting to attack The Pentagon and United States Capitol with remote-controlled model aircraft packed with explosives. He was also charged with supporting al-Qaeda and plotting attacks on U.S. soldiers abroad, by making IED detonators.	Washington, D.C.	Rezwan Ferdaus	Banglideshi	
7-Jan-12	Tampa, FL, various targets	Sami Osmakac is a man who allegedly plotted an attack, to avenge what he felt were wrongs done to Muslims, in the area around Tampa, Florida. Osmakac, an Albanian from Kosovo and a naturalized US citizen, was arrested January 7, 2012, for the alleged attack plan, which involved bombing nightclubs, detonating a car bomb, using an assault rifle, wearing an explosive belt in a crowded area, and taking hostages.	Tampa, FL	Sami Osmakac	Albania	
17-Feb-12	United States Capitol	A Moroccan man who was arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for allegedly plotting to carry out a suicide bombing on the United States Capitol. El Khalifi thought he was working with al-Qaeda operatives, but was actually in contact with undercover FBI agents. He was sentenced to prison for 30 years in September 2012.	Washington, D.C.	Amine El Khalifi	Morrocan	

10-Aug-12	Wainwright Building	On the morning of August 10, 2012, several St. Louis television and radio outlets received an e-mail from a person who said they were going to bomb the Wainwright State Office Building in downtown St. Louis. The e-mailer was taken into custody by ATF and FBI and is currently charged with attempt to commit mass-murder and attempt to commit a terrorist act.	St. Louis, Missouri	Mark Anthony Grady		
17-Oct-12	New York Federal Reserve	A Bangladeshi man was charged with trying to blow up the Federal Reserve building in New York. While Nafis believed he had the blessing of al-Qaeda and was acting on behalf of the terrorist group, he has no known ties, according to federal officials.	New York City, NY	Quazi Mohammad Rezwanul Ahsan Nafis	Bangladeshi	

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. I will work with the committee, and we will finalize better language to get this done.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, when Congress created the Transportation Security Administration in 2001, we defined ''TSA security screeners'' in law as ''Federal security screeners.'' Their role, as defined by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, is to screen passengers and luggage at airports across the country. However, beginning in 2005, TSA administratively reclassified ''TSA security screeners'' as ''transportation security officers'' and proceeded to upgrade their uniforms to reflect those of Federal law enforcement officers with metal officer badges.

My concern and those of many of my constituents is that, despite their appearance, TSA officers do not have any Federal law enforcement training to reflect their current title and appearance. This can be confusing to the traveling public as they interact with TSA officers at airports and now on the highways, at rail stations, ferry terminals, bus stations, and at other mass transit facilities across the country.

I strongly believe that Congress has an obligation to ensure that the title and appearance of Federal employees properly reflects their training and background. Until we are able to pass a legislative fix to correct TSA's administrative decision, we need to use the power of the purse to ensure that TSA screeners are not abusing the current perception that they are trained Federal law enforcement officers.

I would like to commend Chairman CARTER and committee staff for their due diligence and dedication in working with my office to address this issue. I am pleased that we were able to reduce screener uniforms by $18 million, a 20 percent decrease, so that we can continue to monitor this issue.

I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman CARTER and his staff in moving forward on finding a permanent solution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I share the gentlelady's concern of this implication that these are law enforcement officers. It is something that anyone who has ever dealt with law enforcement officers should be worried about, so I thank her for working with us and for explaining to us her concerns. I don't want anyone to be out there fooling the public, having people think they're trained law enforcement officers when they're not. I think that's an important thing at every level of law enforcement.

Representative BLACKBURN brought this to my attention and to the attention of the committee last year. We appreciate her staying on top of these issues. In fact, I asked the staff to look into this matter earlier this year. As a result, as she has described, this bill cuts the screeners' uniforms by $18 million, which is about a 20 percent decrease. In fact, this bill calls for a net decrease of $387.5 million to TSA, or 8 percent below the FY13 enacted levels.

Finally, the committee has directed TSA to provide a report describing in detail how TSA is complying with the Buy American Act and to provide Congress with the total number of uniforms and screener consumables purchased in fiscal years '12 and '13.

Moving forward, we will continue to work with the gentlewoman from Tennessee to ensure TSA screeners are not abusing the perception that they are officers of the law. We credit her for shedding light on this issue, and I thank her for bringing it to the attention of the committee. I am willing to work with the gentlewoman in any way she chooses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, $108,618,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

TRANSPORTATION THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CREDENTIALING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of screening programs of the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing, $182,617,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support and intelligence pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107–0971; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), $901,666,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, $50,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for headquarters administration until the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailed expenditure plans for air cargo security, checkpoint support, and explosives detection systems refurbishment, procurement, and installations on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2014 and the completion of a security assessment measuring the effectiveness of using the Transportation Worker Identification Credential: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the expenditure plans and report detailed in the preceding proviso.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Air Marshal Service, $821,107,000: *Provided*, That the Director of the Federal Air Marshal Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act a detailed, classified expenditure and staffing plan for ensuring optimal coverage of high-risk flights.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than $700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of $31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding $1,000,000 in total cost on any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–09377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; $6,839,416,000; of which $340,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which $24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed $15,300 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, $167,683,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a revised future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2015 through 2019, as specified under the heading ''Coast Guard Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' of this Act is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, $13,164,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard Reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; $112,991,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $1,222,712,000; of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which the following amounts, to remain available until September 30, 2018 (except as subsequently specified), shall be available as follows: $18,000,000 shall be available for military family housing, of which not more than $6,828,691 shall be derived

from the Coast Guard Housing Fund established pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 687; $860,553,000 shall be available to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; $149,710,000 shall be available to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; $74,930,000 shall be available for other acquisition programs; $5,000,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation, including waterfront facilities at Navy installations used by the Coast Guard; and $114,519,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: *Provided*, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for the production of the seventh National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for post-production costs: *Provided further*, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for long lead time materials, components, and designs for the eighth National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for production costs or post-production costs: *Provided further*, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: *Provided further*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110–0928 shall apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; $9,928,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, $1,460,000,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; $1,534,589,000; of which not to exceed $19,125 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which $2,358,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which $6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2015; and of which not less than $8,000,000 shall be for activities related to training in electronic crimes investigations and forensics: *Provided*, That $18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That $4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of $35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation: *Provided further*, That for purposes of section 503(b) of this Act, $15,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, may be transferred between ''Protection of Persons and Facilities'' and ''Domestic Field Operations''.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, $51,775,000; of which $5,380,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of facilities; and of which $46,395,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, shall be for information integration and technology transformation execution: *Provided*, That the Director of the Secret Service shall submit to

the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for its Information Integration and Technology Transformation program that describes funding for the current fiscal year and the following 3 fiscal years, with associated plans for systems acquisition and technology deployment.

TITLE III

PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary and the Offices of the Assistant Secretaries for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, $50,522,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $1,176,629,000, of which $200,000,000, shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided for the ''Infrastructure Security Compliance'' program, project, and activity, $20,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an expenditure plan for the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program that includes the number of facilities covered by the program, inspectors onboard, inspections pending, and inspections projected to be completed by September 30, 2014.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service.

OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), $232,190,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $113,956,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management program, to include each fiscal year starting with the current fiscal year and the 3 subsequent fiscal years, that provides—

(1) the proposed appropriation for each activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities, performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered, noting any deviations in cost or performance from the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology;

(2) the total estimated cost, projected funding by fiscal year, and projected timeline of completion for all enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget and underway, including and clearly delineating associated efforts and funds requested by other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security and in the Federal Government and detailing any deviations in cost, performance, schedule, or estimated date of completion provided in the prior fiscal years expenditure or investment and management plan for United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology; and

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance, contractor services, and program costs associated with the management of identity services.

Mr. CARTER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 35, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any intervening amendments to that section?

Hearing none, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, $123,425,000; of which $25,072,000 is for salaries and expenses; and of which $79,534,000 is for BioWatch operations: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, $18,819,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for biosurveillance, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, $914,795,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–295; 120 Stat. 1394), and the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 916): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $27,513,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which none is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency administrative costs: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, $22,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For grants contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, $1,500,000,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) Notwithstanding section 503 of this Act, $1,264,826,000 shall be distributed, according to threat, vulnerability, and consequence, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security based on the following authorities:

(A) The State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605): *Provided*, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2014, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(B) Operation Stonegarden.

(C) The Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604).

(D) Organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(E) Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163), including Amtrak security: *Provided*, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(F) Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(G) Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under section 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1182).

(H) The Metropolitan Medical Response System under section 635 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

(I) The Citizen Corps Program.

(J) The Driver's License Security Grants Program in accordance with section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

(K) The Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 579).

(L) Emergency Operations Centers under section 614 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196c).

(M) The Buffer Zone Protection Program Grants.

(N) Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants.

(2) $235,174,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which $157,991,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers:

Provided, That of the amounts provided in paragraph (1) under this heading, $55,000,000 shall be for operation Stonegarden; *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraph (1), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60

days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)), or any other provision of law, a grantee may not use more than 5 percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: *Provided further*, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, lines 7 and 10, after each dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $97,500,000)(increased by $97,500,000)''.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Homeland Security appropriations bill that will provide $97.5 million for the Port Security Grant Program. I offer this amendment in conjunction with my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman also from California.

I represent Port Hueneme, a critical west coast commercial port and home of Naval Base Ventura County. The presence of the naval base makes the port a potential target of those who seek to do our Nation harm. I believe we must do more to protect Port Hueneme and other ports across this great Nation from potential threats.

□ 1620

The Port Security Grant program is a critical component of our strategy to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks.

The vast majority of critical U.S. maritime infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local, and private sector maritime industry partners, which is why this State and local grant program is so critical.

The funds that the program makes available to non-Federal entities are intended to improve port-wide maritime security risk management, enhance awareness, support training and exercises, and support port recovery capabilities.

Grant recipients must use funds to address vulnerabilities in port security and support the prevention of, detection of, response to and recovery from attacks involving improvised explosive devices and other nonconventional weapons.

My amendment simply ensures that the Port Security Grant program will be funded at $97.5 million, which is at the same level as the previous fiscal year.

This program is a critical Homeland Security initiative for Port Hueneme in Ventura County and ports across our great country.

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for this amendment that I'm cosponsoring with my good friend from California, Congresswoman BROWNLEY.

This straightforward and simple amendment will keep the Port Security Grant program funded at last year's levels and ensure it's protected from further cuts.

U.S. ports remain one of our country's most important economic engines as they link our Nation to the rest of the world and the global economy. Each day, our ports move both imports and exports totaling some $3.8 billion worth of goods through all 50 of our States. And according to the American Association of Port Authorities, the U.S. port industry supports 13.3 million jobs and accounts for more than $649 billion in personal income.

That's why I cofounded the bipartisan congressional PORTS Caucus with my good friend TED POE from Texas in order to ensure that Congress recognizes the vital role ports play in our national economy and the importance of keeping them competitive and, most importantly, secure.

Despite their growing importance, ports have failed to garner the attention and the resources that they deserve.

During my very first Homeland Security hearing, I asked Lee Hamilton, vice chairman of the 9/11 Commission, ''What should Congress be doing to improve security at our Nation's ports?'' He responded by saying, ''My judgment would be that we have not focused enough on our ports.''

For instance, despite a peak funding level of $400 million as recently as 2009, Congress has decreased funding for the Port Security Grant program nearly every year since. This is despite the fact that ports remain extremely vulnerable to attacks.

According to the Congressional Research Service, a 10-kiloton to 20-kiloton weapon detonated in a major seaport would kill 50,000 to 1 million people and would result in direct property damage of $50- to $500 billion and indirect costs of $300 billion to $1.2 trillion due to trade disruption. And while an attack of this magnitude may seem unlikely to many Americans, experts agree that a major attack at one of our Nation's ports is more likely than ever before.

Just last week in a discussion regarding the likelihood of a nuclear attack at a major seaport, former DHS Under Secretary Jay Cohen stated that it's not a question of if it's going to happen, ''but rather a question of where, when, and to what magnitude.''

As someone who can see the Port of Los Angeles from my backyard, this statement provides a sobering reminder that we must be doing anything and everything we can to guard against this threat.

The port complex of LA/Long Beach is responsible for approximately 44 percent of all the trade that comes into this country. If an attack were to ever occur there, it would be economically debilitating not only for my district, but for the entire country, as well.

This amendment will ensure the Port Security Grant program maintains last year's funding and will protect the program from any further budget cuts.

By appropriately funding this program, we'll allow our port operators to continue to increase our capability to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from chemical, biological, nuclear, and other nonconventional attacks.

And while ideally I would like to see this program returned to its previous authorized level of $400 million, ensuring this critical program is protected against further cuts is one of utmost importance at this time.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, while I have concerns with carving out funding amounts for specific grants, I will accept the amendment.

I was born and raised in Houston, Texas. I had something happen to me many years ago as a young lawyer in a hearing at the Port of Houston. Back in 1968, I was told by the Coast Guard that every day two ships pass each other in the Port of Houston, and should those ships collide, just the mixing of those two cargos would explode and kill every man, woman, and child on the Texas gulf coast all the way to Corpus Christi. That's without a nuclear weapon.

We are the largest petrochemical port in the United States. I too am concerned about our ports. I'm very concerned that they could be a target of attack that could cause great damage both in structures and in human life.

So I join my colleagues from California to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I too rise in support of the amendment, which would simply require a funding floor for the Port Security Grant program at the current level.

I very much appreciate the gentlewoman's intent with this amendment. Our seaports are critically important to our Nation's economy, and, therefore, have been a primary focus of our security and preparedness efforts.

Because our bill does not currently allocate State and local program funding among the major Homeland Security Grant programs, I do have concerns with carving out funding for one specific program. But the funding level which our colleague has proposed is equal to the amount allocated to ports in 2013 and that we anticipate would be available in 2014.

Therefore, I support the gentlewoman's amendment, urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $97,500,000) (increased by $97,500,000)''.

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

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, if we learned anything about the Boston Marathon bombings, it is that real threats exist against our homeland from outside actors motivated by outside forces with great access now from readily accessible materials that they can get on the Internet, and they can become radicalized also on the Internet and can target us here at home with IED devices.

I rise in support of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, which would require that at least $97.5 million of the $1.5 billion provided to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for State and local government Homeland Security grants would be used for mass transit security programs.

These programs are listed on (1)(E) on page 38 of the bill. The main FEMA and Department of Homeland Security mass transit security effort is their Transit Security Grant Program.

I want to start by thanking Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for the increase in funding for the account that funds local grant programs for security and terrorism readiness.

□ 1630

I organized a letter, signed by 39 other Members of Congress, asking for funding that is sufficiently robust for TSGP, the Transit Security Grant Program, to be able to meet our needs for mass transit security. Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE listened to our request, and more money will be available for this critical security program.

While the FEMA State and local grant account funds a variety of homeland security initiatives, my amendment addresses the critical, if often overlooked, element of mass transit security. Mass transit, which mostly includes bus and rail, is used by millions of Americans every year. In fact, according to the American Public Transportation Association, there are over 10.5 billion passenger trips in 2012 alone. That amounts to over 28 million trips per day.

We're fortunate in the East Bay of California, which I am privileged to represent, to have an excellent bus system and the world-famous Bay Area Rapid Transit system, also known as BART. There were over 400,000 BART passenger trips just this past April.

Unfortunately, some of what makes mass transit so great, that it is easily accessible and carries so many people quickly through critical urban centers, makes it vulnerable to terrorist attacks. In June 2009, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, summarized the issues facing mass transit, writing the following:

According to the Transportation Security Administration transit officials and transit experts, certain characteristics of mass transit systems, such as multiple access points and limited barriers to access, make them inherently vulnerable to terrorist attack and therefore difficult to secure. High ridership, expensive infrastructure, economic importance, and location in large metropolitan areas or tourist destinations also make them attractive targets for terrorists because of the potential for mass casualties and economic damage.

Just 2 months ago in April, a plot to target trains in Canada was thankfully disrupted before anybody was hurt. And, of course, everyone remembers the horrible London attacks from 2005, and the Madrid transit attacks in 2004.

No American, in any part of our country on any of our mass transit systems, should live in fear of a mass transit attack. And damaging mass transit in our key urban centers wouldn't only harm that particular area but could ripple through our Nation's economy. Transit security means economic security. Everyone has an interest in protecting our public transit systems, and that's where TSGP comes in.

Through TSGP, local mass transit systems receive grants to protect and minimize damage from terrorist events. Example of uses include surveillance training, public awareness campaigns, detection equipment, security cameras, and the hardening of infrastructure.

The continuing resolution for fiscal year 2013 provided a floor of $97.5 million for mass transit security, before sequestration, of which $10 million was reserved for Amtrak. My amendment would use that same number. And since the bill before us is based on sequestration levels already, that would amount to an increase in the floor for fiscal year 2014 over fiscal year 2013.

To provide such broad discretion for the Department of Homeland Security is important. However, I also understand the argument that the Homeland Security Secretary should be able to distribute money based on risk and potential harm. I know some Members may feel we shouldn't set minimum amounts to be spent out of this account.

To provide such discretion is important, but it ignores our constitutional responsibility to provide clear direction on how the money is spent. And, it risks certain priorities being ignored. Moreover, the Transit Security Grant Program is a competitive grant program, and so within that framework money would only be distributed based on risk and damage potential.

Last Congress, minimums were included for this account when a compromise was developed with the Senate, including for transit security. I hope the same thing will happen again. My amendment gives this House an opportunity to state now on the record that we value mass transit security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I'm willing to accept this amendment. Once again, I have the same concerns as my colleague, Mr. PRICE, about the carving out of funding amounts for specific grants, but I will accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would simply require a funding floor for public transportation security assistance and railroad security assistance at the current level. I appreciate the gentleman's intent with this amendment. Public transportation infrastructure is absolutely critical to the functioning of our economy, and, therefore, is and must be a primary focus of our security and preparedness efforts.

The same reservation applies to this amendment as to the previous amendment. We do not currently allocate State and local program funding among the major homeland security programs. So we have some concerns with carving out funding for specific programs, but the funding level proposed here is equal to the amount allocated to transit in 2013 and that we anticipate would be available in 2014. Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), $675,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and $337,500,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. HECK of Nevada.

Amendment by Mr. GARCIA of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 257, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—167

Bass	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Beatty	DeGette	Honda
Becerra	Delaney	Horsford
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Huffman
Blumenauer	Deutch	Israel
Bonamici	Dingell	Jeffries
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kaptur
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Keating
Butterfield	Ellison	Kennedy
Capps	Engel	Kildee
Capuano	Eshoo	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Esty	Kind
Carney	Farr	Kuster
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Langevin
Cartwright	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Chu	Gallego	Levin
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lewis
Clay	Grayson	Lipinski
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Loebsack
Cohen	Grijalva	Lofgren
Connolly	Gutierrez	Lowenthal
Conyers	Hahn	Lowey
Courtney	Hanabusa	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Cummings	Heck (WA)	Lynch
Davis (CA)	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Davis, Danny	Himes	Matsui
		McCollum
		McDermott
		McGovern
		McNerney
		Meeks
		Meng
		Michaud
		Miller, George
		Moore
		Moran
		Nadler
		Napolitano
		Neal
		Negrete McLeod
		Nolan
		O'Rourke
		Pallone
		Pascrell
		Pastor (AZ)
		Pelosi
		Peters (MI)
		Peterson
		Pingree (ME)
		Pocan
		Polis
		Price (NC)
		Quigley
		Rangel
		Richmond
		Roybal-Allard
		Ruiz
		Ruppersberger
		Rush
		Ryan (OH)
		Sánchez, Linda T.
		Sanchez, Loretta
		Sarbanes
		Schakowsky
		Schiff
		Schneider
		Schwartz
		Scott (VA)
		Scott, David
		Serrano
		Sewell (AL)
		Sherman
		Sires
		Slaughter
		Smith (WA)
		Speier
		Swalwell (CA)
		Takano
		Thompson (CA)
		Thompson (MS)
		Tierney
		Titus
		Tonko
		Van Hollen
		Vargas
		Veasey
		Vela
		Velázquez
		Visclosky
		Walz
		Wasserman Schultz
		Waters
		Watt
		Waxman
		Welch
		Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOES—257

Aderholt	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)
Alexander	Fortenberry	McCaul
Amash	Foxx	McClintock
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen	McIntyre
Bachus	Fudge	McKeon
Barber	Garcia	McKinley
Barletta	Gardner	McMorris Rodgers
Barr	Garrett	Meadows
Barrow (GA)	Gerlach	Meehan
Barton	Gibbs	Messer
Benishek	Gibson	Mica
Bentivolio	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)
Bera (CA)	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	Mullin
Black	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Blackburn	Granger	Murphy (FL)
Bonner	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Boustany	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Bridenstine	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Brooks (AL)	Grimm	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Broun (GA)	Hall	Olson
Buchanan	Hanna	Owens
Bucshon	Harper	Palazzo
Burgess	Harris	Paulsen
Bustos	Hartzler	Payne
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Camp	Heck (NV)	Perlmutter
Cantor	Hensarling	Perry
Capito	Herrera Beutler	Peters (CA)
Carter	Holding	Petri
Cassidy	Hudson	Pitts
Chabot	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Clarke	Hultgren	Posey
Cleaver	Hunter	Price (GA)
Coble	Hurt	Radel
Coffman	Issa	Rahall
Cole	Jenkins	Reed
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Conaway	Jones	Ribble
Cook	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Cooper	Joyce	Rigell
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Roby
Cotton	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Cramer	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kirkpatrick	Rokita
Daines	Kline	Rooney
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Denham	LaMalfa	Roskam
Dent	Lamborn	Ross
DeSantis	Lance	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Lankford	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Runyan
Duffy	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sanford
Ellmers	Lucas	Scalise
Enyart	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Farenthold	Lummis	Schrader
Fincher	Maffei	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Massie	Sessions
Flores	Matheson	Shea-Porter
		Shimkus
		Shuster
		Simpson
		Sinema
		Smith (NE)
		Smith (NJ)
		Smith (TX)
		Southerland
		Stewart
		Stivers
		Stockman
		Stutzman
		Terry
		Thompson (PA)
		Thornberry
		Tiberi
		Tipton
		Tsongas
		Turner
		Upton
		Valadao
		Wagner
		Walberg
		Walden
		Walorski
		Weber (TX)
		Webster (FL)
		Wenstrup
		Westmoreland
		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Jackson Lee	McCarthy (NY)
Campbell	Maloney, Carolyn	Pittenger
Green, Al	Markey	
Holt		

□ 1703

Messrs. POE of Texas, SANFORD, CUELLAR, PAYNE, ROONEY, MAFFEI and Ms. FUDGE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RANGEL, HINOJOSA, CONNOLLY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 245, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—180

Andrews	Connolly	Gallego
Bachmann	Conyers	Garamendi
Bass	Costa	Garcia
Beatty	Courtney	Grayson
Becerra	Crowley	Grijalva
Bera (CA)	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bonamici	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Higgins
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Himes
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Hinojosa
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Honda
Butterfield	Dingell	Hoyer
Capps	Doggett	Huffman
Capuano	Doyle	Israel
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Jeffries
Carney	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Engel	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Enyart	Keating
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Chu	Esty	Kennedy
Cicilline	Farr	Kildee
Clarke	Fattah	Kilmer
Clay	Foster	Kind
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Clyburn	Fudge	Kuster
Cohen	Gabbard	Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—245

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1711

Messrs. ELLISON and SEAN MALONEY of New York changed their votes from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—156

Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cuellar
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Gosar
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Horsford
Hunter
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kline
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Petri
Polis
Pompeo
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Veasey
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—268

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Davis, Rodney
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1716

Messrs. CARNEY and CUMMINGS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 196 I was unavoidably detained during this five minute vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Coffman
Green, Al
Grijalva
Holt
Honda
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

□ 1721

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Julie A. Allen, Director of Elections and Information Technology, Missouri Secretary of State's Office, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 4, 2013, the Honorable Jason Smith was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Missouri.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

JUNE 5, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, June 4, 2013, for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District in Missouri, show that Jason Smith received 42,145 or 67.1 percent of the total number of votes cast for that office.

To the best of our knowledge, this election will not be subject to a recount as provided in §115.601, RSMo.

According to Missouri statutes, the counties have two weeks to return their certified

election returns to the Secretary of State's office. The deadline for the Secretary of State's certification is two weeks from the receipt of the last county's returns. In compliance with this schedule, we anticipate to certify the election on or before the first week of July.

Sincerely,

JULIE A. ALLEN,
Director of Elections & Information Technology.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JASON T. SMITH, OF MISSOURI, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable JASON T. SMITH, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect SMITH and the members of the Missouri delegation please present themselves in the well of the House.

All Members will rise and Representative-elect SMITH will please raise his right hand.

Mr. JASON T. SMITH appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JASON T. SMITH TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as the co-dean of Missouri's U.S. House delegation, I want to congratulate and extend a warm welcome to my newest colleague, Congressman JASON SMITH.

Mr. SMITH is an attorney, a fourth-generation farmer from southeast Missouri, and he has distinguished himself as one of the youngest speaker pro tems in the history of the Missouri House. He follows in the footsteps of my dear friend, former Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson, who represented Missouri's Eighth Congressional District for 17 years, and I know Mr. SMITH will continue her legacy of public service.

Now I am pleased to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to also welcome Mr. SMITH to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lacy said that he is a fourth-generation farmer, but he is actually a seventh-generation Missourian, and he has been living on the same farm that his great-grandfather once lived on. He graduated from my alma mater, the University of Missouri, and he has been involved in agriculture and practicing law. As a farmer, I don't think we can ever have enough farmers in this body.

Mr. Speaker, Missouri is known as the ''Show-Me'' State, and last night, JASON SMITH won a special election with over 67 percent of the vote, and I think that shows that he is truly the Representative of the Eighth District of the State of Missouri.

So it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield to the gentleman from the Eighth District of Missouri, JASON SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you very much.

First, I would like to thank Congressman CLAY and also Congressman GRAVES for their kind remarks and also the Missouri delegation. Thanks for being here, and it's great to have that support right behind you.

Less than 18 hours ago, I was standing before friends and family in my small town of Salem, Missouri, and had just gotten elected. We hit the ground running and wanted to make sure that we didn't waste any time to get up here.

All I can say is that I truly look forward to working with every Member of this body. There are 435 of us. My goal is to get to know each and every one of you and help move the country forward one step at a time. I know that we're not going to agree on everything, but do you know what? We need to find those places that we do agree on the issues and then come together and work for the better. I think that we can do that, and I look forward to working with the entire Chamber.

It is truly an honor and a pleasure to represent the fine folks from southeast and south central Missouri, following in the good footsteps of my friend Jo Ann Emerson and also the late Bill Emerson. Thank you all very much, and I look forward to working with you.

□ 1730

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Missouri, the whole number of the House is now 435.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2217.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly assume the chair.

□ 1731

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 41, line 2.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 232, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—190

Amash	Costa	Hahn
Andrews	Courtney	Hanabusa
Bachus	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Bass	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Himes
Bera (CA)	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Horsford
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bonamici	DelBene	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Israel
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Jeffries
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Bustos	Duckworth	Kaptur
Butterfield	Edwards	Keating
Capps	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Capuano	Enyart	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Kildee
Carney	Esty	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Farr	Kind
Cartwright	Fattah	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Foster	Langevin
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Chu	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Clarke	Gallego	Levin
Clay	Garcia	Lewis
Cleaver	Gibson	Loebsack
Clyburn	Grayson	Lofgren
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Conyers	Grijalva	Lowey
Cooper	Gutierrez	

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Engel
Green, Al
Holt
Jackson Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Pittenger
Stutzman
Watt

□ 1736

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I was attending the funeral of our late Senate colleague Frank Lautenberg earlier today in New York City. I missed several rollcall votes on amendments to this bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the Moore amendment (rollcall No. 194), "yes" on the Polis amendment (rollcall No. 195), "yes" on the Heck amendment (rollcall No. 196), "yes" on the Garcia amendment (rollcall No. 197), and "yes" on the Deutch amendment (rollcall No. 198).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the following votes. I ask for unanimous consent to have the following inserted into the RECORD:

1. Moore Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

2. Polis/Chu/Cárdenas Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

3. Heck/Horsford Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

4. Garcia Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

5. Deutch/Foster Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

□ 1740

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. A few days ago, a new report by the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General made recommendations that could save taxpayers $126 million and improve border security.

The Department of Homeland Security uses 62 H–60 helicopters, operated by the Coast Guard and the Customs and Border Protection agencies, for mission support, primarily for law enforcement and search and rescue missions. These aircraft are being converted to add 15 years of additional operational life.

The report found that while the Coast Guard properly managed its conversion program, a similar conversion program at Customs and Border Protection led to significant cost overruns and delays that could ground as many as nine of the helicopters beginning in 2014. The IG made what I think is a very good recommendation—have the Coast Guard Aviation Logistics Center conduct the remaining Customs and Border Protection H–60 conversions. According to the IG, the Coast Guard could convert the remaining helicopters much faster and at a lower price tag than CBP. This could save the Department of Homeland Security about $126 million and speed up the time that the aircraft would be operational and patrolling our borders by 7 years.

I was disappointed to hear that rather than implementing this commonsense taxpayer-dollar-saving recommendation in this time of scarce resources, the Department of Homeland Security is choosing instead to conduct a cost-benefit analysis. I think this delay is unnecessary. At a time when the Department of Homeland Security law enforcement personnel are facing furloughs, this is a missed opportunity to save precious funds and to meet the critical goal of improving our border security.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. DENT. I appreciate the gentlelady bringing the IG report to our attention. As Ranking Member PRICE can attest, the committee has a long, bipartisan history supporting robust funding for the H–60 conversions. In fact, the bill includes funds sufficient to completely recap two H–60 helicopters. Though I am aware CBP has some reservations about conclusions in the IG report, I am a proponent of not paying top dollar when it is not necessary. Consequently, I would like to have an opportunity to dig into these claims before drawing any particular conclusions.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I would like to express my agreement with what Mr. DENT just said. These aircraft are absolutely vital for mission success for Border Patrol agents and air and marine personnel. If there are better, faster, cheaper ways to make these conversions, we need to know about them.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I yield to our chairman.

Mr. DENT. Again, I thank the gentlelady for raising this issue. Clearly she has some personal experience flying these aircraft, and I'm grateful for her service.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for your attention to this matter, and I hope that we can work together to ensure that management of this program is improved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Chair, let me first begin by thanking the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their leadership on this committee. I've watched you over the years, and the two of you work together so well, and I thank you so very much.

Over the years, I have led an effort here in the House to recognize a group of Americans who served our country during World War II. We refer to them as the merchant marines. They have not been properly recognized for their service, and I'm very sad about that. We are quickly running out of time to recognize the few remaining Americans that stood up for our country by serving as merchant marines when our country needed them the most during World War II.

Without weapons or formal training, many risked their lives; and, tragically, too many gave their lives in defense of our great Nation during the Second World War. For those who are still living, we must not let their efforts go unrecognized while we still have a chance.

The recent passing of Senator Lautenberg earlier this week, the last remaining World War II veteran in the Senate, is a strong reminder that our time is running out to recognize those who are lesser known but still contributed significantly to the World War II effort. Few have given more to this country than Senator Lautenberg, and I pray that his family has peace in the weeks and months to come. He will be missed.

Because I believe that it is only fair to recognize merchant marines who served during this war, I reintroduced H.R. 1288, the WW II Merchant Mariner Service Act. To date, I have been joined by 81 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in support of this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation that costs nearly nothing.

This bill would award veteran status and limited benefits to a segment of the World War II merchant marines that has gone unrecognized. These men and women operated tug boats and barges in the territorial seas of the United States transporting raw materials, weapons, and troops that sustained the war effort. Though most of these individuals operated domestically, their duties were not without risk.

A tugboat, the Menominee, was sunk by a German U-boat on March 31, 1942, about 9 miles off the coast of Virginia, causing the death of 16 of the 18 mariners that served aboard.

I acknowledge that a point of order would be raised if I were to offer this legislation as an amendment today. However, the legislation before us does address funding that is utilized in the support of our Coast Guard and merchant marines, and I could not forgo the opportunity to address the dire need to rightly recognize the efforts of these individuals before it's too late.

I thank you and my colleagues for allowing me time to speak on this very important issue. I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1288 and in passing the legislation so these remaining Americans can gain the recognition they deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chair, I rise to bring attention to an issue of critical importance regarding our national security. Our cyber and information warfare doctrines do not pay enough attention to the likelihood that adversaries seeking to cripple United States critical infrastructure could quickly turn to an EMP, electromagnetic pulse, attack.

This Nation's electrical grid is incredibly vulnerable and could be crippled by such an attack. The resulting blackout and EMP damage would quickly move beyond the electric grid. Other systems could collapse, leading to a failure of other critical infrastructures, such as communications, transportation, banking and finance, as well as the transportation of food and water. As I have traveled around my district, I have heard from several constituents and experts that see this threat as ever-present.

While technology has made society more efficient, it has also made us more vulnerable by permeating nearly every aspect of our culture that sustains modern civilization and the lives of millions.

The assessment that the U.S. is vulnerable to an EMP attack is based on the work of the Congressional EMP Commission that analyzed this threat for nearly a decade from 2001 to 2008. The Congressional Strategic Posture Commission and several other U.S. Government studies arrived at similar conclusions and collectively represent a scientific and strategic consensus that nuclear EMP attacks upon the United States are a very real threat.

I applaud Chairman ROGERS and the Appropriations Committee for finding ways to prioritize spending so that the National Protection and Programs Directorate, along with similar programs, are able to continue their necessary work. I hope they will continue to engage with academic institutions and private organizations to find better, more cost-effective solutions to protecting this Nation's critical infrastructure and our way of life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I rise to express my support for the Urban Area Security Initiative Nonprofit Security Grant Program. The Nonprofit Security Grant Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, provides critical support to nonprofit organizations at high risk of terrorist attack.

This is not a theoretical threat. This is a real threat.

For example, a string of anti-Semitic hate crimes took place just 2 years ago targeting synagogues in Bergen County, New Jersey, which I represent. These heinous acts culminated in arson when a fire bomb was thrown through the window of an Orthodox Jewish temple, the residence of a rabbi, his wife, his five children, and his father. Thankfully, the rabbi and his family escaped serious injury in this attack, and local authorities have arrested the suspects and are in the process of bringing them to justice.

□ 1750

Other events across the country have shown the continuing need for these grants as well. Last year, a gunman killed six and wounded four in a mass shooting at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin.

A security guard was tragically killed several years ago at the Holocaust Museum here in Washington by a Holocaust denier and White supremacist. Crimes are not being investigated by White supremacists in this country, just as an aside thought.

These are just a handful of the examples showing the vulnerability of nonprofit organizations to attack.

The Nonprofit Security Grant Program was designed precisely to allow at-risk, nonprofit organizations such as houses of worship and community centers to protect themselves from these types of tragedies by acquiring and installing equipment to ensure against potential attacks. These capital improvements include upgrading security measures, such as installing alarms, barriers, cameras, or controlled entry systems.

In fiscal year 2011, the year during which these terrible events took place in Bergen County, the Nonprofit Security Grant Program was allocated $19 million. For the past 2 years this amount has been reduced by nearly half, to $10 million, despite the ongoing need for this assistance.

If we can't protect our houses of worship, what can we protect?

The program is funded out of the Department of Homeland Security's State and Local Programs account, and allows the Secretary discretion to allocate this funding as she sees fit, or he sees fit, who's ever there.

I call upon the Secretary to allocate at least $15 million to the Nonprofit

Security Grant Program as a step towards restoring adequate funding to this vital program. Although I hope that we can bring this funding back to the 2011 level and beyond, $15 million should be the baseline level of funding these vital programs.

I also believe that the Nonprofit Security Grant Program should receive its own dedicated funding, rather than competing with other important initiatives for a small share of the Department's State and Local Programs' dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nonprofit Security Grant Program in order to ensure that these nonprofit organizations, which serve as the heart of our communities, receive the protection they need.

Madam Chair, let me just add one other thing, and that is, it reduces a tremendous amount of anxiety at these houses of worship—and I mentioned a few religions here just now, but I can cite others—reduces the anxiety of being safe even where you sleep or even where you worship.

Now, we had the right idea. This was a bipartisan idea in 2010, 2011, and before that. Why can't we do the right thing?

It's not that much money. It will help a lot of institutions to protect themselves, especially when you put in a camera or the other things that I mentioned. It makes people feel a lot more relaxed and it reduces anxiety.

I hope that we can do this. I know, Madam Chair, and I'm sorry if I'm appealing to you directly, which I am. Madam Chair, you understand this program very, very well. I would solicit your support for this. And I think it's very important because it's going to stop terrorism in this form.

I mean, this gentleman was sleeping with his family, the rabbi, and the bomb came in through the window. It was thrown up to the second floor and exploded. I mean, can you imagine the trauma for those children?

I apologize for directing my attention to you because you know about these things, and I'm asking you to be helpful to me.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For emergency management performance grants, as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $350,000,000.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2014, as authorized in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5196e), shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: *Provided*, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: *Provided further*, That fees received under this heading shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2014, and remain available until September 30, 2016.

UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the United States Fire Administration and for other purposes, as authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), $42,162,000.

DISASTER RELIEF FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $6,220,908,000, to remain available until expended, of which $24,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit an expenditure plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the use of the funds made available in this or any other Act for disaster readiness and support not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall submit to such Committees a quarterly report detailing obligations against the expenditure plan and a justification for any changes from the initial plan: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall submit to such Committees the following reports, including a specific description of the methodology and the source data used in developing such reports:

(1) An estimate of the following amounts shall be submitted for the budget year at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code:

(A) The unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the prior fiscal year to the budget year.

(B) The unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the budget year to the budget year plus 1.

(C) The amount of obligations for non-catastrophic events for the budget year.

(D) The amount of obligations for the budget year for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State.

(E) The total amount that has been previously obligated or will be required for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State for all prior years, the current year, the budget year, the budget year plus 1, the budget year plus 2, and the budget year plus 3 and beyond.

(F) The amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered for the budget year.

(G) The amount that will be required for obligations for emergencies, as described in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), major disasters, as described in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), fire management assistance grants, as described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187), surge activities, and disaster readiness and support activities.

(H) The amount required for activities not covered under section 251(b)(2)(D)(iii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) An estimate or actual amounts, if available, of the following for the current fiscal year shall be submitted not later than the fifth day of each month, and shall be published by the Administrator on the Agency's website not later than the eleventh day of each month:

(A) A summary of the amount of appropriations made available by source, the transfers executed, the previously allocated funds recovered, and the commitments, allocations, and obligations made.

(B) A table of disaster relief activity delineated by month, including—

(i) the beginning and ending balances;

(ii) the total obligations to include amounts obligated for fire assistance, emergencies, surge, and disaster support activities;

(iii) the obligations for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State; and

(iv) the amount of previously obligated funds that are recovered.

(C) A summary of allocations, obligations, and expenditures for catastrophic events delineated by event.

(D) In addition, for a disaster declaration related to Hurricane Sandy, the cost of the following categories of spending: public assistance, individual assistance, mitigation, administrative, operations, and any other relevant category (including emergency measures and disaster resources).

(E) The date on which funds appropriated will be exhausted.

Provided further, That the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website not later than 24 hours after an award of a public assistance grant under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) the specifics of the grant award: *Provided further*, That for any mission assignment or mission assignment task order to another Federal department or agency regarding a major disaster, not later than 24 hours after the issuance of the mission assignment or task order, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the following: the name of the impacted State and the disaster declaration for such State, the assigned agency, the assistance requested, a description of the disaster, the total cost estimate, and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the last day of each month until the mission assignment or task order is completed and closed out, the Administrator shall update any changes to the total cost estimate and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $5,626,386,000 is for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the amount in the preceding proviso is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, including administrative costs, under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101) and under sections 100215, 100216, 100226, 100230, and 100246 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 917), $95,202,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f)(2) of such Act

(42 U.S.C. 4101(f)(2)), to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), and the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 916), $176,300,000, which shall be derived from offsetting amounts collected under section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)); of which not to exceed $22,000,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and not less than $154,300,000 shall be available for flood plain management and flood mapping, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That any additional fees collected pursuant to section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to this account, to be available for flood plain management and flood mapping: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2014, no funds shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund under section 1310 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 4017) in excess of:

(1) $132,000,000 for operating expenses;

(2) $1,152,000,000 for commissions and taxes of agents;

(3) such sums as are necessary for interest on Treasury borrowings; and

(4) $100,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for flood mitigation actions under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c): *Provided further*, That the amounts collected under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) and section 1366(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 shall be deposited in the National Flood Insurance Fund to supplement other amounts specified as available for section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, notwithstanding subsection (f)(8) of such section 102 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(8)) and subsection 1366(e) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1367(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c(e), 4104d(b)(2)–(3)): *Provided further*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 4 percent of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

For the predisaster mitigation grant program under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133), $22,500,000 to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out the emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), $120,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, $114,213,000 for the E-Verify Program, as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), to assist United States employers with maintaining a legal workforce: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds otherwise made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may be used to acquire, operate, equip, and dispose of up to 5 vehicles, for replacement only, for areas where the Administrator of General Services does not provide vehicles for lease: *Provided further*, That the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may authorize employees who are assigned to those areas to use such vehicles to travel between the employees' residences and places of employment.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; the purchase of not to exceed 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in firearms matches and presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; $227,845,000; of which $300,000 shall remain available until expended to be distributed to Federal law enforcement agencies for expenses incurred participating in training accreditation; and of which not to exceed $9,180 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That section 1202(a) of Public Law 107–206 (42 U.S.C. 3771 note), as amended under this heading in division D of Public Law 113-6 is further amended by striking ''December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''December 31, 2016'': *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that such training facilities are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board, including representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training, shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 52, line 19, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, construction, and ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, $30,885,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and for management and administration of programs and activities as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), $129,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report outlining reforms to research and development programs, as specified in the accompanying report.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for science and technology research, including advanced research projects, development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and operations as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), and the purchase or lease of not to exceed 5 vehicles, $1,096,488,000; of which $548,703,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which $547,785,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018, solely for operation and construction of laboratory facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided for the operation and construction of laboratory facilities under this heading, $404,000,000 shall be for construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 54, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $404,000,000)''.

Page 54, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $404,000,000)''.

Page 93, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $404,000,000)''.

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple. It strikes the $404 million included for the National Bio- and Agro-Defense Facility, known as NBAF, planned for Manhattan, Kansas, and uses those funds to reduce the deficit.

I continue to voice two vitally important concerns with NBAF: safety and cost. As many have noted in the past, putting a laboratory that will study the most virulent and harmful animal diseases known in the heart of cattle country, and in an area that is the frequent victim of violent tornados, is a needless risk to an $80 billion a year industry, especially when the safety of that lab is still in question.

While supporters of this project will testify to NBAF's safety, this claim is not supported by the two risk evaluations conducted by the National Academy of Science's research arm, the National Research Council. These risk evaluations studied site-specific assessments conducted by the Department of Homeland Security.

In its review of DHS' first study, the NRC found that the risk of foot-and-mouth disease released in the Nation's heartland was 70 percent, 70 percent over a 50-year period. Furthermore, the cost of a release of foot-and-mouth disease is estimated at between $9 billion and $50 billion.

In June 2012, the NRC found that the Department's second risk assessment relied on ''questionable and inappropriate assumptions'' in calculating risk to determine that NBAF posed near non-existent safety risks to surrounding areas. The same report could not verify DHS' results due to the ''methods and data being unevenly or poorly presented.''

If the Department's own safety assessments throw into question the safety and security of this new facility, how can we be certain that a billion-dollar project will not pose significant security threats to Americans living nearby? The NRC findings are not a resounding endorsement, by any stretch.

In addition to these significant safety concerns, NBAF's cost is alarming. Initially, $451 million was budgeted for its construction. Today the pricetag is a staggering $1 billion.

It can hardly be considered fiscally responsible to spend more than double the initial amount to build a massive research facility only to duplicate research activities currently performed by other existing facilities. More cost-effective solutions must be considered to meet the Nation's agro-defense research needs, including the expansion of existing facilities around the country.

Alternative options to NBAF do exist. A July 2012 NRC study looked at three separate futures for the Nation's biosecurity needs and clearly demonstrates that, even without NBAF as currently designed, those needs can be adequately filled by existing facilities.

Specifically, one option includes continuing the exemplary work already being conducted at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center, while leveraging out the BSL–4 functions to other existing facilities.

□ 1800

This option would represent a significant savings, while ensuring that current research needs are met. The NRC's studies reaffirmed my concerns, as well as the concerns of many in the agricultural community, that the unknowns are too many, the risks are too great, and the pricetag too high to justify going forward with construction at this time.

Let me close with this. This NBAF project is a boondoggle. We don't even have a shovel in the ground yet and already the cost has gone up by 250 percent. It is not needed. A very reputable organization, that is to say, the NRC, has asserted a perfectly reasonable and vastly less expensive alternative exists. We have scores and scores of infrastructure needs much, much more urgent that we are not addressing.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, support my amendment, and reduce our deficit by $404 million.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this amendment. I'm certainly sympathetic with the predicament of the gentleman from New York—and he's doing his best to represent his district—but this amendment would cut funding for the National Bio- and Agro-Defense Facility, or the NBAF, in Manhattan, Kansas, an essential research center for human and animal pathogens, by $404 million and increase funding for research, development, and innovation by an equivalent amount.

The bill has already cut funding by $310 million from the President's request of $714 million. The amount provided in the bill—$404 million—is the amount needed in order to obtain the Kansas cost share and begin construction. I believe Kansas is prepared to offer $202 million in support of this project.

Again, while I understand the gentleman's local district concern—and he's a strong advocate for his district—this amendment is in fact shortsighted. This horse is already out of the barn, so to speak. We have an immediate need to build up our capacity for research into pathogens that afflict animals in our food chain and, by extension, human beings. The Under Secretary for DHS Science and Technology herself has testified the threat of biological attack through our large and vulnerable food chain is a top priority. She has confirmed that NBAF is required to meet this threat. She's also testified that Plum Island, which is in the gentleman's district, of course, cannot meet this need. Yet this amendment would freeze this effort. The amendment would stall a program needed to address a serious, known risk.

I urge opposition to the amendment. We need to get this facility up and running in Kansas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from New York that would eliminate funding in the bill for constructing the National Bio- and Agro-Defense Facility, or NBAF. I supported a similar amendment offered by the gentleman last year, but the circumstances, I believe, have changed decisively.

Last year, the administration did not request funding for NBAF for fiscal 2013. We were still waiting on the results of a National Academy of Sciences review of options for meeting the Nation's animal disease research needs and on the result of a separate NAS review of the Department's updated risk assessments for NBAF.

Last June, NAS released a report on DHS' updated risk assessment concluding that the Department had made substantial improvements compared to its first risk assessment and that the so-called 65 percent design phase plans for the facility itself appear to be sound and conform with international standards.

Further, last July, a separate National Academy of Sciences report made clear that the existing animal disease research facility on Plum Island is not an option for meeting the Nation's needs and that a new facility with a BSL–4 laboratory is required. This is precisely the capability that the new NBAF facility will provide.

The two studies also made clear that critical work must continue. Notably, the National Academy of Sciences' review determined that the Department had likely underestimated some types of risk while overestimating others. The Department disputes some of these assessments. But even acknowledging that DHS must continue to improve its risk methodology and response planning before the NBAF facility becomes fully operational, we should not wait any longer to begin constructing the new facility, which we know now is securely and safely designed. The longer we wait, the more costly its construction will be and the more costly it will be to continue to maintain the Plum Island facility. We also must consider the cost of further delaying the availability of a Biosafety Level 4 facility, which the NAS, DHS, and other stakeholders are fully convinced we need.

So I believe the funding provided in the appropriations bill is timely and needed, and I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JENKINS. After an exhaustive review, the Department of Homeland Security chose Manhattan, Kansas, as the site for the new BSL–4 National Bio- and Agro-Defense Facility. This will be the only such facility capable of researching large animals in the United States. The construction of this cutting-edge facility must move forward quickly so we can safely conduct critical research to develop vaccines

and countermeasures in order to protect the public and our livestock from the threats of devastating diseases.

Not only will the NBAF accelerate America's ability to protect ourselves, our food supply, and the agriculture economy from biological threats, it will also be the world's premier animal health research facility and further solidify our Nation's place as the international leader in animal health. The NBAF is needed to replace the obsolete and increasingly expensive Plum Island Animal Disease Center. This lab was built in the 1950s and has reached the end of its life. The facility does not contain the necessary biosafety level to meet the NBAF research requirements—and it never will. Any attempts to upgrade Plum Island would cost more than building the NBAF.

Currently, we don't have the ability to research the effects of disease on large animals, such as foot-and-mouth disease, African swine fever, and Rift Valley fever, at any facility in the United States, nor can we rely on international partners for our own security needs. The NBAF project has a history of broad-based support. DHS, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, and the House Appropriations Committee, under both Democrat and Republican leadership, have made it clear time and time again that our country needs the NBAF. And the best place is in Manhattan, Kansas.

The President's budget includes $714 million, which would complete construction. And while I prefer that this bill include that figure, Chairman CARTER has responsibly included sufficient funding for this fiscal year of $404 million. Construction on this facility has already begun, and Congress has already appropriated $127.5 million and the State of Kansas and the city of Manhattan have already committed more than $200 million towards the project. These dollars show a strong commitment at both the Federal, State, and local levels.

Our Nation's food supply cannot sustain another delay. We need to protect our food and our families from danger. We need to stay on the cutting edge of this research field. Our security is at risk. Delaying this project any further is not an option. We need NBAF.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the topic of NBAF. As has been mentioned by my colleague from Kansas, currently in the United States there is not a single research facility that is able to conduct research at Biosafety Level 4.

The NBAF facility being discussed here today and that would be funded in this particular bill will provide critical research in areas, again, that are not able to be researched currently in this country—things such as African swine fever, Rift Valley fever, the Nipah virus, and the Hendra virus.

□ 1810

I repeat. We currently, as a country, without this facility, are required to outsource this particular research to other countries.

As a Kansas farmer and rancher, I recognize the critical damage that would be done to our livestock industries if we do not proceed forth with construction of NBAF.

Indeed, shovels are being turned in Manhattan, Kansas, today. The central utility plant that is related to this, construction is proceeding underway. The State of Kansas has agreed to pay a substantial sum to assist for the cost of construction of this facility.

And, as was indicated earlier, the current facility that served for over 50 years is aging at Plum Island and needs to be replaced. The Manhattan, Kansas, site was selected by a panel of more than 25 scientists. DHS and USDA experts agree this is the best place to build NBAF and provide the critical research that is necessary not just to protect the outbreak of foreign animal diseases that might be accidental, but to protect America and our livestock industries from mass destruction from terrorism and numerous other attacks that could use these particular foreign animal diseases and other things.

One other connection I will note: these are diseases that in many cases not only impact the livestock industries, but are zoonotic and can impact humans. This research needs to be done. We need to continue with construction in order to protect our livestock and our human health in this country.

I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, as authorized by title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.), for management and administration of programs and activities, $37,353,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a strategic plan of investments necessary to implement the Department of Homeland Security's responsibilities under the domestic component of the global nuclear detection architecture that shall:

(1) define the role and responsibilities of each Departmental component in support of the domestic detection architecture, including any existing or planned programs to prescreen cargo or conveyances overseas;

(2) identify and describe the specific investments being made by each Departmental component in fiscal year 2014 and planned for fiscal year 2015 to support the domestic architecture and the security of sea, land, and air pathways into the United States;

(3) describe the investments necessary to close known vulnerabilities and gaps, including associated costs and timeframes, and estimates of feasibility and cost effectiveness; and

(4) explain how the Department's research and development funding is furthering the implementation of the domestic nuclear detection architecture, including specific investments planned for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for radiological and nuclear research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations, $211,210,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For expenses for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office acquisition and deployment of radiological detection systems in accordance with the global nuclear detection architecture, $42,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. 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. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act, may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts, and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2014, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates a new program, project, or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project, office, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; or

(5) contracts out any function or activity for which funding levels were requested for Federal full-time equivalents in the object classification tables contained in the fiscal year 2014 Budget Appendix for the Department of Homeland Security, as modified by the report accompanying this Act, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate

and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2014, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or proceeds available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that:

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity;

(3) reduces by 10 percent the numbers of personnel approved by the Congress; or

(4) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by the Congress, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security by this Act or provided by previous appropriations Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer under this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under subsection (b) and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, no funds shall be reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriations after June 30, except in extraordinary circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.

(e) The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in this section shall apply to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided in previous Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 504. (a) The Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund, established pursuant to section 403 of Public Law 103–356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note), shall continue operations as a permanent working capital fund for fiscal year 2014: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security may be used to make payments to the Working Capital Fund, except for the activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation until expended to carry out the purposes of the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That all departmental components shall be charged only for direct usage of each Working Capital Fund service: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be used only for purposes consistent with the contributing component: *Provided further*, That the Working Capital Fund shall be paid in advance or reimbursed at rates which will return the full cost of each service: *Provided further*, That the Working Capital Fund shall be subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act.

(b) The amounts appropriated in this Act are hereby reduced by $250,000,000 to reflect cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments in the Working Capital Fund.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2014 from appropriations for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2014 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2015, in the account and for the purposes for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2014 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) make or award a grant allocation, grant, contract, other transaction agreement, or task or delivery order on a Department of Homeland Security multiple award contract, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of $1,000,000;

(2) award a task or delivery order requiring an obligation of funds in an amount greater than $10,000,000 from multi-year Department of Homeland Security funds or a task or delivery order that would cause cumulative obligations of multi-year funds in a single account to exceed 50 percent of the total amount appropriated;

(3) make a sole-source grant award; or

(4) announce publicly the intention to make or award items under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance of making an award or issuing a letter as described in that subsection.

(c) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with this section would pose a substantial risk to human life, health, or safety, an award may be made without notification, and the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 5 full business days after such an award is made or letter issued.

(d) A notification under this section—

(1) may not involve funds that are not available for obligation; and

(2) shall include the amount of the award; the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated; the type of contract; and the account and each program, project, and activity from which the funds are being drawn.

(e) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 full business days in advance of announcing publicly the intention of making an award under ''State and Local Programs''.

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training that cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus otherwise required under chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 510. (a) Sections 520, 522, and 530 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008 (division E of Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 2073 and 2074) shall apply with respect to funds made available in this Act in the same manner as such sections applied to funds made available in that Act.

(b) The third proviso of section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006 (6 U.S.C. 114), shall not apply with respect to funds made available in this Act.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ''Buy American Act'' means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any person other than the Privacy Officer appointed under subsection (a) of section 222 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 142(a)) to alter, direct that changes be made to, delay, or prohibit the transmission to Congress of any report prepared under paragraph (6) of such subsection.

SEC. 513. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448).

SEC. 514. Within 45 days after the end of each month, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a monthly budget and staffing report for that month that includes total obligations, on-board versus funded full-time equivalent staffing levels, and the number of contract employees for each office of the Department.

SEC. 515. Except as provided in section 44945 of title 49, United States Code, funds appropriated or transferred to Transportation Security Administration ''Aviation Security'', ''Administration'', and ''Transportation Security Support'' for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for the procurement or installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification: *Provided*, That quarterly reports shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

SEC. 516. Any funds appropriated to Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'' for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 for the 110–123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as the result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

SEC. 517. Section 532(a) of Public Law 109–295 (120 Stat. 1384) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

SEC. 518. The functions of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center instructor

staff shall be classified as inherently governmental for the purpose of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note).

SEC. 519. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report not later than October 15, 2014, to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security listing all grants and contracts awarded by any means other than full and open competition during fiscal year 2014.

(b) The Inspector General shall review the report required by subsection (a) to assess Departmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations and report the results of that review to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 15, 2015.

SEC. 520. None of the funds provided by this or previous appropriations Acts shall be used to fund any position designated as a Principal Federal Official (or the successor thereto) for any Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) declared disasters or emergencies unless—

(1) the responsibilities of the Principal Federal Official do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations, and are consistent with the requirements of section 509(c) and sections 503(c)(3) and 503(c)(4)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 319(c) and 313(c)(3) and 313(c)(4)(A)) and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

(2) not later than 10 business days after the latter of the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security appoints the Principal Federal Official and the date on which the President issues a declaration under section 401 or section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191, respectively), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a notification of the appointment of the Principal Federal Official and a description of the responsibilities of such Official and how such responsibilities are consistent with paragraph (1) to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report specifying timeframes and milestones regarding the update of operations, planning and policy documents, and training and exercise protocols, to ensure consistency with paragraph (1) of this section.

SEC. 521. None of the funds provided or otherwise made available in this Act shall be available to carry out section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452).

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit unless the results of background checks required by law to be completed prior to the granting of the benefit have been received by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the results do not preclude the granting of the benefit.

SEC. 523. Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Until September 30, 2013,'' and inserting ''Until September 30, 2014,'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''September 30, 2013,'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014,''.

SEC. 524. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that all contracts of the Department of Homeland Security that provide award fees link such fees to successful acquisition outcomes (which outcomes shall be specified in terms of cost, schedule, and performance).

SEC. 525. None of the funds made available to the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management under this Act may be expended for any new hires by the Department of Homeland Security that are not verified through the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act for U.S. Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug (within the meaning of section 801(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) from importing a prescription drug from Canada that complies with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That this section shall apply only to individuals transporting on their person a personal-use quantity of the prescription drug, not to exceed a 90-day supply: *Provided further*, That the prescription drug may not be—

(1) a controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); or

(2) a biological product, as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

SEC. 527. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any proposed transfers of funds available under section 9703(g)(4)(B) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Section 638 of Public Law 102–393) from the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency within the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That none of the funds identified for such a transfer may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the proposed transfers.

SEC. 528. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

SEC. 529. If the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration determines that an airport does not need to participate in the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), the Administrator shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that no security risks will result from such non-participation.

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 71, line 14, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 530. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), and 30 days after the date on which the President determines whether to declare a major disaster because of an event and any appeal is completed, the Administrator shall publish on the Web site of the Federal Emergency Management Agency a report regarding that decision that shall summarize damage assessment information used to determine whether to declare a major disaster.

(b) The Administrator may redact from a report under subsection (a) any data that the Administrator determines would compromise national security.

(c) In this section—

(1) the term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(2) the term ''major disaster'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

SEC. 531. Any official that is required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may not delegate such authority to perform that act unless specifically authorized herein.

SEC. 532. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note), as amended by section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), is further amended by striking ''on October 4, 2013'' and inserting ''on October 4, 2014''.

SEC. 533. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 533, amend paragraph (2) to read as follows:

(2) was transferred to the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense, after December 31, 2005.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, section 533 would prohibit any funds being used for the transport, release, or assistance in the transfer or release of any Guantanamo detainee housed in Cuba on or after June of 2009. My amendment would change that date to December 31, 2005.

Now, in 2006, people who were truly the worst of the worst, those detainees who were housed in CIA black sites were transferred to Guantanamo. Now, prior to 2006, Guantanamo was populated with detainees who were simply not as deserving of indefinite detention, as this latter group, in my view, is. Eighty-six percent of the people of

the first group, prior to 2005, were arrested in exchange for a bounty. The vast majority never committed an act of violence against the United States or any of its allies. About 5 percent may have been affiliated with al Qaeda.

Now, Madam Chairwoman, it seems to me that it's time that we clarify the definition of who is at Guantanamo. I listened very closely to my good friends yesterday, including Mr. WOLF, who cited Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in defining who was at Guantanamo. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is one of those worst of the worst. I don't care what you do with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. As far as I'm concerned, from everything I know, he deserves whatever happens to him. But we're not talking about him if this amendment were to pass. We're talking about people who were brought there initially, more than half were already released, of the 779, by the Bush administration. Eighty-six more have been already cleared for release.

Now, Madam Chairwoman, the fact is we're spending $150 million a year to house these folks. About 150 of them are people that were brought there before 2005. We've authorized up to half a billion dollars to be spent to further modernize the facilities so that we can keep them indefinitely. It's expensive. We're spending $1 million per detainee now, and then we would be talking, if we spent that 500, many more for indefinite detention.

The problem with that, in addition to the money, is the national security issue, because Guantanamo is a recruiting tool and a rallying cry for the enemy. It's not the only thing they cite, but, invariably, it's one of the principal things they cite and why the United States is not the country that it truly is.

They suggest that we are not good to our word, that we don't believe in the very principles of our jurisprudence system, that people are innocent until they've been proven guilty, that they ought to be charged with crimes. We don't believe in indefinite detention. That's what other countries do. We don't do that. We give people a fair trial. But the reason we have Guantanamo is that this was set up to be above the law. It's extrajudicial. The rules don't apply. The rest of the world looks at this and it undermines our credibility and our security as a Nation. That, Madam Chairwoman, is exactly why we should distinguish.

The worst of the worst, keep them there, keep them in some kind of isolated structure, but you sure don't have to spend half a billion dollars for 12 to 15 people. Those other 150, of whom many of them are now on a hunger strike, a majority are on a hunger strike because they believe there's no hope, there's nothing to live for, they're going to be there forever. In fact, more than 30 of them—37, to be exact—are being forcibly tube fed. If this was in another nation, we'd be on the floor—Mr. WOLF would be on the floor objecting to this.

That's why this amendment should pass, Madam Chairwoman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment simply because I don't know the impact on security of this amendment. Who would be released? Where would these prisoners be relocated? And who would they be released to? to Yemen? to the United States? I simply don't know by reading this amendment.

□ 1820

It's clear that if these individuals were released to Yemen, they would not likely remain in custody for very long and likely rejoin the fight.

At the outset of the President's first term, an executive order declared the intention to close Guantanamo Bay and bring the detainees to the United States. That proposal was rejected by this Congress, and prohibitions on transferring detainees to the U.S. were enacted by overwhelming bipartisan majorities.

As my colleague and friend Mr. WOLF just discussed yesterday during consideration of the MilCon bill, this amendment could result in very dangerous outcomes. 779 people were detained in the first few years, and at this time it is unknown how many could potentially be released as an effect of this amendment.

As you know, several men who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back into the battlefield and killed Americans. We also know that having these dangerous individuals detained and tried in the United States dramatically impacts the facilities and localities where they're located. You must remember the violent nature of some of these individuals and the social impact on having these people in our neighborhoods.

I simply cannot support this amendment. It has high monetary and social costs and could potentially endanger our communities. In fact, a few years ago, it was discussed about releasing some of these detainees—five up into New York City—and that was rejected very, very strongly by both Republicans and Democrats. Any proposal that results in these detainees being sent to the United States is simply the wrong policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague, Mr. MORAN's amendment. The fact is that section 533 of this bill, which his amendment amends, has no place in this Homeland Security bill in the first place. If it belongs in any bill, it would be the Commerce-Justice bill. But as a political gesture, for years now, we've had this amendment or something very much like it added to a number of appropriations bills.

What Mr. MORAN has done tonight, though, is interesting. He has not proposed that this section be removed. He has simply amended it, and in a sensible way. He would limit the prohibition of the transfer of detainees to those demonstrably dangerous people who were placed in Guantanamo after 2005. That should remove most of the objections people have made to the elimination of this prohibition entirely.

It seems that the colleagues who have pushed this amendment, year after year and bill after bill, don't apparently have very strong concerns about indefinite detention and the kind of stain that this represents on this country. They also seem to think that if and when detainees are going to be brought to trial, the way to try them is with military commissions at Guantanamo. They seem to think that's the only possible way to bring these detainees to justice.

The reality is that military commissions have a very spotty record at best, while our criminal courts have a long and successful record of prosecuting terrorists. Why would we want to eliminate that option? Why would we want to deny that option to the President?

The reasoning of the proponents of this provision both denigrates our judicial system and actually exalts these detainees to a status they don't deserve in the eyes of the world. If I had my way, this section would not be in the bill in the first place. But since it is, I think Mr. MORAN has made a very sensible proposal that we should consider very favorably, and I hope that my colleagues will do just that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want, again, to begin: I don't believe it's fair to say that had we closed down Guantanamo Bay bin Laden would not have done what he had done. Bin Laden was active and al Qaeda was active in a 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center that was before the Guantanamo Bay. They were involved in the bombing of the American Embassy in Tanzania and Nairobi that was before. And I don't believe that al Qaeda and al-Shabaab and all these are waiting to see, Well, when President Obama closes down Guantanamo Bay, we're going to kind of get off the field and it's going to be over. I just don't think that has any impact.

Secondly, the transferees—according to a political article, FBI Director Robert Mueller stated:

To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.

I agree with Director Mueller. I think Director Mueller has done a great job.

On the Moussaoui case—if the gentleman remembers, Moussaoui was in Alexandria for 4 years, and it tied up Alexandria. And to bring some of these people and to try them here creates a lot of problems.

The other issue, though, is 15 percent, at least—and this is an old figure. It could be higher, it could be a little bit lower, but at least 15 percent of the terrorist recidivism rate of released detainees that were released back to Yemen and places like that, it is not unheard of to have, as you release some—and some were released under the Bush administration—went back on the field and killed our men and women.

And so to release these, certainly you would never do this in an appropriations bill. You would have extensive hearings in and out. You would call the FBI to ask them what are the ramifications. You would call the CIA to ask them what are the ramifications. You would call Homeland Security to ask them what are the ramifications.

So for all these issues—and I won't take up any more time because we covered it last night—I think this is a bad amendment, and I urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairman, I think this is a very important debate.

I remind my colleague from Virginia that I was on the board of supervisors in Fairfax County during the Karzai trial, and most certainly it was a difficult time, but we handled, professionally, that trial. He was tried fairly, convicted, and executed in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It is not beyond our reach to be able to handle these difficult cases.

Madam Chairman, I believe that this is a very important debate. I believe the author needs to be heard in the exposition of this argument, and I'm pleased now to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I thank my very good friend from Virginia. I would like to address a few points that my other very good friend from Virginia made.

First of all, the case that my good friend from Virginia referred to is actually a case in point. As Mr. CONNOLLY pointed out, the American jurisprudence system worked. He was tried and he was convicted and he was executed. And, in fact, no convictions have been achieved with these military commissions. Two guilty verdicts, but they were overturned.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Moussaoui was picked up here in the United States. He was not picked up in the battlefield in Afghanistan or someplace like that. So they were totally separate-type issues.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORAN. I would say to the gentleman, if they were totally separate, then I don't know why he brought that issue into this debate. The fact is there is a lesson, and I want to explain what that lesson is, because our American jurisprudence system worked. He was convicted in a U.S. court.

□ 1830

In fact, before he was executed, there was a description of this person—I don't want to call him a ''gentleman.'' He was crying uncontrollably, and apparently the reason was that all of the conceptions that he had had proved to be misconceptions. He had been screaming about how bad the United States was, how unfair the trial was, and then he realized he was wrong.

It's too late for him to realize that now, but the American jurisprudence system worked. In fact, we have tried more than 1,000 terrorists in the United States. We are currently holding 373 people convicted of terrorism in 98 facilities across the country. There are six Department of Defense facilities in which detainees could be held in the United States, and they are only at 48 percent capacity. There are 98 Justice Department facilities, as the gentleman well knows, and there is one in Alexandria where Guantanamo detainees could be held in the United States.

I just want to show the rest of the world that our justice system works. That is what defines us as a Nation and as a people. Guantanamo doesn't define us. It's just the opposite of what we believe in, what we profess to believe in. That's the problem. Nobody suggested that 9/11 happened because of Guantanamo. We know our history. We know when Guantanamo was established. The fact is that we could cite any number of situations in which our enemy cites Guantanamo as a reason for these young, impressionable men joining the forces of al Qaeda—because they just want to suggest that we really are not who we say we are.

This amendment would let us be who we are. Let the President close this facility that never should have been established in the first place. The Bush administration recognized that when it released more than half of the detainees—779 of them turned in for bounties in Afghanistan and Pakistan. That's not the way we arrest people. They released them. The majority of the people at Guantanamo today have been cleared for release. They ought to be released, or they ought to be tried. As far as the worst of the worst, do what you want with them, but you don't have to spend $500 million to upgrade the facilities at Guantanamo so that you house people indefinitely. That's not who we are. That's why this amendment should pass.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I have collaborated with the Chairman and Ranking Member on this statement and I am pleased to submit it into the RECORD with their concurrence. I appreciate the Committee's efforts to ensure the Department has the necessary cybersecurity resources to safeguard our Nation's digital infrastructure. In recent years, prominent intelligence, defense, and homeland security officials have expressed alarm over the rapidly increasing cyber threat and our inadequate cyber defenses, and we ignore those warnings at our own peril. Former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta recently noted the potential of escalating cyber threats to culminate in a new ''cyber Pearl Harbor; an attack that would cause physical destruction and the loss of life'' and ''paralyze and shock the nation and create a new, profound sense of vulnerability.''

America's critical infrastructure remains a prime target for cyber attacks that are rapidly escalating in terms of scale and sophistication. Failure to secure the sensitive networks that underpin our financial institutions, utilities, and government leaves our country vulnerable to attacks that could cripple our economy or endanger our national security. Enhancing our cybersecurity capabilities should be a top homeland security priority, and it is absolutely vital that we cultivate a robust cyber workforce to carry out that mission.

I share the Committee's ''serious concerns'' that our current cyber workforce training and recruitment efforts are inadequate to meet the scale of the threat. A recent SANS Institute report card found DHS is failing to utilize its full authorities to effectively recruit and retain cybersecurity personnel and neglecting to develop advanced in-house cyber skills. If our Nation is to have robust cybersecurity capabilities, we must cultivate a talented and well-trained cyber workforce capable of managing the protection of our government's networks and lead by example. That means we have to start educating people about the training and career opportunities in cybersecutity starting in our secondary schools and ramping up college recruitment.

When I consulted the Chairman on this matter, he said shared my view and that the Committee believes there has been too little strategic planning and too few resources focused on development of the current workforce and developing a future workforce pipeline. That is why the Committee directs DHS to leverage its existing network of 12 Centers of Excellence around the country to address workforce needs. The bill also directs the Secretary to work with her counterparts at the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Defense, and Labor to develop a veteran's cybersecurity workforce program targeting those veterans who are unemployed. Further it directs the undersecretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate to look across other agencies to see where DHS could leverage existing cyber capabilities. The Chairman further acknowledged that this will continue to be a challenge and focus area across all Federal agencies and the Committee.

Even in my district, which is home to the one of the largest concentrations of technology firms in the country, rivaling that of Silicon Valley, we have a shortage of skilled

cyber warriors. In a wired 21st Century, the Federal Government must have the necessary tools to recruit, retain, and develop a first-class cybersecurity workforce. I look forward to working with the Committee moving forward to achieve that mission.

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

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 534. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301.10–124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 535. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter may be used to propose or effect a disciplinary or adverse action, with respect to any Department of Homeland Security employee who engages regularly with the public in the performance of his or her official duties solely because that employee elects to utilize protective equipment or measures, including but not limited to surgical masks, N95 respirators, gloves, or hand-sanitizers, where use of such equipment or measures is in accord with Department of Homeland Security policy and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Office of Personnel Management guidance.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

SEC. 537. (a) Any company that collects or retains personal information directly from any individual who participates in the Registered Traveler or successor program of the Transportation Security Administration shall safeguard and dispose of such information in accordance with the requirements in—

(1) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–30, entitled ''Risk Management Guide for Information Technology Systems'';

(2) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53, Revision 3, entitled ''Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations''; and

(3) any supplemental standards established by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'').

(b) The airport authority or air carrier operator that sponsors the company under the Registered Traveler program shall be known as the ''Sponsoring Entity''.

(c) The Administrator shall require any company covered by subsection (a) to provide, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Sponsoring Entity written certification that the procedures used by the company to safeguard and dispose of information are in compliance with the requirements under subsection (a). Such certification shall include a description of the procedures used by the company to comply with such requirements.

SEC. 538. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractor performance that has been judged to be below satisfactory performance or performance that does not meet the basic requirements of a contract.

SEC. 539. (a) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a report that either—

(1) certifies that the requirement for screening all air cargo on passenger aircraft by the deadline under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, has been met; or

(2) includes a strategy to comply with the requirements under title 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, including—

(A) a plan to meet the requirement under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, to screen 100 percent of air cargo transported on passenger aircraft arriving in the United States in foreign air transportation (as that term is defined in section 40102 of that title); and

(B) specification of—

(i) the percentage of such air cargo that is being screened; and

(ii) the schedule for achieving screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

(b) The Administrator shall continue to submit reports described in subsection (a)(2) every 180 days thereafter until the Administrator certifies that the Transportation Security Administration has achieved screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

SEC. 540. In developing any process to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security purposes, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all such processes take into consideration such passengers' and crews' privacy and civil liberties consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

SEC. 541. (a) Notwithstanding section 1356(n) of title 8, United States Code, of the funds deposited into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, $10,000,000 may be allocated by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in fiscal year 2014 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

(b) None of the funds made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for grants for immigrant integration may be used to provide services to aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SEC. 542. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless such contract is otherwise authorized by statute to be entered into without regard to the above referenced statutes.

SEC. 543. (a) For an additional amount for data center migration, $34,200,000.

(b) Funds made available in subsection (a) for data center migration may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

(c) No transfer described in subsection (b) shall occur until 15 days after the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified of such transfer.

SEC. 544. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that specific U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities no longer meet the mission need, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of individual Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities by directing the Administrator of General Services to sell all real and related personal property which support Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities, subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements: *Provided*, That the proceeds, net of the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall be deposited as offsetting collections into a separate account that shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended for other real property capital asset needs of existing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement assets, excluding daily operations and maintenance costs, as the Secretary deems appropriate: *Provided further*, That any sale or collocation of federally owned detention facilities shall not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified 15 days prior to the announcement of any proposed sale or collocation.

SEC. 545. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 546. The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall, with respect to fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the information required in the multi-year investment and management plans required, respectively, under the headings U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Salaries and Expenses'' under title II of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, ''Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'' under such title, and section 568 of such Act.

SEC. 547. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure enforcement of immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

SEC. 548. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report detailing the fiscal policy that prescribes Coast Guard budgetary policies, procedures, and technical direction necessary to comply with subsection (a) of section 557 of division D of Public Law 113-6 (as required to be developed under subsection (b) of such section).

SEC. 549. (a) Of the amounts made available by this Act for National Protection and Programs Directorate, ''Infrastructure Protection and Information Security'', $199,725,000

for the ''Federal Network Security'' program, project, and activity shall be used to deploy on Federal systems technology to improve the information security of agency information systems covered by section 3543(a) of title 44, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds made available under this section shall be used to assist and support Government-wide and agency-specific efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective cybersecurity to address escalating and rapidly evolving threats to information security, including the acquisition and operation of a continuous monitoring and diagnostics program, in collaboration with departments and agencies, that includes equipment, software, and Department of Homeland Security supplied services: *Provided further*, That not later than April 1, 2014, and quarterly thereafter, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security of the National Protection and Programs Directorate shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the obligation and expenditure of funds made available under this section: *Provided further*, That continuous monitoring and diagnostics software procured by the funds made available by this section shall not transmit to the Department of Homeland Security any personally identifiable information or content of network communications of other agencies' users: *Provided further*, That such software shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with all applicable privacy laws and agency-specific policies regarding network content.

(b) Funds made available under this section may not be used to supplant funds provided for any such system within an agency budget.

(c) Not later than July 1, 2014, the heads of all Federal agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives expenditure plans for necessary cybersecurity improvements to address known vulnerabilities to information systems described in subsection (a).

(d) Not later than October 1, 2014, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a report on the execution of the expenditure plan for that agency required by subsection (c): *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall summarize such execution reports and annually submit such summaries to Congress in conjunction with the annual progress report on implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347), as required by section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

(e) This section shall not apply to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government and shall apply to all Federal agencies within the executive branch except for the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 550. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 551. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 552. Fifty percent of each of the appropriations provided in this Act for the ''Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', the ''Office of the Under Secretary for Management'', and the ''Office of the Chief Financial Officer'' shall be withheld from obligation until the reports and plans required in this Act to be submitted on or before March 14, 2014, are received by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SEC. 553. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be obligated to implement the National Preparedness Grant Program or any other successor grant programs unless explicitly authorized by Congress.

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funding for the position of Public Advocate, or a successor position, within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 555. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees of a single component of the Department of Homeland Security, who are stationed in the United States, at a single international conference unless the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such attendance is in the national interest and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives within at least 10 days of that determination and the basis for that determination: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section the term ''international conference'' shall mean a conference occurring outside of the United States attended by representatives of the United States Government and of foreign governments, international organizations, or nongovernmental organizations.

SEC. 556. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation, or such officer or agent, and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 557. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation for which any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 558. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit quarterly reports to the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security regarding the costs and contracting procedures related to each conference or ceremony (including commissionings and changes of command) held by any departmental component or office in fiscal year 2014 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than $20,000.

(b) Each report submitted shall include, for each conference or ceremony in subsection (a) held during the applicable quarter —

(1) a description of its purpose;

(2) the number of participants attending;

(3) a detailed statement of the costs to the United States Government, including —

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services;

(C) the cost of travel to and from the conference or ceremony;

(D) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to the conference or ceremony; and

(4) a description of the contracting procedures used including —

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the departmental component or office in evaluating potential contractors for the conference or ceremony.

(c) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a conference or ceremony described in subsection (a) that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a conference or ceremony held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(d) None of the funds made available in the Act may be used for travel and conference activities that are not in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-12-12 dated May 11, 2012.

SEC. 559. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for pre-clearance operations in new locations unless the required conditions relative to these operations and contained in the accompanying report are met.

SEC. 560. In making grants under the heading ''Firefighter Assistance Grants'', the Secretary shall grant waivers from the requirements in subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(E), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4) of section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 88, line 16 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that section?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 561. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish, collect, or otherwise impose a border crossing fee for pedestrians or passenger vehicles at land ports of entry along the Southern border or the Northern border, or to conduct any study relating to the imposition of such a fee.

SEC. 562. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to eliminate or reduce funding for a program, project or activity as proposed in the President's budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming or transfer provisions of this Act.

SEC. 563. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve a classification petition filed for or by a citizen or national of Brazil in order to render such individual eligible to receive an immigrant visa.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against section 563 of this bill. The section violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits legislative language in a general appropriations bill.

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

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Virginia makes a point of order that section 563 proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI.

The proponent of a provision assumes the burden of establishing that any duties imposed by the provision are already required by law.

The limitation proposed in section 563 declines to fund specified classification petitions filed by, or for, citizens or nationals of Brazil. In the opinion of the Chair, current law does not require the Department of Homeland Security to determine the citizenship or nationality of persons for whom classification petitions are filed.

Compliance with section 563 would require the relevant Federal officials receiving funds in this act to make determinations regarding nationality or citizenship of certain persons. The proponent of this provision has not carried the burden of proving that the relevant Federal officials are presently charged with making these determinations.

On these premises, the Chair concludes that the section proposes to change existing law.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained. Section 563 is stricken from the bill.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, we are debating legislation that is critical to the safety of all Americans. One threat that often gets underplayed but which has been catapulted into the news recently is natural disaster.

Seventy-five percent of Americans live in areas that are at risk for some type of disaster—whether flood, fire, hurricane, tornado, landslide, or earthquake. In the past 2 years, the United States experienced 25 severe, extreme weather events that caused over 1,100 fatalities, $188 billion in damages—far more than all of the domestic acts of terror in the last decade.

This legislation spends $6.2 billion on disaster relief, $5.6 billion of which is emergency spending not subject to discretionary caps.

I strongly support the role of the Federal Government in disaster response, recovery, and prevention; but the costs of disaster relief are staggering, and they are growing—whether due to stronger and more frequent storms, climate change, increased development in harm's way, or an increase in disaster declarations.

To put these costs into perspective, Congress started in 2013 by passing the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, which generated $600 billion over 10 years in new revenue. Two weeks later, we passed the Superstorm Sandy supplemental, totaling $60 billion—in total, all of that first year's revenue under that proposal.

In times of budget austerity, Congress should have a full understanding of how much money taxpayers are spending on disaster relief, recovery, and mitigation. Unfortunately, these expenditures are far from transparent. There are wildly varying estimates of what these costs may be. The OMB recently estimated that the Federal Government spent an average of $11.5 billion per year from 2001 to 2011, but it included only funding specifically related to the Stafford Act and excluded the highest and lowest spending years, including $37 billion for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

□ 1840

Another analysis found we spent $136 billion from fiscal year 2011 to 2013 on disaster relief, about $45 billion a year and nearly $400 per household per year on average. A 2005 study referenced the cost of $1 billion per week from emergency response, public and private property damages, and business disruption. This calculation was made before Hurricane Katrina.

An accurate and comprehensive accounting of Federal disaster spending, as well as an estimate of future needs, will enable this Congress and future Congresses to make better decisions about how much to budget for these events and how to prioritize scarce Federal dollars.

Accurate information would also inform the ongoing conversation about ways to reduce this spending in the first place. Spending more money up front on mitigation and community resilience can reduce the need for disaster relief expenditures. The Multihazard Mitigation Council, in a congressionally mandated study, documented that $1 spent on mitigation saved society an average of $4 in avoided disaster costs.

I appreciate language in this legislation requiring FEMA to submit an expenditure plan detailing the use of funds for disaster readiness and support. I think it's an important step forward. But, frankly, I think the reporting requirement may be too narrow.

I would request that the chairman and ranking member would work with me as this legislation moves to conference to expand the scope of the reporting requirement. We need FEMA to look comprehensively at Federal spending on disaster recovery, preparedness, and, yes, possibly prevention, and look at spending on all Federal programs, agencies and departments responding to and preparing for storms, flooding, fires, earthquake, drought and other disasters. FEMA should examine the reasons behind the rising costs and provide recommendations that may mitigate them going forward.

The inherent unpredictability of natural disasters makes exact congressional budgeting in this area very difficult, and my heart goes out to the committee and your staff. But it's clear disaster relief will continue to strain Federal budgets, particularly if the recent bout of extreme weather continues.

The first step towards finding savings will be to have an accurate accounting of these expenditures. We should take that step now in this legislation, and I would look forward to working with the committee if you're so inclined.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments, and I appreciate your concern and agree with you this is a topic of high concern to everyone. As you saw, our bill contains numerous oversight requirements to address these issues.

I look forward to working with the gentleman as the bill moves through the process to ensure that Congress has the most comprehensive information possible on the costs associated with natural disasters. And I agree that if there is a way to mitigate, we should look into that.

I look forward to working with you.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to add my thanks to my colleague from Oregon for what he has said here tonight.

This area of disaster relief funding is one that has challenged us for a long time, getting accurate predictions and estimates of the needs from Democratic and Republican administrations and dealing with this under budget pressures here in this body.

But the baseline for any of this has got to be honest budgeting, realistic assessments, and we need to work on this going forward. So I'm interested in what the gentleman from Oregon says about the ideas that he has that might help us strengthen this, both the accurate accounting of expenditures for past disasters and also a better understanding of the mitigation potential.

I think both of those are important areas for exploration, and I certainly

will work with the chairman and with him in exploring this going forward.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 564. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape or incest: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 565. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 566. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to provide escort services necessary for a female detainee to receive such service outside the detention facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 565 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 567. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2015 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report on purchase and usage of ammunition by the Department of Homeland Security, that includes—

(1) mission requirements pertaining to ammunition, including certification, qualification, training, and inventory requirements for each relevant Department component or agency and a comparison of such requirements to the requirements of Federal law enforcement agencies of the Department of Justice and the military components of the Department of Defense; and

(2) details on all contracting practices applied by the Department of Homeland Security to procure ammunition, including comparative details regarding other contracting options with respect to cost and availability.

(b) Beginning on April 15, 2014, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to Congress that includes —

(1) the quantity of ammunition in inventory in the Department of Homeland Security at the end of the preceding calendar quarter, subdivided by ammunition type, and how such quantity aligns to mission requirements of each relevant Department of Homeland Security component or agency;

(2) the quantity of ammunition used by the Department of Homeland Security during the preceding calendar quarter, subdivided by ammunition type, the purpose of such usage, the average number of rounds used per agent or officer subdivided by ammunition type, and how such usage aligns to mission requirements, including certification, qualification, and training requirements, for each relevant Department of Homeland Security component or agency; and

(3) the quantity of ammunition purchased by the Department of Homeland Security during the preceding calendar quarter, subdivided by ammunition type, and the associated contract details of such purchase, for each relevant Department of Homeland Security component or agency.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 568. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), as amended:

(1) $14,500,000 from Public Law 111–83 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(2) $21,612,000 from Public Law 112–10 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(3) $41,000,000 from Public Law 112–74 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements'';

(4) $32,479,000 from Public Law 113-6 under the heading Coast Guard ''Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements''.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 569. From the unobligated balances made available in the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund established by section 9703 of title 31, United States Code, (added by section 638 of Public Law 102-393) $100,000,000 shall be permanently rescinded.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 570. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I'd like to thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE on behalf of the residents of our region: New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and the east coast.

Mention was made of disasters, and I want to thank the chair and all the committee members, and certainly the big chair, Chairman ROGERS, but particularly the Homeland Security Appropriations Committee for their working with us on behalf of our residents who continue to suffer. I just want to take this opportunity to thank you and show our appreciation.

There were some tough decisions that had to be made, and we are especially grateful to the staff of both sides of the aisle that worked with us to make life a little more bearable for our residents. And since this is the first appropriations bill since Hurricane Sandy, I just want to express my appreciation.

Also, Madam Chairman, I come from a 9/11 State. This committee is very important to urban areas. In this bill are greater protections for the residents of major cities and metropolitan areas. I'd also like to express my appreciation to Chairman CARTER and Mr. PRICE for making sure that different grants are there for first responders. If there are manmade disasters or any type of disasters, the funds are there.

I appreciate this opportunity, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I rise to invite the distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking member to engage in a colloquy.

As a Member that represents a large technology community in northern Virginia, I share Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE's urgency for cultivating a robust cyber workforce, and I appreciate the committee's thoughtful report language identifying this as a Homeland Security priority, with specific actions for the Department to pursue so that they can lead by example. I look forward to working with them and their staffs on this vital initiative.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of our colloquy be entered into the RECORD at this point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may not enter a colloquy into the RECORD.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and assure him that we will continue to work together on this issue.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to invite Chairman CARTER to engage in a colloquy.

Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE have done a lot of good work to craft this bill in a bipartisan fashion that strengthens our ability to provide for the safety and security of our constituents' communities.

□ 1850

As you know, this is a shared responsibility with local and State governments. I'm pleased to see this year's bill makes a significant investment in supporting the public safety activities of those partners. I rise to call attention to the elimination of the Office of National Capital Region Coordination and ask the committee's assistance in ensuring the department not only maintain, but demonstrably improve its collaboration with our local and State partners in the absence of this stand-alone office.

I share the committee's concerns with the performance of the Regional Coordination Office, which according to multiple GAO reports, has fallen considerably short of its goals. Two natural disasters of 2011—a record

snowstorm and an earthquake—showed that gaps in regional communication and coordination unfortunately still exist in the National Capital Region.

During my tenure on the Fairfax Country Board of Supervisors, I was a founding member of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' Emergency Preparedness Council. The attack on the Pentagon on 9/11 revealed gaping holes in even basic communication between the Federal Government and regional partners. For example, following the attack, the Federal Government allowed early release of all of its workforce with zero coordination with local governments, thus creating some of the worst gridlock in the history of Washington, D.C. Thankfully, a proposal to also close Metro that day was rejected or the situation would have been even worse.

This is not just any region of the country. This is the Nation's capital, and the number of Federal assets throughout the region demands that the Federal Government play an active role in coordinating preparedness and response efforts with our local and State partners. In fact, section 882 of the National Security Act of 2002 specifies that the department help assess, advocate for, and assist our State and local partners.

I would ask the chairman of the committee if it is the committee's intent to hold the department responsible for fulfilling those functions without this standalone office?

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's question. The committee has long expressed concerns with the operation of the National Capital Region Coordination Office, and numerous GAO audits have confirmed our concerns that the office has been underperforming its potential to improve regional preparedness coordination. I share the gentleman's desire to improve collaboration across the National Capital Region with the Federal Government, and I know Administrator Fugate is committed to doing just that. I am confident that the coordination responsibility outlined in section 882 can be fulfilled within this reorganization under the Office of the Administrator.

Ranking Member PRICE and I are committed to making sure FEMA acts on the recommendations of the GAO to better meet with the requirements, and we will work to include you and other members of the National Capital Region delegation in that effort.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I just want to echo the chairman on this point. We will work together and with you and with Administrator Fugate to ensure that FEMA meets its coordination responsibilities with regard to the National Capital Region.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member and their staffs, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to enter into a colloquy with Chairman CARTER.

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

Mr. COLE. As many people in this Chamber and around the country know, Oklahoma has had a particularly devastating period of time, and I want to begin by just thanking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and, through them, their constituents for their prayers and their sympathy and their help because we certainly have received an extraordinary amount of help from the American people, from the administration, and from my colleagues here in this Chamber.

While most people have focused on the damage in my hometown of Moore, we actually had, Mr. Chairman, three tornadic events. On May 19, the towns of Shawnee and the small communities of Carney and Little Axe were hit. Two people died, hundreds of homes were destroyed, and there was extensive damage. The second one was the next day, the second episode, hitting the towns of Newcastle and Oklahoma City, in addition to my hometown of Moore, and that one cost the lives of 24 people, and I'll talk about that in just a second.

And then we had a third outbreak on May 31 that hit El Reno, Oklahoma, and parts of Oklahoma City that are in my district. This area actually spreads across several congressional districts. The first episode was largely in Mr. LANKFORD's district, the second largely in mine, and the third actually hit Mr. LUCAS's district, Mr. LANKFORD's district, and my district.

The single greatest loss of life, of course, was in my hometown of Moore. And so my colleagues understand the extent of the disaster, we not only had 24 dead, including 10 children, we had 33,000 people displaced in a town of 55,000; that is, they literally are not sleeping tonight where they were sleeping on the night of May 19. In addition, we lost two elementary schools, a school administration building, extensive damage to three other schools, the hospital, the U.S. Post Office, and hundreds and hundreds of businesses. So the employment base of the community was devastated as well.

The full extent of the physical damage in this area alone is not yet known. The initial estimates by the Oklahoma insurance commissioner are somewhere between $2 billion and $4 billion, but it will take awhile to actually get through this.

I have spent a lot of the last few days visiting with the people in the communities involved, particularly in Moore, but also in Little Axe and Newcastle and Oklahoma City, the other areas. Without the tireless efforts of the first responders from all of these communities and the surrounding area, we simply wouldn't have gotten through the horror of the experience.

The communities in question are extraordinarily close-knit and, sadly, are quite experienced in this kind of activity. My hometown of Moore has actually been hit by six tornadoes in 15 years, including two F5s, the highest category. One of the tornadoes in question, this latest incident, was actually the largest ever recorded, 2.5 miles across, with wind funnel speeds of up to 295 miles an hour. So it is extraordinary to behold.

As I understand it right now, as best we can estimate, there are no current needs for additional disaster funding; but the possibility, obviously, of other disasters and hurricanes, fires, earthquakes, what have you, the rest of the fiscal year always raises the possibility that the resources that are available will be strained, and I want to make it very apparent that if that were to happen, I will certainly be looking forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that should similar misfortune befall other areas, that they, too, have the help that they need.

If I may, I yield at this time to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my good friend, Mr. COLE, for yielding.

The bill before us today builds on our actions of last year and includes robust funding for FEMA in the disaster relief category, funding that will most definitely assist those who lost so much in Oklahoma over the last few weeks.

As of this morning, the Disaster Relief Fund currently has a balance of approximately $11 billion, which is sufficient to address the needs of Oklahoma and other recent disasters.

As Oklahoma begins the road to recovery, I will continue to work with the gentleman to ensure we are doing everything that we can to help the devastated communities. Our hearts go out to those folks.

Mr. COLE. I want to thank my friend from Texas whom I had the opportunity to confer with during recent days for his kind support and assurances. I know my friend would appreciate this. We sort of think of ourselves as Scotland to your England. And in football season, I always remind people that the Red River was an international border for 42 years, and every October it is again. But the reality is, when you're in a tough situation, you don't have any better neighbors in the world than our friends from Texas. And not just on this floor, but the outpouring particularly from our neighboring State in terms of volunteers and contributions, and, honestly, from all

across America, has been extraordinary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I rise to lend my support to the underlying bill we are debating today. The Homeland Security appropriations measures make key investments in technology for our first responders, disaster relief funding for our communities, and critical grant funding for our local fire departments.

□ 1900

It is the centerpiece for how we invest, not only in our national security, but also in the security of our local communities.

Earlier this year, the district I represent was severely affected by regional flooding that damaged hundreds of homes and businesses. The impacts on families is a human one. Many lost their homes. Many lost their business and may not be able to reopen. This terrible situation highlights the tremendous need for disaster relief that is comprehensive and far-reaching.

FEMA helped many in my district to recover a small piece of their lives after the storms; and, consequently, I am happy to see that the committee included $6.2 billion in disaster relief funding. This funding will be critical as we, in Illinois, continue the effort to rebuild our communities affected by the flooding, as well as for those in Oklahoma, New Jersey, and other areas as they rebuild after natural disasters.

I also applaud efforts by the committee to support $1.5 billion allocated for FEMA State and local grant programs. Specifically, I would like to highlight a program that addresses the distinctive security needs of nonprofit groups, helping at the local level to safeguard human life and property against credible threats to the safety of our communities.

The Urban Area Security Initiative provides a funding source for targeted nonprofit groups to invest in their own security. These grants, typically utilized by churches, synagogues and community centers, are designed to acquire and install equipment that can help prevent and mitigate terrorist attacks in our communities.

Organizers use these grants to make capital improvements, such as installing security cameras, physical barriers, or controlled-entry systems, safeguards that can make a difference in deterring threats.

Recent incidents in Boston, New York, Wisconsin, and New Jersey highlight that credible threats to these pillars of our communities exist. The need for these grants is clear, and the impact in our communities can be profound.

I would like to thank the committee for its support of these critical programs that can be utilized by States and local groups to address emerging threats and security concerns specific to their circumstance. I appreciate the bipartisan work done on this important bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Transportation Security Administration or a Visible Intermodal Protection and Response (VIPR) team to conduct a security screening other than pursuant to section 44901 of title 49, United States Code.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the TSA is not just for airports anymore. For years the TSA has deployed Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response, or VIPR teams, to conduct literally thousands upon thousands of unannounced, random sweeps of mass transit locations, ferry terminals, and highways across the country.

And while VIPR teams can show up virtually anywhere at any time, these random searches are typically not in response to any specific threat whatsoever.

And if you look into some of their team actions, they demonstrate this is really not security; this is just security theater.

For example, back in 2011, VIPR teams searched passengers at an Amtrak station in Georgia after the people had gotten off the trains and, obviously, they served absolutely no purpose with regard to security whatsoever.

And if you think that you can escape the TSA and keep some of your integrity intact by simply not going to the airport anymore, by taking a bus, a train, driving your car, well, you're sorely mistaken. VIPR teams now randomly are pulling cars and trucks off the road. They did it down on Tennessee highways where they did a search, costing the drivers there countless hours and fuel as well.

And VIPR teams conducted a similar operation to search vehicles leaving a port down in Brownsville, Texas.

You see, the reach of the Transportation Security Administration, the TSA, has now expanded to such other areas and has even moved beyond transportation and has moved into sports stadiums as well.

How do we know that?

There was an article in, if no place else, the Huffington Post, where they reported back in January that the TSA was patrolling the Metrodome in Minnesota following a Vikings/Packers game. And you have to ask yourself, to what end?

A Los Angeles Times article revealed, despite conducting thousands upon thousands of operations:

TSA officials say there is absolutely no proof that these roving VIPR teams have foiled any terrorist plots or thwarted any major threat to public safety.

You see, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to continue to fund a program that, by its very own admission, has absolutely no record whatsoever of preventing a threat to public safety. And that is why I'm offering this amendment, to prevent funds from being made available to the VIPR teams to conduct searches outside of an airport.

As we come to the floor, always as good stewards of American taxpayers, Congress should not fund the expansion of TSA responsibility, especially when we know these operations are more appropriately handled by local law enforcement agencies at the various levels of government.

This, I think, is truly a commonsense approach. This is a commonsense amendment, and it helps the TSA do its core function more efficiently and protect American air travelers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to work with the gentleman on this issue, but I cannot accept this amendment.

Following the 2004 Madrid train bombing and the 2005 London bombings that targeted civilians using public transportation, Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response, or VIPR teams, were developed to allow TSA to utilize Federal, State, and local law enforcement to protect our Nation's transportation system, including securing our surface transportation systems from the threat of terrorism.

TSA's Surface Transportation Security is responsible for assessing the risk of terrorist attacks for all nonaviation transportation modes. And the VIPR teams, which are specifically authorized in the 9/11 Act, play an important role in protecting our Nation's surface transportation systems.

Simply put, the presence of these teams is intended to promote confidence in our Nation's transport system by preventing terrorism to any mode of transportation, including surface transportation. Now is not the time to eliminate this important program which serves to secure our surface transportation systems from acts of terrorism.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. So I agree with the gentleman that we should add confidence to our travelers; but I would ask the gentleman from Texas what confidence can we have in a program that, by its own admission, says they have not foiled a singular terrorist plot; by its own admission says that they are screening people after they got off the train instead of before they get on; by its own admission says that

these programs are not mandatory, and that means that when you go to a rail station, and you see them there, if you were a true terrorist then you would say, I'm not going to get in that line, I'm going to go over in that line.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, let me say that I listened to what you said before, and you don't need to be repetitive. I understand your concerns. And quite honestly, they're valid concerns; and I will, as chairman of this committee, with the assistance of Mr. PRICE, look into these arguments that you have made.

But at this time I cannot accept your amendment. And I don't need to hear the arguments a second time to accept your amendment. So I'm opposed to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman in opposing this amendment. This amendment would prohibit any funding from being utilized by our mobile Visible Intermodal Protection and Response teams, the VIPR teams.

These teams provide the ability for TSA to randomly screen passengers on mass transit and in our airports. They also work in concert with State and local law enforcement agencies. They provide a surge capacity beyond the local capability in order to be able to respond to intelligence information and special situations.

It's also important that exercises be conducted on a regular basis in order to test the concept of operations and develop the essential working relationship with local authorities.

As the chairman indicated, in our assessments after the attacks in Madrid and London, it became clear that we lacked the capability, lacked the ability to rapidly respond to threats quickly and to react with a show of force against potential threats. That's precisely the purpose of these VIPR teams.

The concept was authorized specifically by section 1303 of the 9/11 Act, a bill that passed this House with 371 votes.

We will address these problems, as the chairman has indicated, problems that the gentleman has identified, problems that deserve to be addressed. We will address the issues that you raise.

□ 1910

You, obviously, have legitimate concerns. But none of what the gentleman has said is an argument for eliminating the funding and for removing an important deterrent capability.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. I appreciate the fact that you would take a look at this. Would that this be the first time that I brought this bill to the floor and raised the egregious examples by the TSA in the past, I would hold some more weight to that, the fact that you would look at it. But this has been going on for years now.

To your point saying that we need them when there are specific threats, what TSA has told us is they're not doing this when there are specific threats. They're doing them random. They're going into sports stadiums for no particular reasons. They're going along highways for no particular reasons. They're stopping trucks for no particular reasons. Not because of a specific threat, but just because of random applications of it.

If this was a situation where we said we know there was a known attack coming or something of that sort and you want to apply it there, that would be one thing. But that's not what TSA does.

At this point in time, we are living in a country where, if you want to travel, you can go to the airport and they can say, you can't travel unless you go through TSA. But if I want to visit my mom in Florida, they can go to the train station and tell me I can't get on a train without going through TSA. And I can go to a bus station, and they can say I can't go on a bus without going through TSA. And I can get into my car and they can tell me that I cannot go in a car without going through TSA.

We have come to a point I cannot travel in this country without some Federal agency actually stopping me.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Reclaiming my time, with all due respect, I believe the gentleman is exaggerating the kind of situation that ordinary travelers encounter. I also understand, and hope he does, that these VIPR teams, if there's going to be the search capacity, if they're going to be there to respond to specific intelligence information, then they're going to have to remain in operation. It's certainly warranted for random collection and checking situations that may be problematic. I'm not saying there would never be abuses, never be intrusive behavior. But we need to correct that, not to come in with a meat ax and eliminate the funding.

So I simply reiterate my opposition to the amendment and ask our colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce section 1301(a) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the use of amounts made available by this Act for the ''Salaries and Expenses'' and ''Air and Marine Operations'' accounts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the expenses authorized to be paid in section 9 of the Jones Act (48 U.S.C. 795) and for the collection of duties and taxes authorized to be levied, collected, and paid in Puerto Rico, as authorized in section 4 of the Foraker Act (48 U.S.C. 740), in addition to the more specific amounts available for such purposes in the Puerto Rico Trust Fund pursuant to such provisions of law.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment last year, and it was adopted by voice vote. However, it was not included in the final Consolidated Appropriations Act enacted in March.

The homicide rate in Puerto Rico is about three times higher than any State, and most of these murders are linked to the international drug trade. Appropriately, the Federal Government is allocating substantial resources to combat drug trafficking organizations operating in the Central American corridor and along the Southwest border. However, those organizations are adapting, returning to smuggling routes through the Caribbean region that were heavily utilized in the 1980s and 1990s. As a result, the Coast Guard seized or disrupted over 17,000 pounds of drugs in the vicinity of Puerto Rico in 2012, a 600 percent increase over the previous year.

DEA seizures rose nearly 100 percent. CBP seizures were up nearly 40 percent. And in 2012, CBP seized more drugs in Puerto Rico than it did along the 180-mile border between Mexico and New Mexico. Meanwhile, the street price of drugs in Puerto Rico has decreased. This is a security problem of national scope, given that 80 percent of the drugs that enter Puerto Rico are subsequently transported to the U.S. mainland, where they destroy communities and lives.

Through various bills and accompanying reports, the House Appropriations Committee has expressed a view that DHS and DOJ should prioritize counterdrug efforts in the U.S. Caribbean to respond to the current crisis. As a case in point, the report for the 2013 DHS appropriations bill stated that the public safety and security issues of the U.S. territories in the Caribbean must be a priority, and that the committee expects the Secretary of Homeland Security to allocate resources, assets, and personnel to these jurisdictions accordingly.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection is on the front lines of the counterdrug fight. The agency has hundreds of personnel stationed in Puerto Rico. My amendment is designed to address a problem that arose in fiscal year 2011, one that continues to compromise the ability of CBP to carry out its vital counterdrug mission in Puerto Rico.

For over a century, Federal law has provided that the collection of certain duties and taxes in Puerto Rico by CBP or its predecessor agencies will be deposited in something called the Puerto Rico Trust Fund. Pursuant to the law and an implementing agreement between the Puerto Rico government and the Federal Government, a significant portion of that money is also used to fund certain Federal operations in Puerto Rico, including the maritime operations of CBP's Office of Air and Marine.

For many years, this arrangement worked well enough. However, because of a shortfall in the Puerto Rico Trust Fund of $1.7 million due to reduced customs collections in fiscal year 2011, CBP closed a critical boat unit in San Juan that in 2010 seized over 7,000 pounds of illegal drugs. CBP took this drastic action because it has interpreted current Federal law to require that it use either the Trust Fund or general congressional appropriations to fund its operations, but not both.

The amendment would simply give CBP the authority to supplement any funding from the Trust Fund with general appropriations made in this bill. This would make it easier for CBP to avoid any further reductions to its operations in Puerto Rico and, ideally, enable the agency to enhance those operations. The need for this amendment is underscored by the fact that the President's fiscal year 2014 budget predicts Trust Fund receipts of $98 million, which is $8.1 million less, or nearly 8 percent below Trust Fund receipts in fiscal year 2012.

I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member to ensure that this amendment, if adopted, remains in the final bill this year and to continuing to work with them to ensure the Department of Homeland Security, including CBP, has the resources it needs to adequately address the border protection challenges and drug-related violence in Puerto Rico.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I, too, commend the gentleman for his amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any change in the list of sharp objects prohibited under section 1540.111 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, from being carried by passengers as accessible property or on their person through passenger screening checkpoints or into airport sterile areas and the cabins of a passenger aircraft, as published in the Federal Register on August 31, 2005 (70 Fed. Reg. 51679).

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GRIMM. I rise today in support of my amendment that would prohibit any funds made available by this act from being used by TSA to implement changes to the current list of prohibited carry-on items for air travel.

□ 1920

Specifically, this amendment would stop TSA from allowing knives back on planes for the first time since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Today, following months of outrage from nearly every corner of the aviation community, and with our amendment looming tonight to block the policy, TSA abandoned its proposal to allow knives back on planes. I do commend TSA for reversing its irresponsible decision for one that is smart and prudent. However, we still need to pass this amendment tonight to make sure this is the law of the land and ensure that there will not be another reversal in the TSA's position regarding knives on planes.

We live in a post-9/11 world, and there is no excuse to take liberties when it comes to public safety. As a former Federal law enforcement agent, I know firsthand that even a two-inch knife can cause very serious harm when used by a trained individual. There's simply no place for a knife in an airplane cabin; and if one must travel with a knife, then they can check it in a bag.

Over the last 2 months, my colleagues and I have heard from flight attendants, air marshals, pilots, TSA screeners, and a whole host of airlines who are all 100 percent in agreement that allowing knives to be brought into the cabin of passenger planes is dangerous, it's unnecessary, and it's irresponsible.

Further, we've heard a chorus of objections to TSA's misguided proposal from groups such as the Coalition of Flight Attendants Union, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, Coalition of Airline Pilots Association, and American Federation of Government Employees, along with American Airlines, Delta Airlines, United Airlines, U.S. Airways and, most importantly, the American people. Their opposition makes it clear that permitting knives on planes creates unnecessary risk for airline passengers and those serving them at 30,000 feet.

In advocating for this change, TSA Administrator Pistole has stated: ''There have been no attempts by terrorists to use a knife to commit a terrorist act aboard an aircraft since 9/11.'' Well, the way I see it, this should be a great indicator that the current policy is working and needs to be kept in place and not repealed. Simply stating that there haven't been any terrorist attacks with knives on planes since 9/11 does not mean that the terrorists won't carry them out in the future.

I want to thank my cosponsors of this amendment—Representatives MARKEY, COOK, SWALWELL, REED, ROS-LEHTINEN and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ—who have stood in strong opposition to TSA's decision to jeopardize America's security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, over the last 11 years we have had zero attacks on our airlines where a knife was involved. Zero attacks. That number cannot get better. However, as we saw on September 11, that number—tragically—can get much worse.

So I rise in support of the Grimm-Markey-Cook-Swalwell-Reed-Jackson Lee amendment, which would prevent the Transportation Security Administration from changing its prohibitive item list—also known as the PIL—and allowing small knives on airplanes. I want to thank the amendment's cosponsors for their hard work on this issue.

I also want to thank TSA Administrator John Pistole. Administrator Pistole announced today that the TSA will not allow knives on airplanes. I think this is a strong step forward. And after listening to the stakeholders, his position is now that these knives should not be on airplanes.

Like many Americans in our country, I was deeply concerned and confounded when the administrator announced that they would consider allowing knives on airplanes. We saw after September 11 that, as my friend from New York mentioned, zero attacks occurred in our country.

We do now have new threats. The threat from liquids or IEDs could seriously jeopardize the safety of airlines and the passengers who ride on them. However, just because we have new threats that are posed against our airline safety does not mean that we should no longer consider old threats. The TSA must learn how to walk and chew gum at the same time.

So I was proud to work with my friend from New York to organize a letter, along with Congressman THOMPSON, as our ranking member on Homeland Security, and objected to that policy—in particular, the failure of the TSA to consult with the key stakeholders who would be most affected by this change, such as flight attendants, passenger safety groups, and transportation screening officers as well. The letter had a total of 133 Members signing on to it. Congressmen GRIMM and MARKEY also organized a subsequent letter with a similar number of Members who signed on to it.

Just like my friend from New York, I also worked in law enforcement prior to coming to Congress. I worked as a local deputy district attorney in the district attorney's office in Alameda County. I also served under this Capitol dome as an intern when September 11 happened. I know what terrorists can do if they have a mission to hurt passengers. I also know, as a prosecutor, what a knife can do in a close, confined area. It's not difficult then to understand why so many Members chose to sign on to our letter.

TSA's mission, I want to remind the people of this body, is not only to protect the airline passengers from a terrorist attack; it's also to protect passenger safety in general.

TSA justified its decision by saying that it would allow the TSOs to move more quickly. However, when you put a limit now on what length of knife would be allowed, what the TSOs effectively become are NFL referees measuring first downs. You can imagine the scene. You have a knife coming through. The TSO can't determine how big it is, so he's got to take out the measuring tape, holding up a long line, preventing him from looking at liquids or other explosives and whether they could bring down an airline. And then he's got to declare if it's allowed or not, all the while bags are still moving through to be screened. This would actually make it harder to detect liquids than make it easier, as the TSA had announced.

Had the TSA meaningfully consulted with the stakeholders before announcing its proposal, these issues would have been addressed. But I do appreciate Administrator Pistole and his decision to put the policy on hold to give more time for input. And I appreciate his decision today stating that he no longer will allow knives on board.

Our amendment reaffirms the current ban of knives on planes. It would prohibit the TSA from making the change it had proposed and now has backed away from.

Our amendment is supported by a number of groups, including the Coalition of Flight Attendants Union, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Coalition of Airline Pilots Association, and American Federation of Government Employees.

It's important that we pass this amendment today to show that the House stands with these groups and the flying public in rejecting knives on airplanes.

I again want to thank my colleagues who are cosponsors of this amendment—Mr. GRIMM from New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COOK, Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. REED. I appreciate their efforts.

I encourage all Members to support our amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. To the managers of this important legislation, to Judge CARTER and to Mr. PRICE, thank you for working on what is an enormously important message and mission of our Nation, and that is to secure America.

I'm grateful to have the opportunity to work with the authorizers, Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, and to work with the ranking member and chairperson of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RICHMOND.

Having just flown in from a memorial, and as Members often do, and as we interact with our constituents, we know a lot about flying. So it is very important that this amendment be taken as it has been offered.

I congratulate my cosponsors—Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SWALWELL and Mr. COOK—all of whom we have worked together with.

For it is interesting that this has come to a point where today we can thank Administrator Pistole for his thoughtfulness in this process and the deliberations that took place, that the announcement comes that he too understands that allowing knives on planes is not the right decision.

But in addition to the important statement of knives, we now know that other accessories, such as baseball bats and billiard cues and ski poles and hockey sticks and la crosse sticks, among others, and golf clubs, likewise have been included in his statement.

This amendment deals with knives. The reason why this is very important is because we should reaffirm the fact, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee—and for many of us who started on this committee after the heinous tragedy of 9/11, many of us who went to Ground Zero during the recovery period because of the horrific tragedy, smoke was still billowing from those terrible tragic issues—we too know what homeland security is. It is a promise to America to do everything we can to ensure the security of the homeland.

□ 1930

And so it is important to take note of Administrator Pistole's very thoughtful concern, and that concern, of course, was the idea of security. This amendment will give comfort to the issue of security.

We know there are issues of safety. We want to make sure that seatbelts are on, and we want to make sure that seats work and bathroom doors work on a plane in flight. We want to make sure that passengers remain in seats during difficult weather.

But security is an important question. And today, this amendment takes a stand for security. I am glad that after 9/11 we did have reinforced doors for the cockpit, we did have the ability of pilots to be trained and to be able to have weapons on board behind that cockpit—all in the name of security. Well, let me tell you, that a knife that has been measured by the eye, that then is allowed to get on the plane, it can be a weapon against security.

And today, we are saying that we need to codify in law the idea that knives will never be allowed to be on planes. Human beings are in the cockpit, our very able pilots. And flight attendants and passengers, grandmas and family vacationers and college students and business persons and our warriors, both wounded and not, and many others travel on airplanes, going home to loved ones, traveling to funerals, and going to joyful occasions.

It is very clear that a knife can be a threat to security. It can be a threat to security because, in fact, even as our valiant flight attendants who have been given required flight attendant training, which we are continuing to work on, they will be the first to stand up against an individual attempting to take a plane or to be able to threaten all of the passengers, to create an insecure atmosphere. And who knows what pilots will be thinking of, will be required to do? Who knows what an unmanned, un-air marshaled plane, or even one with an air marshal, will do when there are a number of those who are on the flight with knives.

So I ask my colleagues to vote for security and vote for the Grimm-Markey-Jackson Lee-Reed-Swalwell-Cook amendment to keep knives off of planes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Congressman MARKEY, GRIMM, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, ROS-LEHTINEN, REED, SWALWELL, and COOK, my cosponsors on this important and bipartisan amendment.

This simple, commonsense amendment, which will keep knives off commercial airplanes, will save lives and increase air transportation security by making it the law of the land.

Mr. Chair, this amendment is needed because on March 5, 2013, the Transportation Security Administration publicly announced its intention to permit passengers, effective April

25, 2013, to bring previously banned items in their carry-on baggage when boarding flights.

Under the new policy proposed by TSA, prohibited items that would be permitted effective that date include items that are potentially dangerous, even lethal, to passengers, flight attendants, pilots, and Federal air marshals, including hockey sticks, lacrosse sticks, golf clubs, and, alarmingly, some knives.

Those of us who were in the Capitol that day remembered with shock and horror how the terrorists who attacked the United States of America on September 11, 2001, used box cutters, small knives, and razor blades to threaten and overpower crew members and pilots on commercial airplanes in order to gain access to the cockpits.

After learning of the action contemplated by TSA, me and more that 135 of my House colleagues wrote the TSA Administrator and urged him unsuccessfully to reconsider changing the PIL to permit knives on planes.

In light of this unhelpful response, I introduced H. Res. 156, a bipartisan resolution with my colleague, Congressman GRIMM of New York, which expresses the House's disapproval of the Transportation Security Administration's decision to modify the prohibited items list, set to take effect on April 25, 2013, that would allow passengers to bring small knives in their carry-on baggage.

More importantly, the resolution strongly expressed the sense of the House that TSA delay any changes to the Prohibited Items List indefinitely and should conduct a formal engagement process involving all of the affected stakeholders and has meaningful consultations with affected air travel industry stakeholders, including flight attendants.

After engaging in the process called for in my resolution, TSA today announced that it was abandoning its efforts to change the PIL to permit knives on planes.

Mr. Chair, allowing passengers to carry knives on planes could be fatal to flight attendants.

Beyond the terrorist threat posed by knives on planes, knives can become deadly threats in the hands of unruly passengers.

Changing TSA policy to allow knives on planes is not efficient.

Instead of the simple rule of ''No Knives,'' TSA screeners will be required to check for all of the parameters set by the TSA as acceptable. This will increase waiting times, not shorten them.

Mr. Chair, on April 9, 2013, the nation was reminded of the terrible harm that small knives can inflict on victims when a mass stabbing occurred on the campus of Lone Star College in Houston, Texas, which is in my congressional district, during which the suspect used a razor utility knife and severely injured 14 people.

The American public, air travel industry stakeholders, and Federal air marshals strongly disapprove of allowing knives on planes because it puts their lives at risk.

This amendment enhances security and will save lives. That is why it is necessary and supported by:

Coalition of Flight Attendants Unions

Association of Professional Flight Attendants

Association of Flight Attendants-CWA

IAMAW (Machinists and Aerospace Workers)

Transport Workers Union Local 556, International Brotherhood of Teamsters

Coalition of Airline Pilots Association

American Federation of Government Employees.

I urge all Members to join us in supporting this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am also not going to object to this amendment given TSA's decision of this afternoon, the decision that has, I believe, made the amendment largely irrelevant. I do want to express my appreciation for the concerns addressed here tonight by the sponsors of this amendment and the stakeholders that many of us have heard from.

I want to take just a second, though, to underscore that TSA did not propose these changes haphazardly. The proposal that is being attacked here tonight and that has been reversed here today by the agency, that proposal was the result of a risk-based approach to TSA's security requirements.

I also remind the House that the current TSA administrator, Mr. Pistole, is a 26-year veteran at the FBI. I've been impressed by his willingness to stand by the data, stand by what objective analysis dictates, whether that means reconsidering a regulation or insisting that it remain in place.

Since the International Civil Aviation Organization changed its standards to prevent passengers from carrying small pocketknives in 2010, more than 5 billion commercial airline passengers on a flight originating outside the United States have traveled without incident.

And I do think it's ironic, Mr. Chairman, that after all these years of Members complaining about long wait times and passengers having to take off their shoes and their coats and their belts, they have to take out those laptops, take out those liquids, that TSA now does something to speed up security lines and suddenly Members want to reverse that decision on the floor of this House. I hope we are not going to get into the habit of overturning risk-based decisions, threat-based decisions on the floor of this House.

But as I say, the amendment before us is now largely irrelevant, so I have no objection to its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF OHIO

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Homeland Security who approves any of the following petitions:

(1) A Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Form I–130, Petition for Alien Relative, in a case in which Brazil is the beneficiary's place of birth (as provided on such form).

(2) A Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Form I–129F, Petition for Alien Fiancé(e), in a case in which Brazil is the alien fiancé(e)'s country of citizenship (as provided on such form).

(3) A Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Form I–140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, in a case in which Brazil is the country of citizenship or country of nationality (as provided on such form) of the alien for whom the petition is being filed.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as has been read, this doesn't allow petitions for relatives, fiances, or workers coming from Brazil.

And I first want to say thank you to Judge CARTER—Chairman CARTER—and Mr. PRICE. We passed a very similar amendment out of the Appropriations Committee that was dinged here a little bit earlier. This is a narrowly tailored version of that.

I rise today not because I want to. Many of us come here because we want to offer amendments. I don't necessarily want to offer this amendment. But I'm offering this amendment on behalf of Major Karl Hoerig. And I would like to tell the House of Representatives a brief story about Karl, who flew 200 missions for our country in Iraq and Afghanistan.

On March 10 of 2007, Major Karl Hoerig's wife went out and bought a .357 Magnum and went to a shooting range. She purchased ammo and asked, ''what ammo can I buy here that best kills.'' Two days later, Claudia Hoerig shot Major Karl Hoerig in my congressional district.

She fled to Brazil, where she was from. She could not be extradited, so we were told, because we don't have a treaty with Brazil in order to extradite their citizens, which would make sense. But later throughout the investigation, we found out that in August of 1999 Claudia Hoerig renounced her Brazilian citizenship and said she was a citizen of the United States, which gives us every right to have her come back and extradited back to the United States.

□ 1940

Now, this woman shot a war hero. She renounced her Brazilian citizenship, and she now is drinking Rum Runners in Rio de Janeiro, walking around freely in Brazil while Carl Hoerig's family is sitting in Newton Falls, Ohio—his brother, his parents—wondering why we can't bring this woman back into the United States for justice.

Now, many people would say, Well, why are you offering an amendment? Why are you trying to defund visas? It's because I've been working on this since 2007. I've got a stack of letters here that go back to Alberto Gonzales—now, many Members of this Congress don't even know who he was—then Condoleezza Rice, then Secretary Clinton, on and on and on to try to get the attention of people, and it takes an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to say we're not going to be able to fund visas anymore.

I don't have any problem with Brazil—we've got a good relationship with them—but they have a woman who killed one of our airmen who flew 200 missions to Iraq and Afghanistan. If you want to talk about a safe haven: if the kids from the Boston massacre a few weeks back instead of going to the 7–Eleven had got on a flight and had gone to Brazil, they'd be sitting in Brazil right now, and we wouldn't be able to get them back here.

I recognize that these are extraordinary actions, but there is a long process ahead before this bill becomes law. We've gotten the Brazilians' attention, and now it's time for us not to take the pressure off, but to allow this process to continue until Claudia Hoerig is back in the United States and getting prosecuted in Trumbull County, Ohio.

It should be known, too, to this House that al Qaeda is setting up shop in Brazil—planning attacks, training people in Brazil right now—and we have no mechanism. If someone were to commit a terrorist act here in the United States and flee to Brazil, we would not be able to get him back.

I think this amendment sends a signal to the Brazilians, hopefully in the long term, to renegotiate treaties and to talk of extradition, but also in the short term to get Claudia Hoerig back into the United States. I would just like to end, Mr. Chairman, with a quote from Carl Hoerig's dad, Ed Hoerig.

He said:

Our government is supposed to be the most powerful country in the world, and they are turning their back on a 25-year veteran. It's wrong. When you say the Pledge of Allegiance, the last sentence is '' . . . and justice for all.'' They are turning their back on my son's justice.

Let's right this wrong, Mr. Chairman, and pass this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the Weekly Standard, Apr. 7, 2011]

AL QAEDA IN BRAZIL?

(By Jaime Daremblum)

The Brazilian magazine Veja is reporting that al Qaeda members have established an active presence in South America's largest country, as have militants associated with Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups. They are apparently engaged in fundraising, recruitment, and strategic planning. Earlier this week, Aldo Donzis, a leading figure in the Argentine Jewish community, spoke to the JTA news agency and voiced alarm about the revelations.

''We have high concern about fundamentalist movements in Latin America and about recruitment activities of fundamentalist movements,'' Donzis said. ''We shared this information with Latin American parliamentarians last July and they agreed with our information. But the situation is getting worse. In Argentina, we have seen graffiti written in Arabic calling for jihad which coincided with the visit of Iranians here. Also, this graffiti was seen in Bolivia. We understand that Brazil needs to feel worried and act.''

Terrorists have long found haven in South America's so-called Triple Frontier, which encompasses the intersection of Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay. This area is known for being a Wild West of lawlessness, drug trafficking, and organized crime. Argentina is especially sensitive to increased terrorist activity in the region. During the 1990s, it suffered two deadly bombings orchestrated by Hezbollah and Iran. The first (in 1992) destroyed the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires; the second (in 1994) demolished a Jewish community center in the same city.

Speaking of Iran, the head of U.S. Southern Command, General Douglas Fraser, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Tuesday and declared that ''Iran continues expanding regional ties to support its own diplomatic goal of reducing the impact of international sanctions connected with its nuclear program. While much of Iran's engagement in the region has been with Venezuela and Bolivia, it has nearly doubled the number of embassies in the region in the past decade and hosted three regional heads of state in 2010.''

General Fraser expressed concern that ''there are flights between Iran and Venezuela on a weekly basis, and visas are not required for entrance into Venezuela or Bolivia or Nicaragua.'' He also confirmed that ''members of violent extremist organizations from the Middle East remain active in Latin America and the Caribbean and constitute a potential threat. Hezbollah supporters continue to raise funds within the region to finance their worldwide activities. Several entities affiliated with Islamic extremism are increasing efforts to recruit adherents in the region, and we continue to monitor this situation closely.''

Yet another reason for the Obama administration to rethink its passive approach to Latin America.

[From the Telegraph, 3 Apr. 2011]

BRAZIL LATEST BASE FOR ISLAMIC EXTREMISTS

(By Robin Yapp)

With preparations for the 2014 World Cup in Brazil and the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro well under way, security experts have expressed fears that terrorists are ''taking advantage'' of weaknesses in the country's laws.

Brazil has not passed any specific anti-terrorism legislation, does not recognize Hezbollah or Hamas as terrorist groups and disbanded the Federal Police's anti-terrorism service in 2009.

Now, Veja, a weekly news magazine, has had access to reports compiled by the service as well as documents about the terrorist threat sent to Brazil by the FBI, CIA, Interpol and the US Treasury.

It says the papers show 21 men linked to Islamic extremist groups including al-Qaeda, have been using Brazil for various purposes including controlling inflows of money and planning attacks.

They include Khaled Hussein Ali, who was born in Lebanon but now lives in Sao Paulo, Brazil's biggest city, from where he runs an internet cafe.

However, according to Veja he is also in control of an online communications arm of al-Qaeda called Jihad Media Battalion, which has a presence in 17 countries around the world and spreads communications from al-Qaeda leaders as well as publicising attacks.

Another of those named is Mohsen Rabbani, an Iranian wanted by Interpol as the suspected architect of bombings on Jewish targets in Buenos Aires in the 1990s that killed 114 people.

According to the documents, he frequently slips in and out of Brazil on a false passport and has recruited at least 24 youngsters in three Brazilian states to attend ''religious formation'' classes in Tehran. ''Without anybody noticing, a generation of Islamic extremists is appearing in Brazil,'' said Alexandre Camanho de Assis, who coordinates Brazil's network of public prosecutors across 13 states.

The papers also show that the US Treasury described the poorly policed Tri-border area, where Brazil, Argentina and Paraguay meet, as a ''financial artery'' for Hizbollah. Daniel Lorenz, a former head of the Federal Police's intelligence department and now Security Secretary for the Federal District, that includes the capital Brasilia, warned that Brazil risks being caught out. ''The terrorists are taking advantage of the fragility of Brazilian legislation,'' he said.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I must reluctantly oppose this amendment. I do not want to minimize in the least the unacceptable nature of the present state of affairs, and I do not want to minimize in the least the brute fact that a murderer is presently escaping justice. I also do not want to minimize the service that this man gave to our country. As a chaplain in the Air Force and as a pastor for over 11 years, it has been, unfortunately, my duty on many occasions to have to deliver news of one who has either been killed in action or of one who has died tragically. With that, my heart bleeds and my heart hurts for this family. In this situation, I commend my friend from across the aisle for his dedication to bringing this person to justice; and right now there is the inescapable fact of a problem going on.

However, the remedy proposed by the author of this amendment raises issues of such magnitude that they need to be resolved through regular order, through the Judiciary Committee's hearing and markup process.

I, personally, pledge to work with Mr. RYAN to examine in the Judiciary Committee the issues of foreign nations' compliance with extradition requests. On behalf of Chairman GOODLATTE, I pledge to examine the possibility of withdrawing the right of nationals of non-cooperating countries to enter the U.S. Certainly, our Crime Subcommittee has the expertise on the extradition issue and the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee has the expertise on immigration.

This is not the first time we have faced such troubling issues. For instance, it is very often the case that foreign nations refuse to accept the return of their citizens who have been ordered deported to the U.S. The DHS' Office of Inspector General reported:

As of June 2004, more than 133,662 illegal aliens with or pending final orders of removal had been apprehended and released into the United States . . . unlikely to ever be repatriated if ordered removed because of the unwillingness of their countries of origin to provide the documents necessary for repatriation.

Some of those aliens, from countries such as China, have gone on to kill Americans once released.

Last Congress, the Judiciary Committee considered legislation by Mr. POE that would have withheld temporary visas from nationals of countries that would not accept back their deported citizens. It is important to note that the legislation would not have just impacted a single foreign country, but would have penalized all bad actors on an equal basis.

I do need to mention that there are also humanitarian concerns with implementing this amendment. In 2012, over 11,000 Brazilians received green cards—immigrant visas. Among these Brazilians were 8,000 ''immediate relatives'' of U.S. citizens—the spouses, minor children and parents of U.S. citizens. So we just have to keep in mind that by enacting this amendment we would be preventing thousands of U.S. citizens from reuniting with their Brazilian spouses, children, and parents.

Again, it is with a hurt heart that I have to rise in opposition to this amendment, but the good intentions of the gentleman from across the aisle do not override the larger concerns when dealing with this proposition in the issue of your amendment. So with that and for these reasons I have set out, I must oppose this amendment, but I do look forward to working to resolve this distressing situation with the author.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. RICHMOND. I stand in support of my colleague from Ohio.

Part of being a legislator and part of having the responsibility of being elected to this body and representing people back home is you have the use of the tools that are in front of you to accomplish the goals that you need to accomplish. As we stress regular order and as we talk about the Judiciary Committee, right now, today—right here on the floor of this House—we have the ability as Congressmen to make a difference for a family whose hero was killed. We know who the perpetrator is, and nothing is being done about it.

So I share in my colleague's frustration, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and I am going to be brief.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CARTER, and I want to thank Mr. PRICE and just say that I believe this is a homeland security issue. This is an appropriate venue for that. As the gentleman from Louisiana said, there is a level of frustration here because we have been working on this, pursuing regular order now since 2007, and we have gotten nowhere. As I said, this woman is walking around in Brazil as a free woman when Carl Hoerig, who flew almost 200 missions for our country, is dead.

This process has a long way to go. We're not anywhere close to this bill's becoming law. We've got a lot of time between today and that day. So let's work today to try to increase the pressure to try to get justice for Carl Hoerig and to try to make this situation right.

Again, I thank everyone. I don't want to be here offering this amendment, because of the situation; but I promised this family I would do everything in my power to get justice for their son and to get this woman. So help me God, I'm going to do everything I can to get this woman back here whether it's this bill or bills in the future. So I ask the Members of this House to please, please, please support this amendment on behalf of Carl Hoerig in his service to our country.

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

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

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

Mr. SALMON. I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for standing so strong for an American patriot. I believe his motives are extremely noble and good, but I don't believe this is the right way to handle it.

I am the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs. Brazil comes under my purview. While we have points of trouble with all of our bilateral relationships, we don't necessarily throw the baby out with the bath water.

□ 1950

This is an extreme measure. It would punish a lot of very innocent people who my colleague spoke of right before me, innocent people that are trying to immigrate or come work or study in the United States from Brazil.

I want to commit to the gentleman from Ohio that, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I will do everything within my power to work with him, if it requires hearings, whatever it takes. I want to help you bring justice. I do not believe that this is the right way to do it. In fact, I think it would be very counterproductive in our relationship with Brazil.

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

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 5____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, carry out, administer, or enforce section 1308(h) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(h)).

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act was passed in order to make the flood insurance program both actuarially sound and functionally sound. And we hope that it is on track to make it actuarially sound, but it is not functionally sound, so this attempts to address this.

What this bill would do is that section 207—and only 207—would not allow it to be implemented for 1 year. After that, it would begin to be implemented.

Let me first say that the CBO has scored this as zero, and it has no impact upon the Federal Treasury.

The reason to do this, though, is that FEMA does not yet have the methodology by which to implement this program. Indeed, there was a GAO report from 2008 which shows that FEMA's rate-setting process warrants attention. As it turns out, they haven't updated it since 2008. So their over 20-year methodology still does not apply.

As it turns out, families are being terribly affected. There's one family in Louisiana which has never flooded and yet has a 6,000 percent increase in their premium. Clearly, this has grave implications for this family, but, as it turns out, it has turned their whole real estate market upside down. People can't build and people can't sell. There is an uncertainty there created by the implementation of this particular section.

Let me emphasize that this is only section 207. All other sections continue, and the CBO score is zero.

Knowing that others would like to comment upon this, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Back home, I've talked to thousands of my constituents and had thousands of my constituents talk back to me, scream back to me, and cry in my arms because of the impact of this legislation. Right now what they're facing is a double whammy when it comes to flood insurance. They face the likelihood of higher rates and incorrect flood maps.

FEMA has drafted new maps that completely ignore the facts on the ground. The maps disregard nonstructural features, like marshland and forest and our investment into restoring our coast. It also ignores the investment and sacrifices by locals to build their own levees. These communities are investing in their own safety, in their own security, and FEMA should recognize that.

In many of these communities, like the west side of St. Charles Parish, the levees are more than 100 years old, and many of these communities have not flooded in 100 years. If that's not 100-year flood protection, I don't know what is.

You see, for too long, the National Flood Insurance Program wasn't on stable footing. Since the last long-term authorization expired in 2008, we had to pass nine short-term extensions. During that time, the program lapsed five times. The last time, in June of 2010, approximately 47,000 home sales were delayed or canceled.

Due to the leadership of my colleague, Representative WATERS, last July we passed the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act. The bill put the program on stable footing for 5 years, but the rate increases FEMA has quoted are astronomical and unintended. Homeowners who played by the rules and built their homes according to the guidelines in place are being told that their insurance is going to go up hundreds of percent. What is even more shocking is that many of these homes have never flooded.

For instance, a homeowner in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana, who was paying $338 per year for flood insurance will now have to pay $23,000 per year with new maps. Another homeowner in the same town will go from $365 to $28,000 per year.

If this stands, people will be forced to give up their homes, burdening the banks and killing the real estate markets. We cannot, in good conscience, stand here and let this law force people to give up their homes, to give up on the American Dream and destroy hardworking, taxpaying citizens. these taxpayers depended on and followed the rules and lost. We cannot turn our backs on them.

I have a bill that will fix much of this without a score, and I'm proud that Representative WATERS and the entire Louisiana delegation have signed on. The homebuilders and the Realtors support this amendment and my bill.

This amendment would give homeowners immediate relief. Therefore, I urge you to join me in supporting this amendment so that we can fix these issues while keeping the National Flood Insurance Program on sure footing and make sure that we don't leave hardworking families across the Nation on their own. Because, as we come here and do things in theory, a lot of times we miss what happens in reality and what's on the ground; and if the we don't change this law, reality is going to set in and people are going to lose their homes. They won't be able to sell them, and we will create another disaster of national proportion with unintended consequences that we never tried to do.

I ask that we support my colleague in this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this kind of reminds me of a story about a World War I Navy veteran that went back home to Ware County where he loved to coon hunt. And this gentleman, after having being injured, got a wooden peg leg. One day, he took his boys out. They were all around the campfire. It was kind of cool that night. They were waiting for the dogs to tree one. So he got a little bit close to the fire, and it burned about 8 inches off of his wooden peg. So all of a sudden, the hounds start baying, and he gets up and starts running. He ran about 20 yards and turned around and said, ''Watch out, boys. There's a hole every other step.''

There's some holes in what this amendment is trying to do. First of all, you've got to remember that this bill was just passed a year ago, and it was the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform bill, where we're trying to reform the flood insurance program. Let me remind people that 406 Members voted in favor of this, and every Member that I see down here that is talking to try to relieve this voted for the bill. Everybody in the Louisiana delegation, everybody in the Mississippi delegation, everybody in the New York delegation—with the exception of one—and everybody in the New Jersey delegation voted for it.

This bill was passed by a unanimous vote, bipartisan, because everybody realized, especially after the effects of Katrina and others, where, in 2005, before Katrina, they had a credit card limit of $1.5 billion, after Katrina, we raised that credit card limit to $20 billion. After Sandy, we raised the credit limit another $10 billion. So right now we've got $30 billion on our credit card. And you know what? In 2017, that has to go back to $1 billion.

If you look at the amount of money that we've had to borrow to pay for this—and I voted for the $9.7 billion because it's an obligation that I think that we had to the people that had flood insurance. That was an obligation that we have.

But the way most insurance works is that if you are at a higher risk, you pay a higher premium. If, for some reason, my car keeps running into things accidentally, my car insurance is probably going to go up. And anybody that has extenuating circumstances, whether you're in a fire zone or whatever it is, your insurance rates are based on that.

□ 2000

The difference is, unfortunately, that the government fashioned, the government-run flood insurance program does not require homeowners in flood-prone areas to pay for their fair share. In fact, premiums in flood-prone areas are so low that FEMA has needed a bailout, as I mentioned, three times in the last 8 years.

Due to FEMA's failures last year, Congress passed a bipartisan Biggert-Waters bill of insurance reform. It was supported, as I mentioned, by these delegations. This landmark 5-year authorization is something that even people here said, We need to do this. In fact, I will quote:

It is imperative that Congress act as quickly as possible to pass a 5-year extension of flood insurance so that policyholders can have some assurance moving forward.

This is by one of the authors of the amendment.

Section 207 does something that no other flood bill has done before. It says that homeowners in flood zones must pay an amount that accurately reflects their risk of flooding. Notably, Congress recognized this section may place a burden on some homeowners in flood-prone areas. So, to address this concern, section 207 specifically stated that the rate increase must be phased in over 5 years, not to exceed a 20 percent increase each year. The outcome is commonsense reforms that are supported by Republicans and Democrats, alike, that balance concerns of homeowners and taxpayers.

Now, I'm no supporter of the government-mandated flood insurance, but these are bipartisan reforms that you don't often see passed in Washington. Let's don't back up. Let's keep going forward. The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act was designed to get FEMA out of this constant bailout, but to be fair to people who experienced frequent flooding. Importantly, these bipartisan reforms were enacted less than a year ago in the Financial Services Committee. We have not even held a hearing on the implementation. This does not need to be in an appropriations bill. It needs to go back to Financial Services and let us look at it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY). I am pleased to say that my colleagues, Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. RICHMOND, and I have worked to address this important issue in an ongoing, bipartisan way.

The National Flood Insurance Program was created in 1968 after record flooding led the private sector to abandon the flood insurance market and stop writing flood insurance policies. The program is a key component of the

Federal Government's efforts to minimize the damage and financial impact of floods. It is the only source of insurance against flood damage for most residents and provides much-needed coverage for 5.5 million homeowners and their families.

This is why I worked across the aisle with my colleague, Representative Judy Biggert, to reauthorize this program. Before this reauthorization, the flood insurance program was plagued by repeated lapses in authority, placing many local communities at risk. During those lapses, FEMA was not able to write new policies, renew expiring policies, or increase coverage limits, causing great uncertainty for millions of homeowners who depend on the program's existence.

The Biggert-Waters bill was instrumental in stabilizing the flood insurance program. It provided a 5-year reauthorization and made critical improvements to the program. The reforms in Biggert-Waters gave communities more input into flood maps and strengthened the financial position of the flood insurance program.

In drafting this bill with then-Chairwoman Judy Biggert, I sought to strike the right balance between protecting homeowners and strengthening the flood insurance program. This law was intended to reauthorize the flood insurance program in a sustainable way. The intent was not to impose punitive or unaffordable rate hikes that could make it difficult for some to remain in their homes. You heard the testimony from Mr. RICHMOND about the incredible increases in the premium costs. This is why I am extremely concerned about reports that homeowners in certain areas are facing high and unsustainable flood insurance rates.

I have committed to work with FEMA and with my colleagues here in Congress to address this unintended consequence of this otherwise helpful legislation, so I am supporting the gentleman's amendment today. This would prohibit FEMA from using funds made available in this act to implement one provision from Biggert-Waters that has raised an unintended consequence and requires further study before being implemented.

While the gentleman's amendment is a positive first step in addressing this issue, more needs to be done.

Last month, my friend from Louisiana, Mr. RICHMOND, and I introduced H.R. 2199, the Flood Insurance Implementation Reform Act of 2013, a bill on which Mr. CASSIDY is an original cosponsor, that would take additional steps to provide meaningful relief and address the issue of affordability. The bill would delay implementation of changes to grandfathered rates, the subject of Mr. CASSIDY's amendment, for 3 years instead of 1 year. It would also delay implementation of the rate changes that FEMA is currently rolling out.

I look forward to continuing to work with my friends on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the Biggert-Waters Act is implemented in a balanced way to ensure the flood insurance program's stability and affordability. FEMA's current implementation schedule would upset that delicate balance and unintentionally impact families and local communities.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 2199 and to also vote ''aye'' on this amendment.

Let me just say to those who would represent that we all voted for it: so since we voted for it and we worked together, we worked across the aisle, Democrats and Republicans working together, that somehow we can't make amends or changes that are desperately needed, working together. I think it is extremely important when you have Mr. CASSIDY over there and you have WATERS over here, one of the original authors of the bill, who are talking about something has happened, unintended consequences that have taken place that will cause homeowners to lose their homes.

Now, it's easy if this does not happen in your communities or in your districts. But, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know that this is an interdependent business that we're in, and to the degree we recognize other people's problems and we're willing to stand up and give support, particularly when it talks about homeownership, when it talks about that which is so important to all of us, that we should work together, and I would urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MULVANEY. I rise today to speak against the amendment. And I think there's one thing that has been overlooked in this debate so far, Mr. Chairman, which is not only was this provision in the bill originally in order to bring sustainability to the flood program, it was also designed to bring fairness to the flood program.

What do I mean by that?

Yes, the original bill was designed to raise flood rates on some people. It was also designed to lower them on other people. You heard the gentleman from Louisiana properly state that this amendment would have no score, have no impact. The CBO scored it at zero. No impact on the deficit; no impact on spending. Absolutely true.

The underlying language in the bill was scored the exact same way. When we passed this bill last year, that provision scored out at zero because the CBO assumed, on its own—it's not required by statute to do this, but it did this on its own. The CBO assumed that when rates went up on some people, they would go down on others. That seems to make a lot of sense; doesn't it? That we would have an insurance program that would actually charge folks more who are in riskier areas, but also seek to charge people less who are in less risky areas. I think that's important. I think it bears stating that if this amendment passes, yes, folks who live in high-risk areas will see lower premiums, but the folks who live in low-risk areas will see higher premiums.

We have a chance here to bring some sanity to something in a government program. We have a chance to bring reason and rational thought to this government program by saying people who are in riskier areas should pay more. Are there protections there? Yes. Are they necessary? Absolutely. But at the end of the day, this program was designed to bring some sanity to this flood program, which is why so many people, myself included, voted for this originally.

I absolutely think this is well-intentioned. I disagree with the impression that these are unintended consequences. These are the exact intended consequences of the underlying bill, that we would simply charge folks who are in risky areas more.

□ 2010

If you live 7 feet below sea level in New Orleans, your rates probably should go up. If you live 600 feet above someplace else, your rates possibly should go down.

I think it's important to know that, yes, there are people in my State who will pay more because of this law. There are also people in my district who will pay less, and that will be turned on its ear if this amendment passes.

So I would encourage us to consider that what we did last year was accurate and correct and brought some much-needed sanity to this program.

With that, I yield the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And let me just say that, you know, FEMA—this does not go into effect this year. In fact, the Louisiana FEMA has been told not to give out these rates because they don't know, they've been trying to do a flood map for 30 years.

Now, if we think a 1-year extension is going to help them, we're misleading ourselves. And, in fact, from my legislative experience, when you extend it for 1 year, then you're asked to extend it again. Look at the student loans. We extended it for 1 year, now they want to extend it for 2 more. It's a constant extension.

My experience has been most court cases are settled on the courthouse steps when the pressure is put on both people to settle.

I think that this is bringing to a head the fact that FEMA needs to get their act together, along with the Corps, and get these flood maps done. By us giving them another year extension, it's not going to do anything but delay us getting these updated maps for another

year. I promise you, that's the way government works.

So we need to understand that, on the one hand, we're saying, well, FEMA has given out all these new rates. It's going to go to 20,000 bucks or whatever it is.

But on the same hand we're saying hey, they don't have the capability of doing a flood map. You can't have it both ways. You know, either FEMA can do it or they can't do it.

But we need to do this through the Financial Services Committee, where the ranking member, the gentlelady from California, was a big part of what we did in the Biggert-Waters bill. And so why don't we take it and go back through Financial Services, where this bill came from, rather than trying to do it through an appropriations bill?

That's the reason this process is so messed up here that we try to do things like this.

So, my concern is that this is the wrong place to try to amend this bill. We need to have hearings. We need to have oversight of FEMA and find out how the implementation of this bill is going, and put the pressure on FEMA and the Corps to finally get these maps straightened out.

But for somebody to have a home that's 7 feet below flood level and pay $329 a year in a premium doesn't make sense.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. CASSIDY. I'd also like to thank my colleagues across the aisle, Ms. WATERS and Mr. RICHMOND, for their support.

I do want to clarify one thing, because I think that the statement was made that it's not an unintended consequence for premiums to go up and go down, and that is true. But the unintended consequence that we're speaking about is the consequence that many of those that have lived in these areas for 40 or 50 years are suddenly going to lose their homes because of an extreme rise in premiums upwards of $15,000 and more. So that's the unintended consequence. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear.

And I know this, not because I, myself, live on the coast in a flood area, but because Superstorm Sandy left a trail of utter destruction in New York City, particularly in Staten Island and parts of Brooklyn, a destruction that was absolutely unprecedented in the city's history.

Tens of thousands, tens of thousands of my constituents found themselves homeless. Their lives were turned upside down, and they're wondering how they're ever going to rebuild or ever move forward. Quite simply, many of my constituents lost everything to Superstorm Sandy, and it will be years before their lives return to any sense of what I would consider normal.

So to ask these victims of a natural disaster who find themselves in this horrible position, through no fault of their own, to pay upwards of $15,000 a year in a flood insurance premium so soon after this disaster took everything from them amounts to nothing more than them being victimized yet again.

So if these premiums were to go into effect, the reality is simple. For many of my constituents, they're going to find themselves unable to pay both their mortgage and their flood premiums. And their property, in the best case scenario, will lose considerable value. But in the worst case it will become completely worthless. This, to me, is unacceptable.

And this is why I support delaying the implementation of section 207 of the Biggert-Waters Act, so that Congress will have the time to reexamine and look at these rate increases and consider ways to ensure the future viability of the flood insurance program while, at the same time, ensuring that flood insurance remains affordable to those that need it most.

So I ask my colleagues to consider all that these individuals have been through, all that they have lost, and bring some understanding to the unintended consequence of not only losing everything they've ever owned, but now, because of flood premiums, possibly losing the entire value of their home.

So I ask for their support on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield my time to Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

I would like to thank Mr. GRIMM for his eloquent description of precisely what can happen and what is happening, and his plea to all of us to ensure that we don't place people in the position of losing their homes because they cannot afford these extraordinary increases in premiums.

I met with residents from Plaquemines Parish who came to the Congress of the United States. All the elected officials and community leaders came together, and they came here to make a plea to us to understand that, with this increase in premiums, they certainly can't afford it, and they can't afford to sell it because nobody is going to buy it.

So Mr. GRIMM talked about victimization and the fact that we would be victimizing people who are victims of natural disasters twice, and that's precisely what it's all about. And I think that we are more caring than that.

I think that we understand that there's still a lot of things to be worked out. The flood maps have not been completed. The pricing has not been really dealt with, and so I think we need time. We need time in order to answer these questions, to deal with the complexities of what we're trying to do.

I think we can stabilize flood insurance. I think that is possible. But I, as one of the authors of this bill, I'm also making a plea to say that we did everything that we could to try and have a bill that's sustainable, that's viable, that makes good sense.

But as we review what is going on and the risk and the harm that people are now confronted with, we're saying, let's take a step backwards for a short period of time and let's give these victims, and other victims in other areas of this country, an opportunity to at least hold on to their homes and not have them literally taken away from them because we didn't realize these unintended consequences.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Congressman CASSIDY's amendment. I want to touch on a few things. First of all, when we talk about the need for reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program, there were many things that needed reform. In fact, the program had expired, lapsed, in some cases for a few hours, for a few days, multiple times over the last few years.

That's an inconsistency that I don't think any of us want to see in our economy when it literally meant home sales would have to be canceled. Realtors that were preparing to have a house sold, somebody that was buying a house, selling a house, couldn't even do that because banks require, in many cases, that flood insurance be attached to the mortgage.

□ 2020

And if there was no program for flood insurance, that means somebody couldn't even buy or sell a house. So it had an incredible disruption in our economy. But there's also the importance of making sure that the program is sustainable. When you look at what is flawed in the interpretation of FEMA, as we stand right now, a year after passage of the law, FEMA has admitted themselves they're not ready to implement the changes in the law.

I want to mention a few communities in particular because it highlights the problems that have maybe been misrepresented or maybe just not even understood by some people when they wonder about this program.

I'll use some examples of communities in my district in coastal Louisiana. Houma Terrebonne, for example. The Houma Terrebonne flood protection system was a system that was built by the people in those communities. It wasn't a Corps of Engineers

project. That community did not flood in Hurricane Katrina, did not flood in Hurricane Rita. It didn't flood in Hurricane Isaac. And yet if you look at what FEMA has done with a community like that, they don't even recognize that that flood protection exists. They decertified that levee; and so everybody in that community who never flooded, they never filed a claim.

There's this perception out there that these are people who flooded multiple times. These people in this community never flooded, even during Katrina, Rita, and Isaac; and yet FEMA has decertified their levee and said, basically, they don't have a levee. So somebody who's behind the levee protection system that worked for Katrina, FEMA has said that levee system doesn't exist. That person now is being faced with currently maybe a $500 premium that FEMA is telling them is going to go up to $15,000 a year.

Does anybody really think that a family making maybe $40,000, who has a home that never flooded, they never filed a claim, and now FEMA is going to tell them you have to pay $15,000 a year just for your flood insurance? I think one of the reasons CBO said there's no score on this is they recognize that person can't pay that $15,000 premium. You've literally made that home worthless—a home that never flooded and that's behind the flood protection system.

The irony is let's look at the Corps of Engineers certified flood system. Go look at New Orleans. The New Orleans flood protection system that failed during Katrina, flooded thousands of households, caused tremendous devastation and loss of life, that's a certified levee. That system failed to certify. The Houma Terrebonne system that never failed, that never flooded, is decertified by FEMA. You're going to tell those people they have to pay $15,000 or $20,000 a year for flood insurance when they never flooded? And their system works.

The same thing with the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System. FEMA, under their interpretation of that law, is saying that levee doesn't even exist. Let me show you a picture. This is during a storm recently. You can see the floodwaters here; and yet behind that levee system the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System, these people didn't flood. All you see is green grass here. There's no water because they didn't flood. FEMA has said this flood protection system doesn't exist.

So these people who never flooded, who haven't filed a claim, they're not a burden to the system. They're paying premiums to the system right now. They're actually helping to try to get it back into the black. FEMA is saying this levee system doesn't even exist, so now these people have to pay maybe $20,000 a year in flood insurance. Again, they can't pay $20,000 a year in flood insurance. Nobody that's not a millionaire can do that. And so they'll walk away from that home. The bank will have to absorb that mortgage. And so their homes are basically going to be deemed worthless, even though their flood protection system works today. They never flooded.

By the way, this one, the same like Houma Terrebonne, the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System didn't flood in Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, or Hurricane Isaac. They didn't file a claim, and yet their system is decertified.

This is a flawed and broken system. It's the reason CBO says there's no score to this. Because the way it's being implemented is unworkable. And even FEMA is admitting this isn't ready for prime time. So this amendment is needed to say let's go back and actually make a system that works. Fix the problems with the system. But you don't go and punish the people that played by all the rules and never even filed a claim.

So I support the amendment, urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PALAZZO. I rise today to ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations act. I want to thank Representative CASSIDY, Representative WATERS, Representative SCALISE, Representative RICHMOND, and the many others who support this amendment.

This amendment would provide relief for many homeowners across the Nation facing significant increases in their flood insurance premiums because of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. Many facing these steep increases are still recovering from devastating storms in recent years, such as Hurricanes Katrina, Isaac, and Sandy. And some can see increases as steep as 25 percent per year.

While I believe it is imperative that the NFIP program remain solvent so that flood insurance remains available to those who need it the most, changes can be implemented in a more compassionate and gradual way. The severe way in which these rates are increased under current law will place a heavy financial strain on families, small businesses, and new home buyers. The fact is we need more time to study how these rate changes will affect Americans.

This amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill gives FEMA more time to complete an affordability study and to review the impact that these rate increases would have on homeowners. It keeps NFIP solvent while implementing changes in a compassionate manner that keeps flood insurance available.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. I thank you for yielding the time, and I'll be very short.

Let me say to my colleagues who oppose this bill that this does not repeal the entire law. This just repeals that portion which is not actuarially sound. We did vote for an insurance program, but we voted for one that was functional and, again, actuarially sound.

I'll make it clear: this does not repeal section 205. Those that built below code or in flood zones, knowingly violating local code, will still pay the penalty. This is for 207 for folks who have never flooded, who've done it right, who've built behind flood protection, to code, and yet in some cases, because of actuarially flawed methodology, they will be paying up to $20,000.

By the way, I did vote for this bill, but not to force an inaccurate, dysfunctional system which the GAO has criticized homeowners that are trying to live their life. There should be sanity and fairness. But that sanity and fairness should be addressed to having something which is actuarially sound.

One of my colleagues said, Wait a second, some will pay less and some will pay more. Actually, some may pay less, next year pay more, and then pay less again. Because they're being judged by systems which, again, are not sound.

We speak so often here of bringing certainty to business. Let's allow business to know what is going on. Why not have that same principle with homeowners? Let's get the actuarial process in which we judge their risk sound and then we can tell them their premium is high, their premium is low. Right now we're telling them it's going to fluctuate up and down because the method by which we judge them is so poorly designed.

So I do urge passage of this amendment, both for the sake of proving we can have functional government, as well as for the sake of these homeowners who are going to be terribly affected if we do not do so.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I do appreciate the gentleman yielding.

FEMA has already stated that their staff in Louisiana were wrong to provide these estimates based on inaccurate and incomplete information. They have already said that. In reality, no one knows—not FEMA, not any of my colleagues—how much folks in those flood zones will pay for premiums under section 207. It's still being evaluated. Flood maps change after every flood, and they're going to continue to do it because of development and more impervious surface and other things

that cause flooding to create in different areas.

There is an appeal process that you can go through; but the best place to do this is where it originated, which is in the Financial Services Committee, not as an amendment on an appropriations bill.

How many hearings have been held on this amendment? None. We're always talking about regular order. That's our cry, Regular order. Why don't we go through the regular process, go through the same committee that this bill originated out of and see if there's not some oversight that we can offer to FEMA to make sure that these people are not hit with these high premiums and that everybody gets on the same page and we understand that if these improvements have been made by cities and counties or homeowners, that they need to be taken into consideration. But this is not the way to do it.

□ 2030

We talk about unintended consequences. I think this bill was 75 pages long. I can read section 207 if you want me to, but it's pretty plain in what it says. There are no unintended consequences to this. This is exactly what it said.

If you want to talk about revisiting unintended consequences, let's look at the 2,800-page Affordable Care Act. We can look at some unintended consequences then. But this is plain and simple. This isn't asking to create another agency or board or commission; this is trying to make FEMA and the Corps do their job on this mapping. This is the wrong place, it's the wrong time, it's the wrong bill to do this.

I would work in a joint effort with these people to try to bring some resolution to this problem. But you've got to remember that these fees do not come into effect this year, and nobody knows what they're going to be.

You know, the Congress is either at stop or knee-jerk reaction. This is something that needs to be carefully thought out. It needs to go through the subcommittee, the committee process.

The chairman has promised that he is going to review this and look at the implementation of it. If we believe in regular order, let's give the system time to work, and let's put it in the committee where the work was originally done.

With that, I just hope that it will be a ''no'' vote on this, that it can go back to the committee that Ms. WATERS and others have put in a bill. Let's go back, let's review it, let's look at it, let's bring FEMA in, and let's do some oversight—which is our responsibility in the Financial Services Committee, not the Appropriations Committee.

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

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

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the amendment. And I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, we've heard talk about if we believe in regular order. Some of us believe in regular order—most of us believe in regular order—but I think everybody in this body believes in homeownership, and the fact that it's your biggest, safest investment; you pass it down generation to generation. And those people who work, sacrifice, save money to buy a home—we ought not change the rules in the middle of the game with a system that's dysfunctional, it doesn't work. But at the same time, we say that we value the sanctity of homeownership and the American Dream.

So what we're asking here today is that we just back up a little bit. Because part of what leadership does is that sometimes you make a decision that has consequences that weren't foreseen or that are not ready to be implemented. But the true sign of leadership is that you back up and say, let's get it right, not let's do it just for the sake of doing it because we were already going down that road—when it's the wrong road.

The biggest question is: What message are we going to send to those people in New York, Louisiana, and all of those red dots on the map that Representative CASSIDY had, what message are we sending to them? Yes, you saved to buy a home. Yes, you pay your insurance. But now we're going to raise your insurance so high you can't afford that home anymore. What are they to do, walk away from the home? Now it's on the banks, now it's on the community. We have more blighted property. That's not what we should do as a body representing the people, representing our constituents.

I would just say that it's not wrong, it's not unusual, and it's a strong sign of leadership to say, hey, we may have gotten this one wrong. Let's review it. Let's make sure we're being fair. And let's make sure that we protect the American Dream as Congress people. So that's all I'm asking.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would just re-urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I reclaim my time, and I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. The gentleman from Georgia talked about there are no unintended consequences, and he attempted to speak for me, one of the authors of the bill. I just think that he does not understand that we put in a lot of work on this bill. We worked in a bipartisan way. And if one of the authors of the bill tells you there are unintended consequences, then I think the gentleman from Georgia cannot dispute that.

Let me just say that I talked with FEMA about mapping, and I talked with FEMA about these decertified levees. They admitted that they had decertified some and they're going to recertify them because they didn't quite know what they were doing.

They also told me that the maps certainly need a lot of work, that they are not complete. What I'm saying is this: all of those homeowners who can't sleep at night, who can't plan their futures, don't know whether or not they're going to be able to send their children to college, all of those homeowners who are in limbo, who don't understand whether or not they're going to be able—certainly they're not going to be able to pay increased premiums. They won't be able to sell the house. Why would we be a party to causing that kind of consternation to fellow human beings? I don't think we want to do that.

We have the power here today to support Mr. CASSIDY's bill and to buy some time and tell FEMA to get it right, to work on it, because these are unintended consequences.

So I just wanted the gentleman from Georgia to know that I certainly appreciate your concern. But you certainly don't understand the work that was put into it and how I know unintended consequences when I see them because of the way that I worked on the bill, and I know it was not intended to do what it is now doing.

If you had spent some time with the people who traveled to Washington, D.C.—elected officials and community leaders alike—who took up the whole room, making an appeal to us to not put them in a position where they would lose their homes, where communities would be destroyed because FEMA was not ready, not prepared—not equipped maybe—to do what they needed to do to carry out the bill even. And that some of those increases that were being talked about, that were being projected, were increases that were almost made up; they were not actuarially sound.

So I would ask you to please vote for this bill. Change your mind. Give some leadership and ask your colleagues to vote for the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the esteemed chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriation Subcommittee to

discuss a matter of importance to our Nation.

The United States Army is electing to reduce the number of Lakota light utility helicopters, which are made in my congressional district, that they had intended to purchase over the next 2 fiscal years. These helicopters are cheaper to acquire, maintain and operate than other rotary wing aircraft which the Army has recently contracted for.

I respect the Army's wishes to control costs and not purchase additional aircraft that they do not need. But I am hopeful that you, Mr. Chairman, and the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Texan MICHAEL MCCAUL, will work with me to have a study conducted to see if there is not some way to enhance our homeland security through a cost-effective manner by utilizing Lakota helicopters in operations that could protect the American people and secure our borders.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that I will be happy to work with you, Mr. BARTON, as we move forward in the appropriations process.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the chairman for his willingness to work with me.

Before I yield back, I just want to let the country know that when Texas is working, we get our job done a lot quicker than when Louisiana is arguing.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BUSTOS

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Sec. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an offeror for the purchase of an American flag if, as required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the flag is certified as a foreign end product.

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

□ 2040

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. It would ensure that American flags purchased with funds from this bill are actually made in America. Pretty simple, straightforward, common sense.

Currently, here is what's happening: the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Homeland Security, and even the U.S. Capitol are free to buy American flags that are only 50 percent made in the United States of America. I find this astonishing.

There are companies in America that manufacture American flags. Pretty logical. And there have been legislative efforts in the past to make sure that American flags purchased by the Federal Government are actually made in America.

Last Congress, Senator SHERROD BROWN of Ohio was able to secure passage of the All-American Flag Act through the U.S. Senate by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, the House was unable to consider the measure prior to adjourning the last session of Congress.

According to the most recent numbers from the U.S. Census Bureau, the value of American flags imported to the United States last year alone was $3.8 million; $3.6 million worth came from China alone. A ''Made in China'' tag should never be sewn into an American flag, let alone American flags purchased by our Federal Government.

My amendment today is an attempt to address the growing practice of importing American flags not actually made in America. The idea for this came about just last week when I was home listening to veterans all over our district. I was in Rockford, Peoria, the Quad Cities, and Galesburg, Illinois. I listened to veterans from the gulf war, from the Vietnam war, from World War II, and had gentlemen stand up so disheartened by the fact that they had flown flags, they had seen flags that had a ''Made in China'' tag sewn into them.

So it is my hope that this Congress will engage further on this issue; but until that time, I feel it necessary to offer this amendment. We must send a clear message as to what our expectations are.

With that in mind, and using existing law as a guide, this amendment would ban purchases of any flag declared as a foreign end product in Buy American Act certifications required by all Federal contracts. This amendment is just the first step in what I hope is a larger effort to require that all American flags purchased by the Federal Government are actually made in America.

I hope my colleagues here today will support me in this endeavor and work with me in moving forward on future, similar efforts.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, we will support the lady's amendment. And I will be happy to yield to my colleague, Mr. PRICE, so that he can also support this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm happy to urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of funds made available by this Act may be used for entering into a new contract for the purposes of purchasing ammunition before the date the report required by section 567(a) is submitted to Congress.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment which will ensure the Department of Homeland Security is being accountable to Congress—and more importantly, the American people.

Earlier this year, it was reported that DHS solicited bids for some 1.1 billion rounds of ammunition. This was more than 10 times the amount that the Department purchased in fiscal year 2012.

Given this large purchase, the American people and Members of Congress rightfully had concerns and questions. The Appropriations Committee has recognized these concerns by including language in this bill to address the ammunitions purchased by requiring DHS to report the cost and the need to Congress. This initial report is required to be submitted at the time of the President's budget.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for their work in this area, and my amendment would complement their efforts and prohibit any new purchases of ammunition until the required report is submitted to Congress. It does not prevent existing contracts for procurement from being carried out. This is a responsible amendment which ensures that Congress and the American people are aware of the necessity and the cost of ammunition prior to entering into new contracts for procurement.

On April 15, 2013, DHS had an inventory of almost 250,000 rounds of ammunition. In fiscal year 2012, DHS purchased 103,178,200 rounds. This is less than half the inventory that they have on hand. As of February 22, 2013, there were 62,618 employees at DHS trained and certified in firearms. Given our current inventory, each individual has nearly 4,000 rounds before our inventory would be exhausted.

With these facts in mind, it is important that we are responsible in entering into contracts for ammunition purchases. My amendment will ensure that this is the case.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleague, I'm on the same wavelength as him, and I have had both my personal office and my staff here at the committee look into

in detail the allegations that he has raised by his amendment. He is quite accurate that the amount of ammunition that presently seems to be in the hands of DHS and the amount of purchases that have taken place over the last 3 years from a gun owner standpoint, if you take a good hard look at it, it looks like they're shooting an awful lot of rounds as practice. I have the same concerns he has about that.

That's why I put into this bill at my request this review of the training exercises: How many rounds are issued for training? How many rounds are issued for firing in harm's way? A complete report to the Congress of the United States was issued because the American people are very concerned about this issue.

I will assure my colleague we're going to look at this report in detail. We're going to have hearings and discuss this with the members of DHS, and all the gun-toting DHS folks, to get an accurate assessment of how much shooting they do and how much they need to shoot.

By my own personal inquiry, by talking to ICE last Friday—in addition, I talked to the Border Patrol personally, and they shoot four times a year to qualify—quite honestly, they acknowledged that they don't need as many rounds as people think they do.

But we want to get this study done. And if we can, have patience to do the study and not try to restrict contracting until we know. And I honestly am not encouraged to allow DHS to have huge stockpiles of ammunition around the country. We want to have an efficient utilization of the purchasing power.

As to the contracting power that they have for that billion-plus rounds, that's a process that I learned through my questions that is used to keep the lowest possible price, and there's no intent to make that——

Mr. MEADOWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I will in just a moment.

There's no intent to make that type of purchase by DHS in any form or fashion. It's just a way that contracting is done on ammunition to utilize the cheapest price.

I will also say—and then I will yield—we checked with every ammunition manufacturer in the country, and they assured me that the shortage of ammunition on the shelves for the American hunter and shooter is not because of purchases by DHS or the military or anybody else. Quite honestly, it's because the American people are buying rounds as fast as they come on the shelf, and they're competing with their fellow Americans.

I will be glad to yield to my friend.

□ 2050

Mr. MEADOWS. I appreciate the chairman for yielding and I appreciate his comments.

This amendment would not stop the current bids that are out there, the current process that we have in place. It would just stop additional processes. We are looking at some 6 months before this report would be due, and the inventory, Mr. Chairman, that we have in place currently is more than enough to handle the target requirements, the requirements that we have currently for those. We've had hearings already, and a number of committees have addressed that, and the background that we have and the inventory that we have is more than enough to handle this while we wait for this report.

Mr. CARTER. In reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's argument. I think it is in the best interest for us to go forward with this study. We are going to keep a close eye, which is why we've got this issue in this bill, but I am not prepared at this time to restrict contracting, so I have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my agreement with the chairman on this matter.

I appreciate the amendment being offered by my friend from North Carolina, but I believe it would introduce an element of rigidity and an arbitrary element into the purchasing process. The chairman has looked into this very carefully. We have provisions in the bill that should get to the bottom of any allegations that have been made about the matter, but in the meantime, it seems the amendment almost presupposes a negative or a suspicious outcome of the study. Maybe not. In any case, I see no reason for layering on a requirement forbidding the purchase of ammunition while we conduct this study.

So I urge the defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the desk. These are Grayson Nos. 1, 3, and 4. In view of the late hour, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification of destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we move on to the reading of the next amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the reading of the first amendment is suspended.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the second and third amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the First, Second, or Fourth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

___

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purchase, operation, or maintenance of armed unmanned aerial vehicles.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the first amendment, this amendment is identical to language that was inserted into the Military Construction-VA bill yesterday by a voice vote. It expands the list of parties with whom the Department of Homeland Security and other relevant entities are prohibited from contracting. This includes contractors who have been convicted of fraud, theft, forgery, bribery, et cetera, according to the terms of the amendment and otherwise.

With regard to Grayson No. 3, the next amendment, this amendment is a simple one.

It reads:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the First, Second or Fourth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

As you will notice, the same sentiment and relevant language appears in my colleague Mr. ELLISON's amendment addressing racial discrimination and other matters. I gladly support his efforts, which passed unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and hope the same will be possible of my amendment in this Congress.

With regard to the last Grayson amendment, I regret that my colleague Representative HOLT could not be here to offer this amendment himself. He is in New Jersey today, remembering Senator Lautenberg. The amendment that I call up is actually the Holt-Grayson amendment, the last amendment. It's an amendment that Mr. HOLT attached to the bill in the last Congress as an en bloc amendment offered by Representative ADERHOLT, which passed unanimously. The text of the amendment is the same word for word, and it reads as follows:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purchase, operation or maintenance of armed unmanned aerial vehicles.

This is an important amendment and one that I am proud to offer here today on behalf of Representative HOLT. In no instance should DHS have access to or use weaponized drones. The bill before us today is the appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Defense. That appropriations bill will come to the floor later this month, we hope.

As our wars abroad come to a close and as excess militarized drones become available for purchase and use potentially by DHS, I feel that it's important to lay down this marker here today that says, no, DHS may not have access to that military equipment. DHS will continue to have access to surveillance drones, and if the committee report is correct, DHS will increase its supply of drones and possibly even build a new airfield to support them.

In his previous amendment, Congressman HOLT shared his thoughts on the ways in which these drones should not be used, so I will close with this: Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE, let's be clear with DHS—no armed drones in the United States.

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

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

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

Mr. CARTER. These three amendments en bloc that we've got here, I want to address them as they were raised.

I support the first amendment with the reservations that I don't understand some of the language in section B, but I'm not here today to act in the judicial interpretation of what is already in law. I have some questions about the ''civilly charged,'' but I'm not going to go into that, so I will accept that amendment.

On the second amendment, which concerns the three sections of the Constitution, I certainly will accept that. In fact, I would not like for anything within this bill to be in contravention of any section of the United States Constitution, so I certainly have no problem with that.

Thirdly, the Department has no intention of having armed drones, and we will certainly accept the third amendment. I am willing to accept all three.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I am happy to also offer my support. I hope my colleagues will support this en bloc amendment.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. MICA. I rise briefly to engage the gentleman from Texas in a colloquy.

First of all, I would like to compliment Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE. Thank you for your work on this bill under some very difficult fiscal constraints. I believe the committee, under your leadership, has successfully found areas where taxpayers can really realize savings and implement reforms to strengthen our national security.

As I have discussed with the chairman before and other colleagues in the past, I am a strong believer in the effectiveness of modeling and simulation for training. In the past, the Department of Homeland Security has purchased large and costly quantities of live ammunition. Live fire testing and training is expensive, detrimental to the environment, and is really unnecessary for most training of almost all DHS personnel.

□ 2100

I believe that the Department of Homeland Security would be well served by increasing its efforts to better integrate and utilize modeling and simulation in the training of law enforcement and security personnel under their jurisdiction.

For years now, our military and our Armed Forces, who daily face intense combat, utilize effective and modern simulation technology in training and preparing our soldiers.

These simulation technologies provide powerful planning and training tools capable of exposing all of our personnel to the complexities and uncertainties before ever stepping into harm's way. There's no reason DHS can't do the same thing. The use of simulation training has yielded better trained, more capable and more confident personnel, again, without live ammunition. Unfortunately, DHS just doesn't get it.

Simulation training is a cost-effective means by which law enforcement and security personnel can improve readiness, tactical decision-making skills, and ultimately save lives and save millions of dollars in taxpayer money.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Chairman MICA makes very good points. FLETC and DHS should review their training regimen and determine where simulation equipment makes sense. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this opportunity to my attention and look forward to working with him.

Mr. MICA. And I look forward to working with the chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REED). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 571. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection program.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act that would cut over $300 million from a program that is supposed to cost taxpayers nothing. If you, like me, are wondering how we got to this point of paying for a cost-free program, keep listening.

Customs and Border Patrol, along with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, conducts agricultural quarantine inspections on incoming vessels and passengers. This is an essential service that protects our Nation's agriculture and wildlife.

CBP and USDA have claimed that the cost of this program is covered by imposing fees on incoming vessels and travelers—a sensible approach. However, when the Government Accountability Office last examined the program in 2011, the fees covered only 60 percent of the program's cost. As a result, the taxpayers had to cover a $325 million shortfall.

I recently introduced the bipartisan SAVE Act with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), which would implement recommendations by the GAO to

push Customs and Border Patrol, along with the USDA, to adjust its fee structure and administration to fully cover the cost of this program.

My amendment would prevent Customs and Border Patrol from continuing to use taxpayer dollars to subsidize incoming vessels and travelers and make the program truly fee-supported.

My amendment would free up remaining CBP funds to do what they should be doing: securing the homeland and facilitating travel, tourism, and trade. More tourism and more trade mean more American jobs.

Mr. Chair, I think we can all agree that this is a commonsense amendment that saves taxpayers dollars and improves the environment for greater job growth. I urge my colleagues on both sides to support this cost-saving amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I oppose this amendment because it would make it impossible for CBP to carry out its mandated mission to inspect and clear agricultural products that enter the United States from a foreign country.

A mixture of fees and discretionary funds pay for CBP officers that inspect and clear foreign ag products. When fees run out, discretionary funds pay for the officers' work.

If we do not provide these funds, as the amendment proposes, agricultural imports to the United States would effectively halt and halt trade.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding, and I also want to oppose this amendment.

I want to say to my colleague that I very clearly understand the purpose of this amendment. I think it's a worthy purpose. I think we should pay for these inspections through fee revenue, and the fees need to be adequate to the task.

So the gentleman, as I understand it, is trying to apply some pressure in that situation so that that gets done. That's a worthy purpose. But the risk is simply too great with a blanket prohibition of discretionary funds to be used for inspections. The risk is simply too great that the vital inspections that really can't lapse would not go on.

So I have to reluctantly urge defeat of the amendment, although I agree with and understand its underlying purpose.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)).

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I offer this amendment to ensure that none of the funds in this bill may be used in violation of section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

This amendment prohibits the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement from using taxpayer dollars to process the release of or to administer alternate forms of detention to illegal immigrants who committed a crime that mandates their incarceration under section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 236(c) requires the Federal Government to detain illegal aliens who committed any one of the serious crimes detailed in that section until that illegal alien is deported to their home country.

In my home State of Georgia, ICE has processed the release of criminal aliens under the guise of sequestration. Along with the fellow members of the Georgia delegation, I have written to DHS and ICE on two separate occasions requesting more information about the releases.

To date, DHS and ICE have failed to provide basic information regarding the criminal aliens released in Georgia. We don't know how many criminal aliens were released and to where. We don't know what crimes they committed prior to detention, and we don't know what forms of alternatives to detention ICE is using to ensure they don't commit additional crimes.

Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable.

Our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and I do not believe taxpayer dollars should ever be used to circumvent the law.

I appreciate the men and women who work for ICE and have great respect for the work they do and the sacrifices they make.

This amendment ensures that political agendas won't interfere with the need to protect innocent citizens from criminal illegal aliens.

The Federal Government should enforce immigration law, particularly section 236(c), that mandates the detention of dangerous criminal illegal aliens.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to prohibit taxpayer funds from being used in violation of section 236(c), and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Though in principle I believe there are times when alternatives to detention make sense, utilizing them to release convicted criminals is never appropriate. Therefore, I appreciate Congressman COLLINS calling attention to the importance of ICE maintaining a robust capability to detain and maintain custody of illegal aliens, especially those convicted of violent and serious crimes and felonies like drug trafficking, prostitution and conspiracy.

Included in this bill is no less than $2.8 billion for enforcement and removal operations, which include $148 million to fully support the statutory requirements to maintain at least 34,000 beds, which is critical if we're going to ensure that convicted criminals and repeat offenders do not endanger public safety. Therefore, I'm happy to accept the gentleman's amendment, and I reiterate my appreciation for Congressman COLLINS for offering it. And as to the fact that he didn't get information from ICE or from DHS, I've had the same experience and I was just as upset as you are.

I support the Congressman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2110

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Transportation Security Administration for the Behavior Detection Officer program

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does one simple thing: it stops TSA from continuing to waste taxpayer dollars on a program the agency has not scientifically validated or shown to be cost effective.

Since 2007, TSA has spent approximately $1 billion on its behavioral detection program, the screening of passengers by observation techniques, commonly referred to as the SPOT program.

Under this program, on an annual basis, TSA spends about $200 million to deploy 2,800 behavior detection officers, or BDOs, at airports around the country to observe passenger behaviors for signs that they present a terrorism risk to aviation. While the goal of this

program—preventing terrorists from boarding flights—is laudable, the program is, by any measure, fatally flawed.

Chief among those flaws is that TSA has not scientifically validated that BDOs can identify terrorists by observing behaviors. Indeed, the Government Accountability Office has found that ''known or suspected terrorists'' have moved through screening on 23 different occasions in airports where BDOs were deployed. In fact, BDOs have never identified, apprehended, referred to law enforcement, or prevented a terrorist from boarding an aircraft. This is not surprising considering that there is no scientific basis for suggesting that they should or would be able to do so.

As if it were not bad enough that TSA has spent almost $1 billion on a program without scientific validation, yesterday The New York Times reported that the DHS inspector general has found that TSA cannot ensure passengers at U.S. airports are screened objectively under the SPOT program, show that the program is cost effective, or reasonably justify the program's expansion.

Indeed, the IG found that the program does not have a strategic plan, a financial plan, or even a comprehensive and uniform training program. In light of the sequester and the resulting budget cuts, I, for one, see no justification for spending another dollar on a program that is wasteful and ineffective.

Mr. Chair, the time has come to stop TSA from squandering additional funds on this misguided effort. I was surprised in these austere times the Appropriations Committee provided funding for the program, especially when, in the report accompanying H.R. 2217, the committee questioned the fundamentals for the program when it said that there are outstanding questions remaining over the value of the program.

We have an opportunity today to ensure we fund programs that are meritworthy and effective, not programs whose value and effectiveness have not been established. Further, we have the opportunity to ensure that $200 million saved by defunding this program is put to far better uses, such as expanding TSA's Pre Check program so more individuals can receive expedited screening, reducing wait times at screening checkpoints, and bolstering surface transportation security.

Earlier today, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee stated that we cannot afford to fund unproven and wasteful programs. I cannot agree more. That is why I am offering this amendment to cut off funding for TSA's unproven and wasteful SPOT program.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I share some of the concerns of the gentleman from Mississippi, and I believe that the outstanding question still remains over the actual value of the Behavior Detection Officer, BDO program, which has yet to be sufficiently validated by TSA. In addition, it is my understanding that a recent OIG report may validate the concerns Mr. THOMPSON has raised about the program. In the report accompanying this bill, this committee also articulated some of the same concerns of Mr. THOMPSON, including whether passengers are screened in an objective and cost-effective manner.

However, I cannot accept this amendment at this time to zero out the program. I remain hopeful that TSA will correct these issues. And my colleague, Chairman MCCAUL, has also said he is hopeful that we can correct these programs. I will be willing to work with Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. MCCAUL and anyone else who has concerns about this to make sure that this program is effectively administered and effectively worked. So at this time, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment as well. I do this because I have great respect for the gentleman from Mississippi and for the good work that he does on the authorizing committee. And I also know that the concerns he has expressed here tonight are legitimate ones. But I believe striking this funding in an appropriations bill is not the preferred way to deal with it.

The Behavior Detection Officers program utilizes specially trained individuals to identify potentially high-risk passengers. This program is specifically designed to detect individuals exhibiting behaviors that indicate they may be a threat to our security. And these behaviors, by the way, are not just randomly chosen. These individuals are trained in psychologically grounded theories as to what kind of behaviors they're looking for and what those behaviors may indicate. It's one element of a layered approach to ensuring the security of our commercial airlines and airports.

Now, I'm aware that the inspector general will soon issue a report that faults TSA for not being able to accurately assess the effectiveness of the program and for not having a finalized strategic plan that identifies the mission, the goals, and the objectives needed to develop performance measures. My understanding, however, is that TSA has agreed with all of these recommendations made by the inspector general to improve the program and plans to address them right away. I also understand that TSA has already drafted a strategic plan for the program.

Ending a program at the Department of Homeland Security just because the inspector general has found that it needs to improve its strategy and its performance measures just doesn't make sense to me. The inspector general certainly has not recommended that the program be ended.

The use of behavior detection is not a new or novel idea. As I say, in fact, it has a validated foundation in psychology. It's been a cornerstone in the Israeli Government's aviation security for years. I commend Administrator Pistole for his understanding of the possibilities and limitations of behavior detection and his attempts to use it effectively. We don't need to end this program; we need to work with TSA and push it to quickly implement the IG's recommendations. So I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2120

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I might add that this amendment was one that was offered by my colleague DAVID SCHWEIKERT from Arizona last year, and it passed on a voice vote.

Department of Homeland Security, DHS, has long viewed State and local governments as valuable partners that can help serve a helpful role in assisting DHS in fulfilling its responsibility with respect to immigration enforcement, and it continues to welcome that participation.

In order to avoid complying with their obligation to share information with DHS, local governments have taken on a ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy known as ''sanctuary policies.''

With the implementation of sanctuary policies, State and local law enforcement officers are barred from asking people about their immigration status or reporting them to Federal immigration authorities.

Sanctuary policies are bad public policy because States or cities that institute sanctuary policies become magnets for illegal immigration. Illegal immigration results in higher costs of living; reduced job availability; lower wages; higher crime rates; fiscal hardship on hospitals and substandard quality of care for residents; burdens on public services, increasing their costs and diminishing their availability; and a reduction of the overall quality of life.

Sanctuary policies are expensive and shift the cost of illegal immigration onto citizens and legal immigrants. Because of the difficulty States have in collecting taxes from persons who are not lawfully present, many are utilizing State and local benefits and resources without contributing their fair share.

Sanctuary policies serve as a perverse incentive for illegal alien families to move to those States or cities who institute such policies. Accommodating those who violate our immigration law encourages others to follow the same path and gives prospective immigrants little incentive to pursue the legal path of immigration when they can sidestep the process and gain the same benefits.

Sanctuary policies also insult those legal immigrants who patiently waited for months and years for the U.S. State Department and DHS to approve their application and paid thousands of dollars in travel, legal, and medical fees to abide by the entry, employment, health, and processing laws and regulations.

Sanctuary policies conflict with Federal law. Recognizing the adoption of sanctuary policies as a growing impediment to combating the wave of illegal aliens residing in the country, Congress adopted the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996 that barred State and local governments from prohibiting employees from providing, receiving, and sharing information on those here illegally with Federal Government immigration officials.

Sanctuary policy denies U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement critical assistance to enable it to accomplish its statutorily mandated mission to identify and ultimately remove those here illegally who are currently in State or local custody.

Sanctuary policies undermine national security efforts and create an environment in which terrorists and individuals of national security concern go unnoticed and uninterrupted.

Sanctuary cities tell those who are here illegally that the laws of our country don't matter. Sanctuary city policies encourage illegal immigration and weaken our Nation's ability to secure our borders. They contribute to a flood of illegal immigrants in this country today.

During the immigration reform debate, sanctuary cities should not be overlooked. This policy is creating an even bigger illegal immigration problem.

With money so tight these days, cities which are purposely skirting Federal law should not benefit from Federal law enforcement funding. The funds should be used for those cities who are actively enforcing the law.

So, in a nutshell, what this amendment would do is disallow any funds from this particular legislation to go to sanctuary cities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. We will accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I'm not sure of the full intent of the gentleman's amendment, but I will say that I'm concerned if we are going to deny funding to cities that have established rules that may be determined that they are sanctuary cities and, in fact, they are not.

Many cities have a process in their own jurisdiction where law enforcement wants to ensure that, in the enforcement of their local laws, that all communities be considered engaged in the law enforcement process.

I don't know whether the gentleman determines that that is a sanctuary city, where chiefs of police wish to hear from communities that are bilingual and, therefore, do not want to have a structure that intimidates them and, therefore, inhibits the prosecution of laws or inhibits the elimination of crime.

So I would only make the argument that I know that the Association of Chiefs of Police have argued that it is important to ensure that immigrant communities feel free enough to communicate with their law enforcement officers.

I don't know if that is the interpretation of the gentleman's sanctuary cities. I know that he is going under the law. But I certainly hope those cities will not be biased or discriminated against with respect to Federal funding on homeland security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SALMON. I was just going to say, my interpretation of the law is exactly as it's stated in the law that we passed in 1996 and nothing more, nothing less.

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

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, being someone who worked on this amendment last year—and I appreciate my next-door neighbor and my old friend, MATT SALMON, for bringing it up—for those of us from Arizona, we actually have some very intimate experience with sort of dealing with these mechanics.

For almost all of us in this body, we run for office telling everyone that immigration is a Federal issue. You know, we need to set Federal policy, and that's how we mechanically will come up with our commonality of enforcement.

But what happens when, all of a sudden, we have a municipality that's still taking those Federal dollars and yet is not playing under the same rules as their next-door neighbor municipalities?

The beauty of this amendment is very, very simple. It says, if you're going to take these resources, you need to play by the rule book that we in Congress set on an issue that we're supposed to be dominant on.

And the reality of it is, when you have a municipality that, through stated policy, flaunts what we're trying to do, particularly in immigration policy, it ends up creating this sort of balkanization in our communities, and it sets off those very fights that I believe our last speaker was touching on.

And having been the county treasurer of Maricopa County, I've seen the edges of this, when one municipality was looking very, very differently at our Federal laws compared to another one and, literally, the movements that would happen with populations and the fights that would start and also the chaos it would actually create when you were trying to have a community of also equal law enforcement.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's one of the reasons I stand here and support the Salmon amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in the hopes of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the work that you have done on this bill, along with our ranking member.

I had intended to offer an amendment in the hopes that we could move forward with modernizing our pedestrian access at our land ports of entry, but I was held up in the NDAA markup, which is ongoing still.

My amendment would have been simple. It would have set aside $5 million within the Construction and Facilities Management account in title 2 of this bill to begin construction on shovel-ready projects at our land ports of entry, the pedestrian access points.

Mr. Chairman, our land ports are out of date and in need of massive repair.

□ 2130

This is the first step in addressing the massive wait times for pedestrians across our country.

I was recently in Calexico, California, where I saw elderly people waiting in 102-degree heat just to come and shop in the United States. We hinder our economy when we hinder the lifeline of trade into our country. Mr. Chairman, this is happening every day at our border communities throughout this country. And as a Member of Congress from a border State, you understand that all too well.

So I want to ask the chairman for his support in working with me during the conference to ensure pedestrian access points at land points of entry have the funds that they need to be improved so that we can increase our trade at our land ports.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlewoman from California for engaging me in this colloquy.

As she had just stated, wait times at our ports of entry, both vehicle and pedestrian, have increased in recent years. I would have supported the gentlewoman's amendment, but will vow to work with her in ensuring that the proper funds are given to the pedestrians to reduce wait times at land ports of entry. I'll be glad to work with you on this issue.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that clarification and for your strong support in improving pedestrian access points at our land points of entry, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the amendments made by section 100207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (title II of division F of Public Law 112–141) with respect to any property located in the State of New Jersey or the State of New York.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. My amendment is actually very similar to what Representative CASSIDY had on the floor about an hour ago. My amendment would delay the increase in National Flood Insurance Program premiums in New Jersey and New York until the end of FY 2014. It does so through prohibiting funding for the implementation of section 207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act with regards to the States of New York and New Jersey.

New Jersey and New York suffered unprecedented damages during Hurricane Sandy. Many of these coastal residents in New Jersey and New York are still struggling to rebuild and now are staring down huge increases in flood insurance premiums due to the provisions of the Biggert-Waters Act. The people of New Jersey and New York have suffered enough and cannot afford to pay skyrocketing premiums in the middle of the rebuilding process. The least we can do is give them a reprieve, a little peace of mind, until the end of the 2014 fiscal year.

I would like to thank Mr. KING and Mr. LOBIONDO for working with me on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. The authorizers have indicated that they oppose this amendment that's being proposed by my friend from New Jersey. I'm reluctant to oppose it. So I just wanted to make the statement that the authorizing committee is opposed to this. We've had a debate almost ad nauseam on the State of Louisiana, with exactly the same amendment. I think everything that's been said about this flood program has been said, so I'm not going to continue that debate. I just wanted to make a note that although I'm not going to officially oppose it, I will state that the authorizers were supposed to be here to oppose.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair and the ranking member of this subcommittee for their work on this bill. It's certainly one that I'm very happy to support.

Given the importance of trade at both our northern and southern land ports of entry, I am particularly pleased that the bill includes 1,600 new CBP officers to expedite trade at our ports. I planned to offer an amendment that would have helped to target these new officers to the busiest ports of entry. It would have required the Department of Homeland Security to submit a report detailing the average crossing times at the busiest land ports and what the staffing needs are to ensure that we can reduce those wait times to 20 minutes or less. I understand my amendment would be subject to a point of order, but I look forward to working with the chair and ranking member to address this issue as the process moves forward.

Very quickly, wait times right now at our ports of entry are unpredictable and they are inconsistent. People can wait as few as 20 minutes or they can wait as long as 2 or 3 hours to enter the United States at a pedestrian bridge, as a commuter by vehicle. Or, most important, for our economy, trade can wait hours at a time to enter the United States.

The economy that I represent in El Paso, Texas, has 100,000 jobs at stake that depend on this cross-border trade. There is over $90 billion in U.S.-Mexico trade that is crossing at those ports every single year. More than 6 million jobs in this country depend on that U.S.-Mexico trade that is crossing at our southern ports of entry alone. In the State of Texas, we have more than 400,000 jobs. In the State of North Carolina, we have over 100,000 jobs. That's why I think it's so important to understand the wait times and to be able to fix them and to move people and CBP officers where they are most needed. So, again, I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member to address this issue going forward.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'ROURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to comment to my colleague from Brownsville that we in Texas are very proud of our ports of entry on the border. They do an exceptional job in a difficult environment. We do need to reduce the wait times. And I'm looking forward to working with you and looking forward to coming to Brownsville and visiting down that way. I've been to Laredo a lot of times lately, but I haven't been to Brownsville. And I will get down that way.

I intend to work with you and our friends from California and Arizona to do the best we can to move these wait times down to something that's manageable. So I just want to comment I'd be glad to work with you.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I'd like to address Mr. RUNYAN's amendment with the flood insurance. We've had great discussion on this tonight about the flood insurance and how appropriate it is to come through an appropriations bill rather than going through regular order and going through the committee of origination, which is the Financial Services Committee. So I don't want to take up any more time. We have been through this and through this and through this.

With all respect to the gentleman from New Jersey, I just don't know that it's proper to do something specific for just two States when there's 5.5 million people in other States that have flood insurance that are involved in this. We can give the committee of authority the ability to address the FEMA situation.

With that, I ask for a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code.

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

□ 2140

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me again thank the committee for its leadership and acknowledge to my friends that this amendment was adopted in the last appropriations for Homeland Security. I believe it's an important amendment to continue to keep before this committee, but also to continue to provide codification of it.

I have served on the Homeland Security Committee for a very honorable period of time. When I say that, it is a time that I have enjoyed being able to address the questions of homeland security or domestic security under the Homeland Security Department. Through that time, I have had the privilege on one of my committees to have oversight over the U.S. air marshals.

I would offer to say to my colleagues that often U.S. Air Marshals don't get the thanks and appreciation that they deserve. It is not an easy task, even as they are on domestic flights. International flights are quite difficult in terms of the time, but also the intensity of the work because their astuteness and awareness of what's going on in a small compact area is very important to the safety of those passengers.

So my amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. What it does is it asks that no funds be used to limit the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance the use of Federal air marshals on inbound international flights considered to be high risk by the Department of Homeland Security.

There's little that I need to say to my colleagues that we live in a different atmosphere and certainly a different neighborhood. We're all well aware of our eyes being focused on the Christmas Day bomber just a few years ago, or the fact of the shoe bomber that was headed to Boston, or the fact of the various training that is going on with individuals even from the United States in Yemen. We're also aware that one of the Boston Marathon bombers flew from the United States overseas and back. So we realize that individuals are using the international air skies, if you will, to travel back and forth to the United States.

My amendment ensures that the Federal air marshals are effectively using their funds to deploy personnel on inbound flights that are considered high risk by the Department of Homeland Security and that there is no limitation to that ability.

I believe the Federal air marshals are the last line of defense in many instances in defending the cockpit and aircraft cabin against terrorist attacks, those who have obviously been able to transcend other barriers and getting on planes in international ports.

As a former chair and a member of the Homeland Security Transportation Security Committee, I worked over the years and sponsored legislation to ensure that we have enough air marshals and that they receive all the requisite training to effectively secure the aircraft. Again, many times their work goes unnoticed, but it is vital work to best protect our Nation from terroristic threat. It is of extreme importance that we use the necessary funds to support the use of Federal air marshals on inbound international flights.

Make no mistake, the threat to our aviation system from aircraft inbound to the United States from foreign airports continues to be a serious and dangerous threat. It is often recited by those who are engaged in intelligence matters that aviation assets still are the asset of choice for many of these franchise terrorists. To best protect our Nation from terroristic threat, it is important that we take note of our international flights.

Following the capture and killing of Osama bin Laden, intelligence was gathered that suggested al Qaeda still has an interest in attacking the United States, likely through transportation modes, whether it is to airplanes, trains, and other modes. This fact, coupled with the numerous suspicious activities even on domestic aircraft where passengers are attempting to open cabin doors in flight or otherwise disrupt, is of concern. Certainly, our air marshals play a very important role.

While my amendment deals with the threat of inbound aircraft to the United States, its ultimate impact would be to ensure that air marshals are assigned to the highest risk flights. It simply prohibits funds from being used to limit the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance air marshal coverage on inbound, high-risk flights. And it reinforces the importance of the job that air marshals do, but also the importance of assessing this high-risk threat in many instances, which is the aviation vehicle.

The terroristic threats are ever-changing. We must allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to make the necessary adjustments to protect the American people. This is not a funding issue or a people issue, rather, a security issue.

This amendment is budget neutral, and I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment that really speaks to the idea of security for the American people.

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

Thank you for this opportunity to explain my amendment, which simply prohibits any funds in the Homeland Appropriations Act from being used to limit the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance the use of Federal air marshals on inbound international flights considered to be high risk by the Department of Homeland Security.

My amendment ensures that the Federal Air Marshals are effectively using their funds to deploy personnel on inbound flights that are considered high risk by the Department of Homeland Security and that there is no limitation on that ability.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Federal Air Marshals are the last line of defense in defending the cockpit and aircraft cabin against terrorist attack.

As the former Chair and a current member of Homeland Security Transportation Security Subcommittee, I have worked over the years and sponsored legislation to ensure that we have enough air marshals and that they receive all the requisite training to effectively secure aircraft.

To best protect our Nation from terroristic threat it is of extreme importance that we use the necessary funds to support the use of Federal Air Marshalls on inbound international flights.

Make no mistake—the threat to our aviation system from aircraft inbound to the United States from foreign airports is serious and dangerous.

Following the capture and killing of Osama Bin Laden, intelligence was gathered that suggests that Al Qaeda still has an interest in attacking the U.S., likely through transportation modes. This fact, coupled with the numerous suspicious activities even on domestic aircraft where passengers were attempting to open cabin doors in flight or otherwise disrupt flights, is of concern.

While my amendment deals with the threat on inbound aircraft to the U.S., its ultimate impact will be to ensure that air marshals are assigned to the highest-risk flights.

It simply prohibits funds from being used to limit the discretion Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance air marshal coverage on inbound high-risk flights in accordance with the Department's risk model.

The terroristic threats are ever changing and we must allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to make the necessary adjustments to protect the American people.

This is not a funding issue or people issue, rather a security issue and this amendment is budget neutral.

Let me thank those under Homeland Security for their service, including my friends at the Transportation Security Administration. Let me thank the Federal Air Marshals as well for their service.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support amendment 153 to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2014.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this gentlelady's amendment. It is my understanding that it's a restatement of current law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment to H.R. 2217.

The 287(g) program has been an integral component of immigration enforcement efforts, yet the Obama administration has been systematically weakening the integrity of the program by slashing funding and discontinuing numerous agreements. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to do the same throughout this open amendment process.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, Homeland Security Appropriation Subcommittee Chairman Judge JOHN CARTER, for recognizing the importance of the program and ensuring that the underlying bill provides $43.5 million to restore it. My amendment simply adds an additional layer of protection for the program by stating that none of the funds made available under this act may be used in contravention of section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The 287(g) program enables State and local law enforcement to enter into agreements with Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, to act in place of or in tandem with ICE agents by processing illegal aliens who are incarcerated for crimes for removal.

287(g) agreements have a proven track record, Mr. Chairman. Since 2006, over 309,000 potentially removable illegal aliens have been identified under this enforcement program. I emphasize ''potentially removable'' because the final decision remains with ICE. Additionally, with less than 6,000 ICE agents, 287(g) agreements serve as a critical force multiplier by allowing State and local enforcement to assist in enforcing Federal immigration laws.

In my district, the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, the Cobb County Sheriff's Department has successfully participated in a 287(g) program since 2007. I know that the Cobb Sheriff's Department wants to continue its participation in this program, and I am sure countless other law enforcement agencies do as well.

However, the Obama administration continues to weaken our immigration laws by reducing options available to enforce those laws. The administration has gone so far as discontinuing existing agreements, suspending pending agreements, and seeking to slash the 287(g) program by 25 percent. We cannot let this continue.

Mr. Chairman, the administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tout Secure Communities as an alternative to 287(g). While Secure Communities is an important part of immigration enforcement, it focuses primarily on removing aliens that the administration deems a priority, namely, criminal aliens. While removal of these types of aliens is important, the administration must stop picking and choosing aspects of existing immigration law it chooses to enforce.

State and local enforcement officers go through extensive training to participate in 287(g) agreements. This training allows them to participate in enforcing immigration law while carrying out their other duties.

□ 2150

Rather than turning a blind eye to someone here illegally, officers are able to identify and take action when they encounter an illegal alien who has been incarcerated for committing a crime. They're not patrolling the streets. The Obama administration's continued attack on the 287(g) program ignores the program's success and the officers' training—assuming that they can't multitask—and instead forces those who are charged with upholding the law to just simply ignore it.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we start enforcing our immigration laws. It is time we uphold the rule of law. For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues, please support my amendment to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gingrey amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am mainly baffled by this amendment. What on Earth could it mean to contravene 287(g)? Nobody wants to contravene any Federal statute. That's what this amendment says.

If the offering of his amendment is an occasion to gloss over the problems with 287(g) and tout its virtues, I will simply very briefly go back to the debate earlier today when I think this was pretty thoroughly discussed. We have in 287(g) an effort to bring local officials into the business of immigration enforcement.

In some communities that has worked reasonably well. And I must say, in my experience where it has worked reasonably well is where those local authorities focused on the jails and on the prison population and the people who, in fact, had committed serious crimes. And in that sense, it is a parallel effort with the Secure Communities effort.

I know of other instances, though—and I think the Department has verified that there are other instances—where that line between Federal and local authority has gotten very seriously blurred, where there have been instances of profiling and other abuses. In fact, there have been so many abuses that I concluded some time ago that 287(g) was prone to abuse, that there were too many problems with the way that program was set up for it to really be our long-term effort to involve local officials in immigration matters.

I believe it's very important that 287(g) be phased into the Secure Communities effort. The Secure Communities effort is now taking off around the country, and I think can in time supersede this flawed 287(g) concept.

And then, finally, there's also the matter of expense. We discussed earlier today $32,000 per removal for that task force model 287(g) program versus something like $1,500 under secure communities. It's a waste of money.

Therefore, I thought the administration did the right thing in reducing the funding for 287(g) and continuing the phase-in of Secure Communities. I regret that the committee put that money back, but I certainly feel that this current amendment—I don't understand what it means—but I certainly don't want to let the occasion pass without saying to my colleagues, I think this 287(g) program is one that we need to oversee very, very carefully. I remain convinced that it can and should be superseded by a better program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. GINGREY from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding me time. I would just say to my colleague from North Carolina that—as I pointed out in describing this amendment—the 287(g) program superseded some of these State laws that were enacted west of the Mississippi, not east of the Mississippi, and obviously there were some problems. But in this situation that I'm describing—and the reason the chairman of the subcommittee wants so strongly to fund this program—is communities like Cobb County, Georgia, in the heart

of the 11th Congressional District, my district. Sheriff Neil Warren has been utilizing this program since 2007, Mr. Chairman, and as I pointed out, it is a force multiplier. The deputy sheriffs in Cobb County are not patrolling the streets profiling, looking for certain individuals to ask them for their papers or anything of that sort.

This program is just simply when someone is incarcerated for committing a crime in our community. And it doesn't matter their ethnicity. Anybody in that jail with the training of these officers under the 287(g) Federal program, federally trained, they have the ability, the knowledge, the wherewithal, to find out, to check the databases, the Homeland Security information, Social Security, to find out whether or not these individuals are in this country legally.

Now, if they're not in the country legally, we make note of that—they make note of that—under the 287(g) program. They serve their time for the crime they committed in our community, whether that's running a red light or driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol or a minor fender-bender, whatever it is, they serve their time.

ICE is then simply given this information, and they can make a decision whatever they want to do in regard to whether they deport these illegal immigrants. The Secure Communities program, of course, gives them the ability to decide not to deport them. Well, the local community, the local sheriff's department, is out of it at that point. So nothing can be better than a program like 287(g). And it's well worth the dollars spent, and as I point out, a force multiplier.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, and I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's get the job done and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I was intending on offering an amendment dealing with Border Security Centers of Excellence. I will not offer that amendment, and I would like to just indicate that I look forward to working with the ranking member and the chairman.

As we move to a comprehensive immigration reform, Border Security Centers of Excellence are universities that look to the highest technology of how we can secure America. They undertake research and education initiatives designed to meet the needs of the Department of Homeland Security, border security, and immigration in a global context. They develop and use cutting-edge research methodologies focused on unique science and technology policy issues, and they develop educational programs in order to educate current and future practitioners, which is really crucial, and researchers in the relevant disciplines.

If we want to secure America, we need the technology and the expertise. As a ranking member on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I can assure you that as we look to the new metrics of border security in the northern and southern border, we need personnel. And my amendment was going to ensure that we allow Congress to gather the information needed by Congress to establish more universities, or opportunities for more universities and colleges to participate as Border Security Centers of Excellence.

In my own community, Houston Community College, Texas Southern University, University of Houston, a number of campuses could be engaged as Border Security Centers of Excellence. Texas Southern University, for example, received from my initiative a Transportation Security Center of Excellence that was established under that particular legislation, the Transportation Security Administration legislation.

□ 2200

So I would like to make sure that we look forward to doing that.

I do want to indicate, as we pass the amendment dealing with no knives on planes, that I had introduced legislation with Mr. GRIMM that allowed Administrator Pistole an indefinite amount of time to consult with stakeholders. I, frankly, believe that legislation helped turn the corner for the thoughtful position that Mr. Pistole has now taken. I think the amendment that we passed today was by voice and was common sense and makes a good, important statement.

I also think the idea of emphasizing the importance of U.S. air marshals in my previous amendment that was accepted is important and to reemphasize the importance of the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security for the traveling public in order to ensure that it assesses high-risk places of departure so that air marshals can be used effectively, efficiently, and with funding.

With all of that, I believe the amendments that have been put upon the floor today and that I have discussed and offered contribute positively to the ultimate direction of security in this country. As I conclude, I hope that we will be able to have more Border Security Centers of Excellence, and I look forward to working with this committee and the authorizing committee to ensure that in comprehensive immigration reform we have the technology, the personnel, the training, the research, and the education to make it work as it should.

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

Madam Chair, thank you for this opportunity to explain my proposed amendment, which simply gives the Secretary of Homeland Security the flexibility to conduct the study on the feasibility of expanding the membership of university-based Homeland Security Centers of Excellence.

The mission of the Department of Homeland Security Centers of Excellence is to:

Undertake research and education initiatives designed to meet the needs of the Department of Homeland Security, border security and immigration in a global context.

Develop and use cutting-edge research methodologies focused on the unique science, technology, and policy issues within this domain.

Develop educational programs in order to educate current and/or future practitioners and researchers in the relevant disciplines, and to help define emerging education areas.

Under current law composition of membership of Homeland Security Centers, the number of centers is limited by law and can only be enlarged by Congress.

This amendment allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a study to gather information needed by Congress in determining eligibility of more universities.

In my congressional district, 18th Congressional District of Houston, TX, there are a number of institutions that have the expertise in research and staffing that would be in addition to this consortium involved in the Border Security Center of Excellence, such as the University of Houston and Texas Southern University.

My amendment would just simply allow the United States to benefit from the expertise from new Homeland Security Centers of Excellence. I look forward to working toward adding more Border Security Centers of Excellence.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana.

Amendment by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

Amendment by Mr. RUNYAN of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 345, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—80

Amash	Grimm	Perlmutter
Andrews	Gutierrez	Polis
Bass	Higgins	Rahall
Bentivolio	Himes	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Rice (SC)
Bonamici	Huffman	Richmond
Braley (IA)	Israel	Sánchez, Linda T.
Brown (FL)	Jeffries	
Burgess	Kelly (IL)	Schrader
Capps	Kildee	Schwartz
Carney	Kilmer	Sensenbrenner
Cartwright	Kind	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Maffei	Speier
Courtney	Maloney, Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Massie	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matheson	Tonko
Doyle	McGovern	Tsongas
Duncan (TN)	Meeks	Van Hollen
Edwards	Meng	Velázquez
Ellison	Michaud	Wasserman Schultz
Engel	Miller, George	
Esty	Murphy (PA)	Waters
Farr	Nadler	Watt
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Gohmert	Pallone	Yoho
Green, Gene		

NOES—345

Aderholt	Conaway	Goodlatte
Alexander	Cook	Gosar
Amodei	Cooper	Gowdy
Bachmann	Costa	Granger
Bachus	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Barber	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crawford	Grayson
Barr	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barrow (GA)	Cuellar	Griffin (AR)
Barton	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Beatty	Cummings	Guthrie
Becerra	Daines	Hahn
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Hall
Bera (CA)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Harris
Black	DeLauro	Hartzler
Blackburn	DelBene	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Bonner	Dent	Heck (NV)
Boustany	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Brady (PA)	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Brooks (AL)	Dingell	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Doggett	Honda
Broun (GA)	Duckworth	Horsford
Brownley (CA)	Duffy	Hoyer
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Bucshon	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Bustos	Enyart	Huizenga (MI)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Hultgren
Calvert	Farenthold	Hunter
Camp	Fattah	Hurt
Cantor	Fincher	Issa
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Cárdenas	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Carter	Forbes	Johnson, E. B.
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Castor (FL)	Foster	Jones
Castro (TX)	Foxx	Jordan
Chabot	Frankel (FL)	Joyce
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Kaptur
Chu	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Cicilline	Fudge	Kelly (PA)
Clarke	Gabbard	Kennedy
Clay	Gallego	King (IA)
Cleaver	Garcia	King (NY)
Coble	Gardner	Kingston
Coffman	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Cohen	Gerlach	Kirkpatrick
Cole	Gibbs	Kline
Collins (GA)	Gibson	Kuster
Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
LaMalfa	O'Rourke	Schweikert
Lamborn	Olson	Scott (VA)
Lance	Owens	Scott, Austin
Lankford	Palazzo	Scott, David
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Sessions
Latham	Pastor (AZ)	Sewell (AL)
Latta	Paulsen	Shea-Porter
Levin	Payne	Sherman
Lewis	Pearce	Shimkus
Lipinski	Pelosi	Shuster
LoBiondo	Perry	Simpson
Loebsack	Peters (CA)	Sinema
Lofgren	Peters (MI)	Smith (MO)
Long	Peterson	Smith (NE)
Lowenthal	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pingree (ME)	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Pitts	Southerland
Luetkemeyer	Pocan	Stewart
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Poe (TX)	Stivers
	Pompeo	Stockman
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Posey	Stutzman
	Price (GA)	Takano
Lummis	Price (NC)	Terry
Lynch	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Radel	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Reed	Thornberry
Marino	Reichert	Tiberi
Matsui	Renacci	Tierney
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Tipton
McCaul	Rigell	Titus
McClintock	Roby	Turner
McCollum	Roe (TN)	Upton
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Veasey
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Vela
McMorris Rodgers	Rokita	Visclosky
	Rooney	Wagner
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Meadows	Roskam	Walden
Meehan	Ross	Walorski
Messer	Rothfus	Walz
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Miller (FL)	Royce	Weber (TX)
Miller (MI)	Ruiz	Webster (FL)
Miller, Gary	Runyan	Wenstrup
Moore	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
Moran	Rush	Whitfield
Mullin	Ryan (OH)	Williams
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Wittman
Negrete McLeod	Sanford	Wolf
Neugebauer	Sarbanes	Womack
Noem	Scalise	Woodall
Nolan	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Nugent	Schiff	Yoder
Nunes	Schneider	Young (AK)
Nunnelee	Schock	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Markey	Pittenger
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sires
Langevin	McHenry	Young (FL)

□ 2228

Messrs. HANNA, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. CAPUANO, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BACHMANN, Messrs. FATTAH, CÁRDENAS, CHABOT, KELLY of Pennsylvania, CICILLINE, PASTOR of Arizona, BLUMENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. PAYNE, SCOTT of Virginia, RUSH, HONDA, and LEWIS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, GOHMERT, YOHO, RAHALL, and THOMPSON of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, on rollcall vote No. 199, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 261, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—165

Amash	Gabbard	Neal
Andrews	Garamendi	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Grayson	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Bustos	Holt	Polis
Butterfield	Honda	Price (NC)
Capps	Horsford	Quigley
Capuano	Hoyer	Rangel
Cárdenas	Huffman	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	
Chu	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Clay	Kennedy	Schrader
Cleaver	Kildee	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kind	Scott, David
Connolly	Kuster	Serrano
Conyers	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costa	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Speier
Crowley	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Loebsack	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowey	Tierney
Delaney	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Tonko
DeLauro		Tsongas
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Van Hollen
Deutch		Vargas
Dingell	Maloney, Carolyn	Veasey
Doggett		Velázquez
Doyle	McCollum	Visclosky
Duckworth	McDermott	Walz
Edwards	McGovern	Wasserman Schultz
Ellison	Meeks	
Engel	Meng	Waters
Enyart	Michaud	Watt
Esty	Miller, George	Waxman
Farr	Moore	Welch
Fattah	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth
Fudge	Napolitano	

NOES—261

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

Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Grijalva
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2234

Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. SCHIFF changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—180

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Lofgren
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Nadler
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—247

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2239

Mr. OLSON changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 50, noes 373, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—50

Beatty
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps
Cárdenas
Chabot
Clarke
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Doyle
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gibbs
Gohmert
Granger
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Honda
Hunter
Israel
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Latta
Mulvaney
Owens
Pascrell
Pingree (ME)
Poe (TX)
Renacci
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ryan (OH)
Schrader
Schweikert
Shuster
Stivers
Stutzman
Tiberi
Visclosky
Welch
Westmoreland
Wolf
Yoder

NOES—373

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

McCollum

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Cleaver
Garrett
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Ruppersberger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 146, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—281

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—146

Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeGette
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2247

Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. WITTMAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MEADOWS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Campbell
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2251

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 280, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—146

Alexander
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)

Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Moore
Mulvaney
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Tonko
Vargas
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—280

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Gutierrez
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Young (FL)

□ 2255

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 278, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—148

Andrews
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cramer
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Dingell
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
Lance
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Moore
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Nunes
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—278

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Messer
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Walz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Pittenger
Sires
Waters
Young (FL)

□ 2300

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of an alternative fuel unless its lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. In summary, my amendment would stop the government from enforcing this ban on all Federal agencies funded by the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plan to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuels. This restriction was based on the opinion of environmentalists that coal-based jet fuel produces more greenhouse gas emissions than traditional petroleum.

We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and can efficiently rely on domestic and more stable sources of fuel. But section 526's ban on fuel choice now affects all Federal agencies, not just the Defense Department. This is why I'm offering this amendment today to the DHS appropriations bill.

Federal agencies should not be burdened with wasting their time studying fuel emissions when there is a simple fix, and that fix is to not restrict Federal Government fuel choices based on extreme environmental views, unsound policies, and misguided regulations like those in section 526.

With increasing competition for energy and fuel resources, and the continued volatility and instability in the Middle East, it is now more important than ever for our country to become more energy secure and to further develop and produce our domestic energy resources. Placing limits on Federal agencies' fuel choices is an unacceptable precedent to set in regard to America's energy policy and independence.

Madam Chair, section 526 makes our Nation more dependent on Middle East oil. Stopping the impact of section 526 will help us promote American energy, improve the American economy, and create American jobs.

Madam Chairman, it is also important to note that this amendment does not prevent and does not restrict the ability of the Federal Government to purchase any alternative fuels, including biodiesel, ethanol, or other fuels from renewable resources. It places no restrictions whatsoever on that.

Let's remember the following facts about section 526. It increases our reliance on Middle Eastern oil, it hurts our military readiness, our national security and our energy security, it prevents the increased use of safe, clean, and efficient North American oil and gas, it increases the cost of American food and energy, it hurts American jobs and the American economy, and last—but certainly not least—it costs our taxpayers more of their hard-earned dollars.

I offered this amendment to appropriation bills during the 112th Congress and they all passed on the floor of the House with strong bipartisan support. My friend, Mr. CONAWAY, also added similar language to the Defense authorization bill today to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is intended to ensure that the environmental costs from the use of alternative fuels are at least no worse than the fuels in use today. It requires the Federal Government do no more harm when it comes to harmful emissions and climate change than it does today through the use of unconventional fuels.

Section 526 precludes the use of fuels such as coal-to-liquids, as well as unconventional petroleum fuels such as tar sands and oil shale, unless advanced technologies such as carbon sequestration are used to mitigate their greenhouse gas emissions. This is a provision in law that I think affords important environmental protections, important conditions on the adoption of alternative fuels, so I think it would be a mistake for this body to prohibit in any way the enforcement of section 526. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Flores amendment to H.R. 2217 that will prevent funds in this legislation from being used to carry out section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Section 526 prohibits all Federal agencies from contracting for alternative fuels that emit higher levels of greenhouse gas emissions than conventional petroleum sources.

□ 2310

This means that, if a Federal agency, particularly the Department of Defense and Homeland Security, has the ability of utilizing an alternative fuel that even has one scintilla more of carbon emissions than conventional fuels, it cannot be used. Some of you may not know what a ''scintilla'' is, but the professor from Duke does. It's a very, very, very small amount. As a result, section 526 severely limits innovation from Homeland Security at Customs and Border Patrol to improve clean carbon capture technologies for alternative fuels, thereby increasing our dependence on foreign oil, and will only further increase fuel costs.

The amendment intends to remove the handcuffs placed on the agencies under this bill by section 526. This means that Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, particularly the Air Force, will still be able to purchase Canadian fuels with just traces—scintillas—of oil sands that may create

more of a carbon footprint than completely conventional fuel.

Madam Chairman, I support a full repeal of section 526 because the cost of refined product for DOD has increased by over 500 percent in the last 10 years when volume has only increased by 30 percent. The Flores amendment takes a very important step in achieving this goal by prohibiting funding to carry out section 526 for the upcoming fiscal year at Homeland Security.

With that in mind, I appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleague from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on this important issue. I urge this body to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I rise to engage Chairman CARTER in a colloquy on the Science and Technology Directorate within the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the enabling act that created the Homeland Security Department provided the new Department with special access to the Department of Energy's national laboratories. The intent was for DHS to utilize the unique capabilities at the national laboratories so that DHS would not build up the duplicative capabilities within the Department.

Building duplicative capabilities at different agencies is a poor use of taxpayer dollars, and there is no need to do so given the Department's access to the existing national labs. At a time when our government has dramatically reduced its ability to conduct cutting-edge research into new technologies, we must ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is using its resources in the most cost-effective methods possible.

Instead of reinventing the wheel and developing new capabilities, the DHS should be utilizing our DOE national labs whenever practicable as they conduct research, development, testing or evaluate activities. The national labs have first-rate capabilities in many areas relevant to Homeland Security, ranging from explosive detection technologies to advanced cybersecurity techniques. Mr. Chairman, I urge us to work with the Department to ensure that their research and development funds are effectively spent and not used to create redundant capabilities.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman from New Mexico for raising this issue.

As he has pointed out, the Department has the ability to utilize the incredible scientific resources of our national laboratories. I look forward to working with him on this important issue.

As our Nation continues to face a tight fiscal situation, it is vital that DHS work to ensure that its Science and Technology Directorates make good use of our government's existing capabilities.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance operations at Abu Dhabi International Airport in the United Arab Emirates. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Meehan-DeFazio-Miller amendment. This amendment deals with the Department of Homeland Security, which has entered into an agreement to establish a Customs and Border Protection preclearance facility at the Abu Dhabi International Airport in the United Arab Emirates. There are currently other pre-clearance facilities in some countries around the world, and the purpose behind these is really to facilitate the travel for many who go through this at a facility away from the United States. We have huge backlogs at some of our critical airports, particularly in places like New York.

However, the ranking member on the Homeland Security subcommittee, on which I serve, along with the other members and some 150 Members of Congress, have joined me in a letter because we are concerned about the intent of what is done with this. The effect of it is really going to be to dramatically disadvantage American airlines.

You see, what's happening in Abu Dhabi is there is no American airline that flies from Abu Dhabi to the United States. This is solely being done for the benefit of an airline which is solely supported by the United Arab Emirates, and it is going to have a disparate impact on the ability for our American airlines to be competitive for the very simple reason that what will happen is many people will say, Well, I'm going to get to New York, and I've got a 3- or 4-hour wait in order to get through that line. I'm going to go to Abu Dhabi, and I'm going to fly through there on the foreign carrier.

All the jobs associated with our American airlines begin to be influenced by supporting a foreign-based airline that will then increase its market share into the United States. It also starts to shift some of the favor of the placement of these facilities towards third parties' countries that will enter an agreement like is happening in Abu Dhabi where they are underwriting 80 percent of the cost. I don't want to see our Customs and Border Patrol to be for sale to the highest bidder, and that seems to be what one of the concerns is here.

The reality as well is that, the extent to which we think we are having an impact on terrorism, anybody is going to know: don't go through Abu Dhabi. Go through any of the other places that will still get you into the country without a pre-clearance that would be a check on a foreign area.

The last thing is that this is going to be partially funded with United States taxpayer dollars. Twenty percent of the cost is going to be associated with us, so why would American taxpayers be paying money to support what will actually be to the benefit of a foreign-based airline?

So along with 150 of my other colleagues, I hope that our amendment will ensure that taxpayer dollars do not go to subsidize the pre-clearance facility and the foreign government-owned airlines, and I urge Members of both parties to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it's a good amendment, and I have the same concerns that are expressed by the author.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The Customs and Border Protection preclearance program, Madam Chairman, serves a critical national security function by stationing CBP officers abroad at the cost of the host nation. This allows CBP officers to screen and make admissibility decisions on individuals, goods and baggage long before they ever leave a foreign port or could possibly become a threat to the homeland.

I myself have been screened as a part of pre-clearance operations in Canada and Ireland. Apparently, these operations offer not only a convenience for travelers but also an effective and efficient way of carrying out security operations.

□ 2320

In fiscal year 2012 alone, CBP officers and agriculture specialists pre-cleared more than 1.5 million travelers destined to the United States. To outright prohibit the expansion of this program to an area of the world where we know

terrorists are actively traveling and training and seeking to carry out missions of harm against the homeland simply makes no sense whatsoever.

I understand many domestic airlines have expressed concern that this deal would somehow give UAE-based airlines an upper hand, but there are some facts that aren't disputed and we simply should consider.

For one, CBP has stated numerous times that access to Abu Dhabi for American carriers would be a precondition of implementing preclearance there.

Secondly, our bill provides statutory language that prohibits preclearance operations at new locations until three conditions are met: the foreign and national security rationales have been provided to the Congress; a full cost analysis has been provided to the Congress; and an economic impact analysis of any new location on U.S. airline carriers has been conducted and provided to the Congress.

That's good language. That will be good oversight on our part, and I commend the chairman for including that language in our bill.

So given this language, given the known benefits for traveler convenience, for this country's security, the known benefits that this program provides, I simply can't support the gentleman's agreement and I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. For ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs'' for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), as authorized by subsection (f)(2) of such section, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Homeland Security—Office of the Chief Financial Officer'' is hereby reduced by, $10,000,000.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, in what has been one of the worst drought years in the recorded history of my home State of New Mexico, we're already feeling the effects of another severe fire season. Already, more than 18,000 acres of forest have burned as a result of two fires caused by downed power lines, and those numbers are growing as we speak. Hundreds of homes have been threatened and families have been evacuated. In 2011, during the Las Conchas fire, we lost 150,000 acres of forest to wildfire, again caused by a downed power line.

The importance of disaster preparedness is key to saving human lives and property. My amendment today would make available an additional $10 million for State and local grant programs to ensure local towns and communities can be prepared for catastrophic wildfires before they hit. This amendment is cost neutral.

While there may be concerns by some of my colleagues and even opposition, I would ask, Madam Chair, that we work together to understand that when there are communities burning that we reach out and we try to do what we can to help these innocent individuals.

My amendment would also allow local utilities to take preventive measures for the causes and impacts of wildfires. We must do all we can to ensure that communities have the resources they need to address the dangers and damages of wildfire before and after catastrophic events occur.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Madam Chair, before I yield back, I would like to take a moment to thank all of the firefighters for their brave service battling the Tres Lagunas and Thompson Ridge fires in northern New Mexico. Time and again, those on the frontline, as well as those on the command teams, have acted admirably while putting their lives at risk. To all of those who have volunteered, donated resources and lent a helping hand to the firefighters and our displaced friends and neighbors, God bless you and thank you for your hard work.

Again, Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to consider supporting my amendment that will help our communities prepare for wildfires. And with that, Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work in this important area, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. In total, this bill provides $2.5 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants. This is $400 million above the President's request for fiscal year 2014 and $35 million above fiscal year 2013.

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

I strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline and vote ''no'' on this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I have no objection to this amendment. In fact, I want to commend the gentleman for offering it.

He's in a tight spot with limited possibilities for offsetting the addition he wants to apply to the situation in his area that he describes. The offset is not ideal, but I'm certainly willing to work with him going forward to get more money directed to these vital emergency needs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, on this I would like a recorded vote, please.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman, Congressman CARTER, regarding Operation Stonegarden, which is a facet of our Homeland Security operations and which is provided for in the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

By way of background, Operation Stonegarden is a Department of Homeland Security grant program that is intended to provide a great deal of cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, local, municipal and tribal law enforcement agencies in a joint mission to secure the United States borders, including travel corridors in States that border Canada and Mexico, as well as States and territories with international water borders. The grants are made available to local units of government. They're made based on risk analysis and feasibility of the proposed investments demonstrated by the applicants.

I speak on behalf of local law enforcement entities in Arizona when I say that this program actually works. It serves to bolster resources available to law enforcement and border States as they do their best to tackle overwhelming problems of illegal immigration, in addition to illegal trafficking of drugs, persons, weapons and money. I hear nothing but praise for the program, and I know that the people of Arizona and other border States reap the benefits of this program whether they know the program by name or not. When people are involved in the process, you see certain programs and initiatives take off because everyone's input is respected, considered and valued.

In fact, the program works so well and is needed so badly that in 2009, Secretary Napolitano decided to extend an additional $30 million to be divided amongst the States which needed the resources most. Though I may not agree with Arizona's former Governor on many issues, this is a decision I applauded.

The problem of illegal immigration is one that I think will remain for sometime, which is why we are debating immigration reform in Congress today.

□ 2330

As I have said before, trust is a series of promises kept. Current and previous administrations held by both parties have failed to keep that promise, and so we are here today. Border security and interior enforcement are of utmost concern when considering immigration and the protection of our homeland, and this program is a prime example of the teamwork that is needed to deliver on the promises made to the people of this great Republic.

This investment in our Nation's homeland security is one that pays off over and over again, and it is my hope that future legislation will continue to provide robust resources for this program.

It is our collective duty as a deliberative body to ensure that we both support the Federal programs and initiatives that actually work, while simultaneously reducing or sunsetting those that do not. I am pleased that the House has begun such a process in the past two Congresses, and I am proud to be part of it.

The people of Arizona and I thank the chairman for increasing the resources available to Operation Stonegarden relative to previous appropriations.

And with that, I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for highlighting this important program. As a fellow border State Member, I am especially aware of the issues we face with illegal immigration and criminal trafficking across our borders, particularly our southern border. Operation Stonegarden provides valuable resources to local and tribal governments for coordination with their Federal counterparts and to assist them in furthering our Nation's border security. I look forward to working with my friend from Arizona and others as we move forward to ensure continued support for this worthy and valuable program.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by September 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Homeland Security Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have introduced a similar amendment to nine different appropriations bill in the past 2 years, and each time it was accepted and passed by voice vote.

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

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light duty vehicles in America. According to the GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with almost 55,000 being used by the Department of Homeland Security.

By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources—including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen and renewable electricity. Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies, will increase our Nation's domestic security, protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

On a similar note, I will soon be introducing the Open Fuels Act, which is similar to this, with our colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Our bill would require 30 percent of new automobiles in 2015 and 50 percent in 2016 and every subsequent year to be able to be operated on nonpetroleum fuels in addition to or instead of petroleum-based fuels. And it would cost $100 or less per car manufactured in America to do this.

Possibilities include the full array of existing technologies—including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive, fuel cell, ethanol and methanol, and a catchall for new technologies. I remember driving and going into a gasoline station in Brazil. I believe the chairwoman was with me at the time. And we noticed that there were all kinds of alternatives available to Brazilian consumers that were not available to American consumers, and it just seems to me that we ought to not only catch up but pull ahead and have that same kind of technology available to Americans.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and the Open Fuels Act as we work towards breaking our dependence on foreign oil, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, we support this amendment, and I yield to my colleague, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the chairman for yielding, and simply want to also express my support for the amendment, and hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the documents described in subsection (b).

(b) For purposes of this section, the documents described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Policy Number 10072.1, published on March 2, 2011.

(2) Policy Number 10075.1, published on June 17, 2011.

(3) Policy Number 10076.1, published on June 17, 2011.

(4) The Memorandum of November 17, 2011, from the Principal Legal Advisor of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement pertaining to ''Case-by-Case Review of Incoming and Certain Pending Cases''.

(5) The Memorandum of June 15, 2012, from the Secretary of Homeland Security pertaining to ''Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children''.

(6) The Memorandum of December 21, 2012, from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement pertaining to ''Civil Immigration Enforcement: Guidance on the Use of Detainers in the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Criminal Justice Systems''.

Mr. KING of Iowa (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I object. I think we want to hear this entire amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that I offered last year that succeeded here on the floor by a vote of 238–175 in a bipartisan fashion. It's the amendment that simply says none of the funds made available in this act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the documents described, which are known as the Morton memos.

The Morton memos are essentially executive edicts that have flowed from the White House, that have flowed also from the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, down through John Morton, who is the Director of ICE; and they seek to implement an administrative amnesty policy. There are six of these memos, and the one we're most familiar with is the memo that grants what is known, generally speaking, as Dream Act Lite, which gives I'll say a legal status, if you accept the authority of the President to suspend immigration law, to those who fit four different classes of people.

Four classes of people granted administrative amnesty if they claim to have come to the United States under the age of 16; if they've been here over 5 years; if they have received a high school or a GED degree; or been honorably discharged from the military.

□ 2340

And in the memo, particularly the one who is the Dream Act Light memo, dated June 15 of 2012, seven times they mention that prosecutorial discretion on an individual basis.

Well, this sets up four classes of people. It has been the subject of litigation. The litigation that's gone to a Federal court in Texas is the case of Crane v. Napolitano. Chris Crane is the President of the ICE union. They made 10 points to the unconstitutionality of these memos which direct ICE sometimes to break the very immigration law that they've pledged to uphold.

And so I have in my hand the decision that came down from that district in Texas, and it's a northern district of Texas. And of the 10 points made in this case, the judge upheld 9 of them in the favor of the Constitution and the rule of law. The 10th one he sent back to them and said, the government hasn't given us a clear enough argument; rewrite that and I'll give you another decision on it. I expect that all 10 are likely to be found in the favor of the Constitution and the rule of law.

The point here is, Madam Chair, the President does not have the authority to waive immigration law, nor does he have the authority to create it out of thin air, and he's done both with these Morton memos in this respect.

They do have prosecutorial discretion, I concede that point. But the President nor do any of his agents through the executive branch of government have the authority to create classes of people and waive the enforcement of immigration law for classes of people and then, on top of that, create a work permit out of thin air.

That's just a couple of these memos, of these six memos that are there all together. And we should remember that the memo dated November 17, 2011, includes 475,000 people who had already been adjudicated for deportation. And the President, through his agents in the executive branch, has ordered that the people that have been adjudicated for deportation on those lists should have the law waived and they should stay in the United States even though the law that requires that they've already been adjudicated for deportation—300,000 of the 475,000 have already been granted an administrative legal presence.

This Congress has the full authority to establish immigration law. The President takes an oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. And every single document that provides lawful presence in the United States of America, aside from a naturally born American citizen, is a product of this Congress, not a product of the pen of the President or the people whom he appoints.

And so this is an amendment that prohibits the resources from being used to enforce the Morton memos, and it conforms with the Founding Fathers' vision, and it conforms with the Constitution in that the President cannot defy his own oath of office. He can't defy the Constitution. The President can't take on Article I authority and legislate by executive order or edict or press conference. That's the job of this Congress. That's why we are Article I. He is Article II.

And whatever people think of the impending immigration policy here in the United States, we cannot allow the executive branch to usurp the legislative authority of the United States Congress. If we allow that to happen in immigration, it could happen to anything.

So I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I rise with great disappointment, and I think ''sadness'' is the right word. This is an amendment that I very much hoped would not be offered tonight. I know that many in this Chamber hoped it would not be offered tonight.

It's a ''poison pill'' amendment. That's a term I've not used tonight, and it's a term I don't use lightly. I very much hoped this amendment would not be offered, and I hope now that it's been offered that it is not fated to pass.

We've worked for months cooperatively on this Homeland Security appropriations bill. As I said in announcing bipartisan support for this bill at the beginning of today's debate, I commended the chairman heartily and the staff and Members who have worked so hard on this in a bipartisan fashion, trying to come together. We gave a little, we took a little, but we did understand that it was important for this institution and for our Nation's security to come together on a Homeland Security bill that most Members of this Chamber could support. And for that reason, most divisive issues, most extraneous issues that have the capacity to divide us, and, in fact, to destroy that bipartisan support, most of those have been conscientiously avoided. And that has included, until this moment, the offering of amendments on this floor.

The gentleman describes this as an amendment he offered last year. Yes, it's an amendment that he offered last year, and it's an amendment that blew up bipartisan support for this bill last year.

And it's an amendment, by the way, with one very toxic addition from last year—twisting the knife, so to speak—adding the Dream Act children to the bill's provisions. Unbelievable that that would be added in this version of the bill.

Let me just say that what the King amendment would prohibit is what every law enforcement agency in this country must do and does with regularity: making the most effective use of limited resources.

No law enforcement agency in the land can go after every violation. Each law enforcement agency must prioritize the resources and go after the ones who would do us the most harm. Can we imagine that the Department of Homeland Security would not do that? In fact, we would rightly condemn them if they did not do that.

One of the documents that the King amendment would require Immigration and Customs Enforcement to ignore states, and I'm quoting:

> Aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety are priority one for removal.

That's what the gentleman wants the agency to ignore. In a world with limited resources, it's dangerous, it's irresponsible, it's totally unrealistic not to prioritize the detention and the deportation of people who pose a threat to public safety and national security. And to do it in a demagogic fashion, saying, if you prioritize criminals, if your priority is dangerous people, then, well, you must be giving amnesty to everyone else, it's absurd. It's absurd. It may have a certain appeal on the talk shows, but it is unworthy of this body.

Why would we want ICE to spend as much time and energy going after innocent kids in college who were brought to this country by their parents as it spends going after known dangerous criminals?

Why would we want ICE to focus on the detention and the deportation of

the spouses of U.S. citizens serving in our military rather than on people who pose a threat to national security?

Colleagues know there is no answer to these questions that doesn't point in the direction of a resounding rejection of this extreme and destructive amendment. And I beg my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have a number of good friends on the floor, Madam Chair. My good friend, Mr. KING, serves with me on the Judiciary Committee, good friend, Mr. PRICE, who is the ranking member, has just given an eloquent exposé of the contents of Mr. KING's amendment. And I've worked with Judge CARTER, Congressman CARTER, Chairman CARTER, as we look to ensuring the security of the border and protecting the homeland.

I think it is important, first of all, that we should thank ICE officers across America because most ICE officers, in spite of the judicial decision that Mr. KING offers, have followed the executive order or the directions of their Director, Mr. Morton, who is an established public servant and law enforcement officer.

□ 2350

His credentials are without question. The Judiciary Committee has heard from Mr. Morton on several occasions to articulate the premise of the provisions that are being attacked in this amendment. Each time he has been able to document the value of what this prosecutorial discretion series of orders represents. In fact, Mr. Morton went out on the road. He came to Houston, Texas, and met at our immigration services office to explain to an array of community service persons what this actually meant.

There was no offering of amnesty. There was no utilization of that language. There was no suggestion that this would be an open-door policy. This was a suggestion that thoughtful ICE agents, law enforcement officers, entrusted to uphold the law, would have the authority to use prosecutorial discretion so that, as my colleague from North Carolina said, we would go after the terrorists, go after those who are here to do us harm, but allow hardworking families to stay together.

In the remarks of my good friend from Iowa, he does not make mention of the fact that the Obama administration has deported more individuals than any administration preceding it. Many of us have advocated against that. But what we did advocate for is a fair assessment of how you make that determination.

Now, maybe my good friend and the friends on the floor are not aware that we're under sequester, that we're operating under a budget line that is not even a trillion dollars. It's $970-plus billion. That's way below what I'd like to see to fund this government that we have. If that is the question, then why would my good friend, Mr. KING, suggest that we are not doing our job?

So we want to split up hardworking families and fathers who are supporting their families because it may be an overstay or they came in undocumented? But most of all, the pains of the eons and eons of young people that have come into my office that are in the academic institutions of Houston, or Texas, who want to stay here and contribute to America's dream—the Dream children—and we're now telling them, after receiving a prosecutorial deferral, using prosecutorial discretion, a case-by-case determination that there's no credible criminal background, nothing they have done wrong, and by that decision, that simple, even-handed decision, that nothing has been done wrong by them and they're allowed to stay.

I just want to know if my friend will support me on comprehensive immigration reform. Then we'll be able to get it fixed. And maybe he will answer that. But I will ask my colleagues to please look at this as a law enforcement tool. This is not willy-nilly. This has been a thoughtful process that ICE has articulated for its agents throughout the country for them to thoughtfully look at those individuals that would pose a danger. Deport them. But to those families who need to be united that are surviving and working and supporting four and five children and going to work and going to houses of worship, or those children that are in the sophomore year or third year or graduating or graduate school, or the mother who came and fell on the ground in my office prostrate and crying when it was acknowledged that her graduate school daughter could stay here and finish her degree. It was through no fault of her own. She had come here to the United States not knowing that she did not have status.

So I'm hoping, like Mr. PRICE, that we will not have a divisive amendment. And I'm praying that my good friend will join me on comprehensive immigration reform, Madam Chair, and that he will withdraw this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BARLETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the statements that were made here, Madam Chair. I'll just go through some of the things that I heard from the gentleman: that this amendment is a poison pill; that it's very toxic; that it's twisting the knife; that it's unbelievable; that it's a demagogic fashion; that it's talk show appeal.

I would point out to the body that none of that has any substance. And the real substance of this is that we all stood here on the floor of this House of Representatives and raised our hand and took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. We saw that happen today with the new Member right down here.

I take that seriously. I bring my Bible in and I swear on that Bible. And I carry a Constitution in my jacket pocket every single day, and I read it many of those days. But I adhere to that, as we all take the oath to do so. And if we have Members of this Congress that don't know the difference between article I and article II, or Members of this Congress that conflate article I and article II, or Members of this Congress that can somehow excuse a President who has crossed a line that he has himself drawn not just with his oath of office that I referenced earlier, but with a statement to the high school not very far outside of where we are right now on March 28, 2011, when he said:

> I know you want me to pass the DREAM Act by executive order, but I don't have the authority to do that. That's Congress' authority. I am the President. Congress writes the laws, the executive branch enforces the laws, and the Judiciary Branch rules on the language and the constitutionality of it.

The President was right. He's a former adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago. And even though I disagree with him quite often, that time he was right. But about a year later, he issued this order that his DREAM Act Light, that is an executive act that defied his own definition of the limitations of article II, the executive branch, and he assumed the powers and the authority of article I, the legislative branch.

Now, how can we take an oath to uphold this Constitution and excuse that kind of behavior? Because whether or not we approve of the policy, let's have the debate on the policy here, where it belongs. Let's not hand this over to a President who has usurped constitutional authority.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned this tension, this conflict, but they never envisioned that a United States Congress, House or Senate, would allow the President to usurp our constitutional authority. They envisioned that each body would aggressively defend the authority that we have within the Constitution.

This amendment that I have simply says we're not going to use taxpayers' dollars to defend this unconstitutional act on the part of the President of the United States. I've taken all the due diligence I can. I called a meeting. We initiated the litigation. We're moving it through the court system. But we can never catch up through the litigation process the things that the President has usurped that are the legislative authority that we have. That's the question that is here.

Whatever your position is on the DREAM Act Light and the Morton

memos and all of the things that seem to be coming out of the Gangs of 8 in the House or Senate, we have an oath to uphold the Constitution. That's the vote here, Madam Chair.

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

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

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. First of all, this has nothing to do with the Constitution of the United States. The fact is that the Congress of the United States has passed laws granting the President of the United States this executive authority. He has it by statute and by law. As a matter of fact, many of you might remember that in 1999, Congressman LAMAR SMITH and others wrote to then-President Clinton asking him to use his discretionary power more often.

In other words, I'm sorry to say to the gentleman, Mr. KING, but I think the gentleman from Texas is an authority on this issue, as he has chaired the Judiciary Committee, and the gentleman from Texas knows best. He signed that letter. And it was bipartisan. So this has nothing to do with the Constitution of the United States, not to kid ourselves.

Now, if we want to deal fundamentally with if this is good or bad, we can deal with that also. The fact is that this House passed the DREAM Act 216–208—that is a fact—in the fall of 2010, and 55 Senators stood up for the DREAM Act in the Senate.

□ 0000

The fact is that a majority of Senators have already voted in favor of it, and a majority of the Members of this House.

Now, what I don't find in the Constitution is where it says that a majority of Senators shouldn't prevail. We all know that. It should be just simply 51 out of 100, but that's not the way the Senate works. But that's not in the Constitution of the United States.

So what the President is really doing in his executive order is allowing. And I just want people to understand that we're also here for justice and for fairness. It is only fair and just that young men and women—who are no different than my daughters, than your daughters. They are just as American as they are. They speak this language. This is the country that they love. It is the only country that they know. And we're waiting for the paperwork to catch up to those Americans—that's what they are.

They came out by the hundreds of thousands. In Chicago, there were 12,000 in line. They came up with their moms and their dads and they were crying for joy because they had an opportunity to go to school, to become educated, and to contribute back to this Nation—children. We should not hold children responsible for the actions of adults and of their parents. We should give them an opportunity, and that is what this executive order has done.

They go to school with your children. They sit down in the same churches with you and pray on Sunday. They play on the same playground. They're an integral part of the communities in which we live. In America, when they hear them speak, they hear the voices of young Americans. And one day we will pass the DREAM Act, and we will not need an executive order.

Things are getting better, Mr. KING, here. November 6, everybody said stop picking winners and losers; let's fix this immigration issue. And Republicans and Democrats are working together to find a solution. Now is not the time to divide this House and the Senate when it is looking.

We can't talk decently about Benghazi or the IRS or anything—ObamaCare or the budget or guns. But there is one thing. I mean, when you have a Vice Presidential candidate, our colleague, PAUL RYAN, come to Chicago and speak, when you have Congressman CARTER come to San Antonio with me and speak, things are changing. Let's respect that. Let's respect the love and the intensity of caring about fixing our broken immigration system that has been expressed.

I was so delighted, I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa, when your majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, gave a speech and said I'm not only for the DREAM Act, I'm for a pathway to citizenship for the dreamer. I said great. I didn't question his motives. I said great. How can I help you?

Let's help him, the majority leader, and others—Democrats and Republicans alike—who have said, you know what, let's fix our broken immigration system. We're tired of it dividing families.

I want to say I've had them come into my office, American citizen soldiers—going and fighting on the frontline so that you have the right to speak here and protect it—and they have their wives being deported. We should have this discretion so their wives aren't deported. That's only fair and right.

Four million American citizen children—Mr. KING, 4 million American citizen children have undocumented parents. We should not separate them. We should have discretion to keep those families together.

Let's defeat this motion. It has no place in the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I know everyone's tired. I just finished getting off the floor, offering an amendment, and a colloquy with my colleague, the dear chairman, Mr. CARTER, as well. I went back to my small place to make a sandwich, and I saw this amendment come on the floor. And I had to hurry back.

Everybody's tired because it's so late, Madam Chair. Here we are, it's midnight. Under the dark of night, here we have an amendment that I hope the talk shows are paying attention and watching tonight, and I hope that dreamers across America are watching their televisions. Because, if not, they're going to be reading about this in the morning.

At a time when, as Congressman GUTIERREZ described, we're coming together as a Congress and as a Nation to try to get comprehensive immigration reform adopted; at a time when we should be concentrating our efforts on going after those criminals that are doing bad, bad things; when the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and faith-based organizations, churches across America on Sundays and Saturdays and even at Bible study on Wednesdays are talking about the importance of respecting our friends and our neighbors, especially those young people, these dreamers—these young men and women who serve in our military who are undocumented here in the United States, to look after them and to pray for them and encourage the Congress to come together, this amendment is a slap in their face, Madam Chair.

The King amendment would make communities less safe by discouraging crime victims from coming forward to police. The Morton memo on victims and witnesses encourages the agency not to initiate removal proceedings against an immediate victim or witness to a crime. This is needed to ensure that victims of domestic violence and other crimes come forward to seek protection. It is needed to help effective prosecutions of criminals.

The memo supports the U visa and the Violence Against Women Act's self-petition process that came under fire during the recent Violence Against Women debate, notwithstanding the strong law enforcement support for both these protections.

Let me see if I can make that simpler. An undocumented woman who is here in the United States who is a victim of rape, who comes forward to say who raped her, goes before the law enforcement without the memos in place and these protections, potentially, she is to be detained and deported because she was raped and she came forward with the courage to be able to try to get that individual who perpetrated that crime.

It's sad, Madam Chair, that here we are yet again at a time when Democrats and Republicans have come together to be able to advocate for the importance of taking care of our dreamers, when this passed this House and so many of our Senators came forward, when the leaders of our respective parties in this very House of Representatives that we're honored to be a part of have come together and advocated for this change. We're having

this debate after midnight here in Washington, D.C., tonight. It's sad.

And the Morton memos are hardly new. Prosecutorial discretion memos in the immigration context have existed since 1976. Congressman GUTIERREZ eloquently described the letters that were sent by Congressman Hyde and Congressman LAMAR SMITH asking for the Executive to use its discretionary authority.

Madam Chair, it's a sad, sad day that we're here tonight—under the dark of night—where I hope dreamers across America are paying attention. Because we need them tomorrow to light up those phones and make sure that they're talking to their friends, their families, to their deacons, to their priests, to their faith-based leaders and ask them to please stand up and encourage Members of Congress, when this comes up for a vote tomorrow morning, to call Members of Congress and tell them to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I would just like to point out that I do specifically challenge the gentleman from Iowa's claim that the President's deferred action program is unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court did rule in Arizona v. United States that the Federal Government, under the supremacy clause, does have the authority to set immigration policy over and above that of any State. Inherent in the authority to enforce the immigration laws is the right to be able to prioritize how that policy will be prioritized and how that policy will be executed.

Now, the fact is that the executive branch has the authority, has the right to decide that they will take action on some cases and will take action on others in a prioritized fashion. That is the very heart and soul of what DACA represents.

So for the gentleman to argue that there is some constitutional infirmity with deferred action is wrong. He's wrong on the law. He's wrong on his constitutional argument.

The fact is that it's important for the people of the United States to hear that these specious, weak arguments about lack of constitutionality are incorrect.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 0010

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Chair, I just want to make clear something about DACA. I filled out many applications, as I know my colleague from Minnesota has. They pay a fee. They go through an extensive background check. They have to give up their fingerprints and go through an extensive background check if they find they're denied DACA. So don't think it's just show up.

Now they're given a work permit for 2 years, and they get to work with that work permit. They don't have any right to health care or to any means-tested program, nothing but the right to work and not to be deported from the United States of America, and they're contributing to this country already.

So I just want to make that clear. Why would we want to spend the money of the Federal Government chasing down and hunting down and deporting people who came here as children who do not even know the country that they came from? Again, I want to reiterate: they are American in everything but a piece of paper. And the Congress of the United States should be working to try to see how it is we bring them in and integrate them more fully.

I want to express to the gentleman from Iowa something very, very clearly. I want to use every dollar and every resource to go after every gang-banger, every drug dealer, every person that is a criminal doing harm in the United States. But these are children who are doing no one harm. They came as children, they are innocent, and should be treated as such.

We want to prioritize our enforcement. We want to prioritize our enforcement so that we go after people who will do American citizens ill. They don't. They're children. They're wonderful, young people. And I would suggest to everybody here, meet one, talk to one. And what you're going to see is, the same values that you inculcate in your own children are the values that have been invested in these young men and women. We should give them a chance.

Many of them are being denied as they go through the process. But it is a process that says we should use prosecutorial discretion. It is law. Everybody in this body knows, and you don't have to be a student of the Constitution of the United States to know, that the President has plenary powers to pardon anybody at any time for any reason. Just ask Gerald Ford about Richard Nixon. That is a fact.

The President of the United States in this case is taking innocent young men and women who have been thoroughly checked in their background and said, Do you know what? I want to go after the mean, ugly people who want to do us harm, and I want to set aside these young men and women. We voted for it—216 to 208—and it was a proud day in the Congress of the United States.

And I just want to say one more time to the gentleman from Iowa, there are Members of your side of the aisle who I know——

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTIERREZ. No, I won't.

Who are going to continue to work with us in this Congress of the United States to get this finished. Please let us do that work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of any of the following:

(1) The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs).

(3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (relating to prohibition of discrimination).

(4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (relating to unlawful police pattern or practice).

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, before the body is a simple amendment of leaders of four separate caucuses, Members of this body—the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Spanish Caucus, and the Congressional Asian Pacific Islander Caucus—who join together to support a simple amendment to this important legislation.

Now, Madam Speaker, it is important to point out that the hardworking staff employees of DHS deserve respect and honor. They keep our country safe. We appreciate that. We appreciate all law enforcement, especially when they put their lives on the line for our safety. No one questions the public service and the professionalism demonstrated by security officials every day.

However, occasionally reports of racial and ethnic and religious profiling do occur. We see them in the news and we hear about them from civil liberties organizations. Too many Americans who are simply going about their business have been discriminated against

solely because of race, color, ethnicity. This is wrong, and it is well-rooted in our society that this is not an acceptable value or practice, and it's not what America is all about.

This amendment we are offering today would simply help to put an end to it. Our amendment—straightforward—simply cites the Constitution and existing antidiscrimination laws to affirm that no funds made available by this law can be used to engage in racial, ethnic, or religious profiling. This is not a controversial amendment, nor is it partisan. In fact, it was a former Bush administration official who said that religious, ethic, and racial stereotyping is not good policing.

Now, we simply ask that this amendment receive the support of the body and that we, again, affirm our Nation believes in equality under the law, and that it is behavior that should inform law enforcement decisions, not simply identity.

I ask for a ''yes'' vote, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, we accept this amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to my colleague, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also urge acceptance of the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any activity by Transportation Security Administration Transportation Security Officers outside an airport as defined in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, as I have stated earlier during the floor debate, TSA transportation security officers are not Federal law enforcement officers. They do not have any Federal law enforcement training, nor are they eligible to receive Federal law enforcement benefits.

When Congress created the TSA in 2001, we defined TSA screeners in law as Federal security screeners. Their role as defined by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act is to screen passengers and luggage at airports across the country.

However, beginning in 2005, TSA administratively reclassified TSA security screeners as transportation security officers and began to upgrade their uniforms to reflect those of Federal law enforcement officers with metal officer badges.

□ 0020

Time magazine contributor Amanda Ripley succinctly summed up the transition by stating that TSA was ''outfitting frontline employees with new gold badges and royal blue shirts as part of a broader effort to improve their image and make people, to put it bluntly, hate them less.''

The problem is that TSA officers do not have any Federal law enforcement training to reflect their officer title or appearance.

Law enforcement personnel for air transportation security are clearly defined in section 44903 of title 49, U.S. Code. U.S. Code states that ''law enforcement'' means individuals who are authorized to carry and use firearms, vested with the power of arrest, and are identifiable by distinctive marks of authority.

TSA officers do not meet these basic requirements of our law. Their training consists of 2 weeks in a classroom to learn how to screen passengers and bags, followed by 2 to 4 weeks of on-the-job training.

That is why it is troubling to me and many of my constituents that TSA is allowing their officers to take part in DHS VIPR team operations outside our airports. These operations are currently taking place on our Nation's highways, in our rail stations, ferry terminals, bus stations, and other mass transit facilities across the country. Adopting this amendment would end this practice.

The American public should be outraged that our national security strategy to prevent a horrific attack at a mass transit facility includes randomly sending people with no Federal law enforcement authority to randomly select and search citizens without any actionable intelligence. I strongly believe that Congress has an obligation to ensure that the title and appearance of Federal employees properly reflect their training and background.

There are already enough well-documented concerns questioning whether these individuals can even carry out the basic functions of their jobs within our airports. Here is an example:

Last year, a TSA officer whistleblower in Nashville produced documents showing that TSA officers in charge of screening a passenger's bags were receiving failing grades at being able to identify potential threats and were not receiving remedial training.

Another example is a GAO report, which I have with me right here, published in January, which shows that the TSA is failing to deploy passenger-screening canine teams to airports and terminals with the highest risk as determined by the agency's high-risk list. Furthermore, the report lays out concerns that the current protocols in place ''are not appropriate for a suicide bombing attempt requiring an immediate law enforcement response.''

If that's not concerning enough, there is a DHS Office of the Inspector General report released just last month on TSA's Behavior Detection Officers—and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi referenced this earlier—which only consists of TSA's Transportation Security Officers, and it raised concerns about their performance:

TSA senior airport officials at airports contacted raised concerns regarding the selection, allocation and performance of the BDOs.

TSA does not use an evaluation period to determine whether new BDOs can effectively perform behavior detection.

For these reasons, we should end this program and restrict them to the airports.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. I rise in opposition, reluctantly, to the gentlewoman's amendment.

This is very similar to the amendment that was raised earlier this evening. I expressed my opinion then, and I don't change my opinion. I have a great deal of concern about the issues that have been raised by my good friend from Tennessee—in fact, from Williamson County, Tennessee, and I'm from Williamson County, Texas.

I am going to recommend to my ranking member that we look into these allegations of misuse of law enforcement, or of the presumption of law enforcement. We are going to talk to Mr. Pistole to try to get to the bottom of this stuff, but I don't think what the gentlelady is trying to accomplish with this amendment is appropriate at this time without our holding hearings and discussing some of these issues and trying to examine the statutes and make sure that they are operating within the statutes.

So for that reason, I think this is not the time, and I am going to have to oppose this amendment.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I would echo his sentiments on this amendment. I understand that it's well-intentioned and that there may very well be some specific issues that demand attention, but this is largely the same amendment that we debated earlier this evening, which was voted down by a considerable margin, and I believe we should do that again.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARLETTA

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ___. None of the funds made available under the heading ''Departmental Management and Operations—Departmental Operations—Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'' may be used for official reception and representational expenses until the Secretary of Homeland Security complies with section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b).

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

Mr. BARLETTA. My amendment is simple.

The amendment would say that none of the funds from the Office of the Secretary may be used for official reception expenses until the Secretary of Homeland Security fully implements the biometric entry and exit data system.

A biometric exit system is already required by law. In 2004, Congress mandated the establishment of this system to track foreigners leaving our country. The 9/11 Commission recommended creating a biometric exit system as well. The creation of an effective exit system would keep our country safe because we would have a more effective way of tracking people who may pose a risk to our national security.

Oftentimes, people speak of the illegal immigration issue as involving the northern, southern, and coastal borders; but as Boston showed us plainly, it involves much more than that. Nearly half of the illegal immigrants currently in the United States did not cross a traditional border. Rather, they arrived here on a legitimate visa, saw the visa expire, and never returned home. The truth is, if your State is home to an international airport, you effectively live in a border State. We know that 40 percent of illegal immigrants are visa overstays; but since we do not have an effective way of tracking who leaves our country, that number may be different. This amendment would withhold funds from the Secretary's reception expenses until the biometric exit system is fully implemented.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. We will accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Before I make a motion, Madam Chairman, I would like to thank all of the employees of the House for being willing to extend the time tonight so that we could get those Members who have been waiting for 4 or 5 hours finished. I want to apologize for the inconvenience, but we appreciate the efficiency that it allowed us.

Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARLETTA) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair announces that the correct tally on rollcall vote number 205 was 146 ayes and 280 noes.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 622—An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 6, 2013, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

JASON T. SMITH,
Eighth District of Missouri.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1701. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and Other Late Type Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0009; FV13-905-2 IR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1702. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0026; FV12-923-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1703. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0051; FV12-966-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1704. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreases Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0027; FV12-922-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1705. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0045; FV12-905-1 FR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1706. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1707. A letter from the Associate Director of Financial Reporting and Accounting Policy, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2012 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1708. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period October 1, 2012 through March 31,

2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1709. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a separate management report for the period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1710. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit regarding Truczinskas v. Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1092. A bill to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center'' (Rept. 113–97). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YODER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 2258. A bill to amend the indemnification responsibilities applicable to the Secretary of Defense when Department of Defense property at military installations closed pursuant to a base closure law is conveyed to expand such indemnification responsibilities to include all military installations closed since October 24, 1988; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 2259. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws and to preserve existing uses; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to ensure basic conservation measures are implemented by farmers who receive Federal crop insurance premium assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2261. A bill to ensure the continuation of successful fisheries mitigation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ISSA (for himself and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 2262. A bill to designate the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway Street in San Diego, California, as the ''John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center'' and to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway Street in San Diego, California, as the ''James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2263. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2264. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal, State, and local assistance in the enforcement of the immigration laws, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to authorize appropriations to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2265. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue an oil and gas leasing program under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act for the 5-year period 2016 through 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2266. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require certain systemically important entities to account for the financial benefit they receive as a result of the expectations on the part of shareholders, creditors, and counterparties of such entities that the Government will shield them from losses in the event of failure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2267. A bill to make the United States exclusively liable for certain claims of liability to the extent such liability is a claim for damages resulting from, or aggravated by, the inclusion of ethanol in transportation fuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2268. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize a national elementary and secondary service-learning program that promotes student academic achievement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2269. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow funds provided under the Matching Grant Program for School Security to be used to improve information sharing between law enforcement and schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 2270. A bill to impose enhanced penalties for certain drug offense that take place on Federal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2271. A bill to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 249. A resolution recognizing the legacy of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) on its 80th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

In which Congress has the explicit authority to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval forces.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 2259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art Sec 3

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 2263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Export-Import Bank is purported to be authorized under the congressional power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations'' in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of The Constitution of the United States. Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 14; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution (the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 69: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 129: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 148: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 164: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 182: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 198: Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 288: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 292: Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 347: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 367: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 406: Mr. COBLE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 445: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 460: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 485: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 509: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 510: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 511: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 519: Ms. HAHN, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 523: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 533: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 632: Mr. TERRY and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 647: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 649: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 685: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 690: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 698: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 714: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 719: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 725: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 732: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 760: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 763: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 764: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 800: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 805: Mr. GIBSON and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 813: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 853: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 888: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 903: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 940: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 975: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 983: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 984: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1005: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1020: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1093: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1094: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1130: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1148: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1149: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1154: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1155: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1175: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1179: Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1186: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1226: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1239: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1250: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1252: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1274: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1284: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1304: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1330: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1333: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1351: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1362: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1413: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1416: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1443: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1485: Mr. HOLT and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1493: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1509: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1518: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1553: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. VELA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1563: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1582: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1588: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1620: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1630: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1634: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1706: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1714: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1717: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HURT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1731: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1732: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 1755: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1759: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1764: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1787: Mr. CONAWAY and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1796: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1797: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1825: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1827: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1830: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1837: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1842: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1848: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1851: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1852: Mr. HIMES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1856: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1871: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1874: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1876: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1900: Mr. MARINO and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 1910: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1920: Mr. SIRES, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1931: Mr. COOPER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1944: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1962: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1974: Mr. RADEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1982: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1983: Mr. RADEL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1985: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1988: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1993: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2000: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2002: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2009: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 2016: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2019: Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. REED, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2023: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2026: Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2041: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2051: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2053: Mr. PETRI, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WALDEN, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2055: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2092: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2098: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2116: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2119: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2134: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2143: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2174: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2183: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2192: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2220: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 35: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 41: Mr. RADEL.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. HARRIS.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 13: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H. Res. 35: Mr. BARR, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 89: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Res. 109: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 112: Ms. HANABUSA and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H. Res. 147: Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 187: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 203: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 208: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 236: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)).

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. GALLEGO

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 11, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. TIPTON

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 9, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $7,655,000)''.

Page 49, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,655,000)''.

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIS

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Under ''Departmental Management and Operations—Departmental Operations—Office of the Secretary and Executive Management'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $4,359,200)''.

Under ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses''—

(1) after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $43,592,000)''; and

(2) after the sixth dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,400,000)''.

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. MEEHAN

AMENDMENT NO. 17: 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 U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance operations at Abu Dhabi International Airport in the United Arab Emirates. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 18: Page 54, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $404,000,000)''.

Page 54, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $404,000,000)''.

Page 93, line 9, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $404,000,000)''.

H.R. 2217

OFFERED BY: MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. For ''Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs'' for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), as authorized by subsection (f)(2) of such section, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Department of Homeland Security—Office of the Chief Financial Officer'' is hereby reduced by, $10,000,000.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2013 *No. 78*

Senate

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE, PURSUANT TO THE ORDER OF THE SENATE OF JUNE 4, 2013

SA 1164. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1165. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1166. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1167. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1168. Mr. UDALL, of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1169. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1170. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1171. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1172. Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1173. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1164. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, lines 14 and 15, strike ''(except pulse crops)''.

On page 14, line 19, insert ''including any adjustment or reduction pursuant to section 1101 or 1302 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711, 8752) and'' after ''this Act,''.

On page 20, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(14) PAYMENT ACRES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the adjustment in subparagraph (B), the term ''payment acres'' means, in the case of adverse market payments, 85 percent of the base acres for a covered commodity on a farm on which adverse market payments are made.

(B) ADJUSTMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), in a crop year in which more than 15 percent of the base acres for the covered commodity on the farm is planted to fruits, vegetables (other than mung beans and pulse crops), or wild rice, the payment acres shall be reduced by the amount equal to the acreage planted to those crops in excess of 15 percent of the base acres in a crop year.

(ii) COVER CROPS.—Cover crops or commodities described in clause (i) that are grown solely for conservation purposes and not harvested for use or sale, as determined by the Secretary, shall be permitted without reduction in payment acres.

(iii) DOUBLE-CROPPING.—In any region in which there is a history of double-cropping covered commodities with the commodities described in clause (i), as determined by the Secretary, the double-cropping shall be permitted without reduction in payment acres.

On page 24, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

(i) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of making adverse market payments, the Secretary shall give a 1-time opportunity to adjust the peanut base acres on a farm to—

(I) producers on a farm with peanut base acres; and

(II) producers on farms that do not have peanut base acres but have an established planting history of peanuts during the 2009 through 2012 crop years.

On page 24, lines 13 and 14, strike ''to producers on farms with peanut base acres''.

On page 25, strike lines 5 through 15, and insert the following:

(i) IN GENERAL.—If a producer on a farm makes the election described in subparagraph (A), the adjustment in peanut base acres shall be equal to the average acreage planted on the farm to peanuts for harvest or similar purposes for the 2009 through 2012 crop years (excluding any crop year in which peanuts were not planted on the farm), as determined by the Secretary.

Beginning on page 25, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 26, line 4, and insert the following:

control of the producer; and

(II) any adjustment, as appro-

On page 35, line 23, insert ''or equal to'' before ''50''.

On page 40, line 3, strike ''$523.77'' and insert ''$513''.

On page 51, line 8, insert ''for individual coverage'' after ''section 1108''.

On page 160, line 18, insert ''of title I'' after ''subtitle B''.

On page 168, line 3, insert ''of title I'' after ''subtitle E''.

On page 168, strike line 9 and insert the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this

On page 252, line 15, strike ''subchapter C'' and insert ''subchapter B''.

On page 274, strike lines 5 through 7 and insert the following:

(1) by striking ''SEC. 403.—The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 403. EMERGENCY MEASURES.

On page 286, line 2, strike ''and'' and insert '', veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))), and''.

Beginning on page 351, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 355, line 7, and insert the following:

SEC. 4001. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

(a) TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL FOODS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL FOODS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pilot a demonstration project by awarding a grant to 1 or more tribal organizations authorized to administer the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations for the purpose of purchasing nutritious and traditional foods, and when practicable, foods produced locally by Native American producers, for

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

distribution to recipients of foods distributed under this program.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may award a grant on a noncompetitive basis to 1 or more tribal organizations that have the administrative and financial capability to conduct a demonstration project, as determined by the Secretary.

''(C) FUNDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On October 1, 2013, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this paragraph $475,000, to remain available for use during fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

''(ii) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this paragraph, the funds transferred under clause (i), without further appropriation.

''(iii) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.—The funds and authorities provided under this subparagraph are in addition to any other funds or authorities the Secretary may have to carry out activities described in this paragraph.''.

(b) FEASIBILITY REPORT FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) FEASIBILITY REPORT FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

''(1) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that—

''(A) contains a list of programs, services, functions, and activities within each agency with respect to which it would be feasible to be administered by a tribal organization; and

''(B) a description of whether that administration would necessitate a statutory or regulatory change.

''(2) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—In developing the report required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with tribal organizations.''.

On page 640, line 20, strike ''farmers or'' and insert ''farmers, veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))), or''.

On page 889, line 24, strike ''2013'' and insert ''2014''.

On page 919, strike lines 15 through 25 and insert the following:

(4) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2012'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) $16,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''(3) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—'' and inserting ''(3) SUBSEQUENT DISCRETIONARY FUNDING.—''; and

(ii) by striking ''fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018''.

On page 925, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert the following:

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''(3) FISCAL YEAR 2013.—'' and inserting ''(3) SUBSEQUENT DISCRETIONARY FUNDING.—''; and

(ii) by striking ''fiscal year 2013'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) SUBSEQUENT MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of

On page 1087, lines 16 and 17, strike ''of 1938''.

On page 1133, strike line 15 and insert the following:

''(2) EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR NON-YIELD BASED CROPS.—The Secretary shall establish equitable treatment for non-yield based crops.

''(3) PREMIUM.—To be eligible to receive a pay-

On page 1133, line 20, insert ''the lesser of'' after ''equal to''.

On page 1133, after line 24 insert the following:

(II) the producer's share interest of the crop;

On page 1134, line 1, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(III)''.

On page 1134, line 3, strike ''(III)'' and insert ''(IV)''.

On page 1134, line 5, strike ''(IV)'' and insert ''(V)''.

On page 1134, line 8, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

On page 1134, line 15, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

On page 1134, line 16, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

On page 1135, line 7, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

On page 1135, line 9, strike ''Effective October 1, 2018'' and insert ''Beginning with the 2019 program year''.

On page 1135, lines 14 and 15, strike ''Effective October 1, 2018'' and insert ''Beginning with the 2019 program year''.

SA 1165. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 893, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 7____. RESEARCH PROJECTS, TRANSACTIONS OTHER THAN CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by adding after section 1472 (7 U.S.C. 3318) the following:

SEC. 1472A. RESEARCH PROJECTS: TRANSACTIONS OTHER THAN CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE PERSON.—In this section, the term ''eligible person'' means any—

(1) agency or instrumentality of the United States;

(2) State, territory, or possession (including any political subdivision of a State, territory, or possession); or

(3) person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution.

(b) ADDITIONAL FORMS OF TRANSACTIONS AUTHORIZED.—Under the authority of this section, the Secretary may enter into transactions (other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants), on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may consider appropriate, subject to competition to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Secretary), with any eligible person to carry out basic, applied, and advanced research projects, including prototype development, field or laboratory testing, and evaluation of innovative products and services.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section is—

(1) in addition to the authority provided in section 1472 to enter into contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements to further the research, extension, or teaching programs in the food and agricultural sciences of the Department of Agriculture; and

(2) notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code.

(d) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, transactions entered into under this section may be fully funded, cost shared, unfunded, or, reimbursable arrangements.

SA 1166. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12____. SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) food insecurity and hunger are a fact of life for millions of individuals in the United States and can produce physical, mental, and social impairments;

(2) recent data published by the Department of Agriculture show that approximately 50,000,000 individuals in the United States live in households experiencing hunger or food insecurity, and of that number, 16,700,000 are children;

(3) the Department of Agriculture data also show that households with children experience food insecurity nearly twice as frequently as households without children;

(4) 5.1 percent of all households in the United States (approximately 6,100,000 households) have accessed emergency food from a food pantry 1 or more times;

(5) the report entitled ''Household Food Security in the United States, 2011'', published by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, found that in 2011, the most recent year for which data exists—

(A) 14.9 percent of all households in the United States experienced food insecurity at some point during the year;

(B) 20.6 percent of all households with children in the United States experienced food insecurity at some point during the year; and

(C) 8.8 percent of seniors living alone were food insecure;

(6) as of the date of enactment of this Act, long-term unemployment is still at a record high, with over 37 percent of unemployed individuals nationally out of a job for 6 months or longer, an additional 7,900,000 people working part-time due to reduced hours, and rising gas prices and State budget cutbacks having left millions of hungry Americans struggling;

(7) the problem of hunger and food insecurity can be found in rural, suburban, and urban portions of the United States, touching nearly every community in the Nation;

(8) although substantial progress has been made in reducing the incidence of hunger and food insecurity in the United States, many Americans remain vulnerable to hunger and the negative effects of food insecurity;

(9) the people of the United States have a long tradition of providing food assistance to hungry individuals through acts of private generosity and public support programs;

(10) the Federal Government provides nutritional support to millions of individuals through numerous Federal food assistance programs, including the emergency food assistance program established under the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.) (commonly referred to as ''TEFAP'');

(11) more than 61,000 local, community-based organizations rely on the support and efforts of more than 200 food banks and thousands of volunteers nationwide to provide food assistance and services to millions of vulnerable people;

(12) emergency feeding organizations like food banks and food pantries rely on nutritious commodities provided through the emergency food assistance program to feed hungry Americans; and

(13) emergency feeding organizations have seen a significant decline in TEFAP food distributed in 2012 while demand has increased by 46 percent between 2006 and 2010 according to the Hunger In America 2010 study with no signs of abating.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the emergency food assistance program and the significant positive impact the program has on communities and families nationwide that are struggling with hunger; and

(2) commits to work together in a bipartisan manner to increase funding for emergency feeding programs, specifically food provided through the emergency food assistance program, under this Act.

SA 1167. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 986, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 83___. PAYMENTS MADE TO STATES AND COUNTIES IN WHICH FEDERAL LAND IS LOCATED.

(a) SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of the payments made under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2012 shall be reduced by not greater than 5 percent of the amount of the payments made for fiscal year 2011.

(b) PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2013 shall be the full amount authorized to be made under that chapter for that fiscal year.

SA 1168. Mr. UDALL of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 12_____. FARM AND RANCH LAND LINK COORDINATORS.

Section 226B(e)(2) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6934(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) FARM AND RANCH LAND LINK COORDINATOR.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate 1 farm and ranch land link coordinator for each State from among the State office employees of any of the following agencies in that State:

''(I) The Farm Service Agency.

''(II) The Natural Resources Conservation Service.

''(III) The Risk Management Agency.

''(IV) The Rural Business-Cooperative Service.

''(V) The Rural Utilities Service.

''(ii) TRAINING.—The Small Farms and Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Group shall coordinate the development of a training plan so that each State coordinator receives sufficient training to have a general working knowledge of the programs and services available from each agency of the Department to assist small and beginning farmers and ranchers in the transition of land from retiring farmers and ranchers.

''(iii) DUTIES.—The coordinator shall—

''(I) coordinate technical assistance at the State level to assist small and beginning farmers and ranchers, and retiring farmers and ranchers, interested in, or in process of, the transition of land, with the goal of keeping land in agricultural production;

''(II) develop, in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations, and submit a State plan for approval by the Small Farms and Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Group or as directed by the Secretary to provide coordination to ensure adequate services to small and beginning farmers and ranchers at all county and area offices throughout the State that support linking small and beginning farmers and ranchers with retiring farmers and ranchers, including, at a minimum, facilitating the transition of land;

''(III) oversee implementation of the approved State plan; and

''(IV) work with outreach coordinators in the State offices of the Farm Service Agency, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Risk Management Agency, the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, the Rural Utilities Service, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, and appropriate nongovernmental organizations to ensure appropriate information about technical assistance is available at outreach events and activities.''.

SA 1169. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1050, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 10013. IMPORTATION OF SEED.

Section 17(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136o(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) IMPORTATION OF SEED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the Secretary is not required to notify the Administrator of the arrival of a plant-incorporated protectant (as defined in section 174.3 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) that is contained in a seed, if—

''(A) that plant-incorporated protectant is registered under section 3;

''(B) the Administrator has issued an experimental use permit for that plant-incorporated protectant under section 5; or

''(C) the seed is covered by a permit or notification (as defined in part 340 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)).

''(3) COOPERATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In response to a request from the Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide to the Administrator a list of seed containing plant-incorporated protectants (as defined in section 174.3 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) if that seed has been imported into the United States under a permit or notification referred to in paragraph (2).

''(B) CONTENTS.—The list under subparagraph (A) shall be provided in a form and at such intervals as may be agreed to by the Secretary and the Administrator.

''(4) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this subsection precludes or limits the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the importation or movement of plants, plant products, or seeds under—

''(A) the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); and

''(B) the Federal Seed Act (7 U.S.C. 1551 et seq.).''.

SA 1170. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 876, line 22, strike ''shall'' and insert ''may''.

SA 1171. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 986, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 8_____. TROPICAL FOREST RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 6(f) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1645(f)).

(2) TROPICAL FOREST.—The term ''tropical forest'' means any area of forest land that is located between the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn.

(b) TROPICAL FOREST CONSERVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of tropical forest conservation, rehabilitation, reforestation, and research, the Secretary may—

(A) acquire tropical forest land and interests in tropical forest land in any State by purchase, donation, exchange, transfer, or interchange; and

(B) designate the land and interests in land as national tropical research forests.

(2) CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES.—The Secretary shall manage each national tropical research forest designated under this section in a manner that protects and conserves indigenous flora and fauna, water quality, streams and aquifers, and the geological, ecological and other natural values.

(3) RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.—Research and land management practices conducted in a national tropical research forest may include—

(A) silviculture; and

(B) the control of ungulates and invasive species.

(4) OTHER USES.—Public recreation and other multiple uses may be allowed in a national tropical research forest if the uses are compatible, and do not interfere, with conservation objectives and research and management practices.

(5) APPLICABLE LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A national tropical research forest shall be managed in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System and this section.

(B) HAWAII.—The Secretary may designate a national tropical research forest acquired in Hawaii as a unit of the Hawaii national

tropical research forest in furtherance of the purposes of the Hawaii Tropical Forest Recovery Act (Public Law 102–574; 106 Stat. 4593) and the amendments made by that Act.

(C) SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICABILITY.—This section shall be considered supplemental to, and not in derogation of—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) title XXIV of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 6701 et seq.); and

(iii) the Hawaii Tropical Forest Recovery Act (Public Law 102–574; 106 Stat. 4593) and amendments made by that Act.

(c) REALTY MANAGEMENT.—

(1) WILLING SELLERS.—Land and interests in land acquired under this section shall be from willing sellers only.

(2) LAND VALUATION.—Land and interests in land acquired under this section shall be valued—

(A) in accordance with appraisals prepared in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions developed by the Interagency Land Acquisition Conference; or

(B) for areas of land for which elements of value (such as physical characteristics and other amenities) are readily apparent and substantially similar, in accordance with market surveys or mass appraisal techniques approved by the Chief Appraiser of the Forest Service.

(3) COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary may allow a unit of State or local government, an institution of higher education, or a nonprofit organization to cooperate in the management of a national tropical research forest in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may establish.

(4) FUNDING.—For the acquisition of land and interests in land under this section, the Secretary may use amounts—

(A) deposited for general use in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the ''Sisk Act'') (16 U.S.C. 484a);

(B) donated or appropriated for research purposes;

(C) appropriated from the land and water conservation fund established under section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–5);

(D) appropriated to the Forest Service that are otherwise unobligated and available;

(E) derived and available from payments under any Federal permitting program for the mitigation or offset of environmental impacts; and

(F) derived and available from the sale or disposition of land pursuant to the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (43 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

(5) PUERTO RICO.—

(A) REVENUES FROM EL YUNQUE NATIONAL FOREST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To fund land acquisition solely in Puerto Rico that is authorized by subsection (b)(1), in addition to the amounts otherwise made available under paragraph (4), the Secretary may use all amounts generated from El Yunque National Forest that are deposited in the National Forest Fund, other than those amounts required by law to be paid to Puerto Rico.

(ii) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary under this subparagraph shall remain available until expended and without further appropriation.

(B) EL YUNQUE NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the Secretary acquires land that abuts the boundaries of El Yunque National Forest, the Secretary shall adjust the boundaries of El Yunque National Forest to include the acquired land.

(ii) RELATION TO OTHER LAW.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–9), the boundaries of El Yunque National Forest, as adjusted pursuant to this subparagraph, shall be considered to be boundaries of the National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

(d) INSTITUTES OF TROPICAL FORESTRY.—Section 2407 of title XXIV of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 6701 et seq.) (7 U.S.C. 6706) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''The Institutes'' and inserting the following:

''(b) ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT OF LAND.—The Institutes may—

''(1) acquire and manage land and interests in land for tropical forest conservation purposes and research; and

''(2) provide public outreach and educational opportunities consistent with research and conservation objectives, including, to the maximum extent practicable, to international partners and allies.

''(c) RESEARCH.—The Institutes''.

SA 1172. Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 946, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 947, line 9, and insert the following:

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''multistate'' and all that follows through ''technology implementation'' and inserting ''integrated, multistate research, extension, and education programs on technology development and technology implementation'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''A sun grant'' and inserting ''Effective beginning on the date on which the program under this section is funded at the fully authorized level of the program, a sun grant'';

SA 1173. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1150, after line 15, add the following:

SEC. 122 _____. STAY AND STUDY ON PROPOSED ACTIONS RELATING TO SULFURYL FLUORIDE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall delay taking final action on the objections addressed in the proposed order entitled ''Sulfuryl Fluoride; Proposed Order Granting Objections to Tolerances and Denying Request for a Stay'' (76 Fed. Reg. 3422 (January 19, 2011)) as that proposed order relates to tolerances under chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on—

(1) the potential public health, economic, and public right-to-know effects that may result from finalization of the proposed order described in subsection (a);

(2) any alternatives to the use of sulfuryl fluoride in the agricultural sector, including alternatives available through the USDA National Organic Certification Program and alternatives used in other countries; and

(3) actions that Federal agencies can take to help address public health threats, including to the health of infants and children, by reducing fluoride exposures below levels that have been determined to be safe.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF RUSSELLVILLE, MO

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 175th Anniversary of the town of Russellville, MO. The town of Russellville, MO traces its roots back to May 3, 1838 when Richard Morris, Buckner W. Russell, and Benjamin P. Griffen had the land surveyed. The town was later named in honor of Buckner W. Russell.

The first settlers arrived in the area around 1830 and found a plentiful supply of large oak trees, wild game, and fertile farm land. The town grew steadily thanks to the hard work of its founding families. Businesses were added and additional settlers made it their home. It later became a stop on the Missouri Pacific Railroad.

The town has several churches that were established early in its history. The first were Catholic, Methodist, and Presbyterian. It now includes churches representing the Assembly of God, Baptist, and Lutheran denominations. The first Sunday School was organized in 1858 by James Banister.

As early as 1895, Russellville had the only weekly newspaper in Cole County, the Russellville Rustler, edited by Gutman Wilson. The community found music to be an important part of entertainment. A music club was organized in 1906 at the home of Mrs. L.L. Sullins. The club studied the history of music, prepared programs for their meetings, and gave several public performances.

Today Russellville continues to be a small, but strong rural community, home to new residents as well as descendants of some of the original settlers. The town is home to a great school system, local businesses, and an important agriculture industry.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM M. NOVICK

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor one of the most distinguished men in my home state of Tennessee.

Dr. William M. Novick has helped many, many thousands of children all over the world in more than 30 countries. He is someone for whom I have the greatest respect.

Dr. Novick currently serves as the Paul Nemir Endowed Chair of International Child Health, Department of Surgery at the University of Tennessee. I cannot think of a more capable or distinguished person to have in this role.

During the past 20 years, Dr. Novick has performed more than 6,000 pediatric heart surgeries on the world's poor. Last year alone, he performed more pediatric heart surgeries than the Mayo Clinic.

This year, he has devoted his time and talents toward the Caribbean, performing more than 100 surgeries on Dominican and Haitian children.

Dr. Novick is currently taking more than 400 cases per year in Iraq, Libya, Egypt, and the Middle East, and he has even operated on children of Chernobyl.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. William M. Novick is an example of American grace and generosity all over the world. It is fitting he has found a place at the University of Tennessee, home of the Volunteers.

I call his accomplishments as the Paul Nemir Endowed Chair of International Child Health, Department of Surgery at the University of Tennessee to the attention of my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD. I hope to see Dr. Novick's work continue for many years to come.

J. WALTER CAMERON CENTER

HON. TULSI GABBARD

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1973, the J. Walter Cameron Center opened its doors in Wailuku, Hawai'i, with a mission to assist people with special needs by providing a home for Maui's social service agencies. Since then, more than 120,000 Mauians, and their families, have found hope, help, and healing.

The Cameron Center is the vision of two remarkable men, J. Walter Cameron and Douglas Sodetani, who saw that an innovative public-private partnership could serve Maui's people with one of the nation's first multi-tenant social service centers. A designated 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, the center is governed by a volunteer, community-based Board of Directors and operated by a dedicated and hard-working staff.

The Cameron Center is the home to sixteen Resident Social Service Agencies including: American Cancer Society; ARC of Maui County; Best Buddies International; Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Hawaii; Fun Day Foundation; Heritage Hall, Inc.; Hui No Ke Ola Pono, Inc.; Imua Family Services; Ka Lima O Maui; Maui Chamber of Commerce; Maui Community Mental Health; Maui County Office on Aging, Mediation Services of Maui; Mental Health Association of America; MEO K'hi Kamali'i; and the Pacific Cancer Foundation. Together, these agencies—through meetings, workshops, training sessions and other community events—serve more than 40,000 people annually.

The Cameron Center has also kept pace with changing times with its "Going Green" Program. Through the installation of a photovoltaic electricity system and energy efficient mechanical systems, appliances and lighting, it has been able to save $42,000 in energy costs each year while significantly reducing environmental impacts

Congratulations to the J. Walter Cameron Center, its board, staff and volunteers for a job well done in serving those in need for two generations. The Center will be celebrating its 40th anniversary on Saturday, June, 8, 2013, at the Yokouchi estate in Wailuku.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained due to a long-standing commitment and missed rollcall vote 192, on consideration of a motion to recommit with instructions for H.R. 2216, and rollcall vote 193, on passage of H.R. 2216, the Military Construction, Department of Veterans Affairs and Other Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 192 and "aye" on rollcall 193.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2216) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this bill.

I agree with my colleague and our ranking member on the full committee, Rep. LOWEY of New York, that this bill will help us do all we can to help bring down the disability claims backlog, which unfortunately is at record levels. I am also very grateful to the committee for including an additional $20 million dollars for suicide prevention and outreach services for our veterans—the third such year I've made such a request. I also noted with satisfaction the committee's inclusion of language directing the VA to work far more closely with community-based organizations that have successful programs to prevent suicides. Indeed, the most successful of these programs in the nation is the Vets4Warriors program at the University of Medicine and Dentistry in New Jersey. My late friend, Senator Lautenberg, worked closely with me to support this program and bring it to the attention of senior VA

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

and Pentagon officials. The VA should have a direct partnership with Vets4Warriors and I will certainly continue to press for that, and am very happy to have the committee's support for that effort.

Madam Chair, while I will support this bill I do not support the process that brought it to the floor today. This bill came up under a rule that enshrines sequester, cutting another $90 billion in overall funding for the government at a time when it has become clear to all but the most obtuse among us that the sequester has caused real harm to real people. The self-executing rule under which this bill is being considered will cause still more harm—not directly to our veterans, but to millions of other Americans from the additional draconian cuts the majority is seeking to impose. That's why this bill and the Homeland Security bill are under a veto threat from the President, and rightly so. I urge my Republican colleagues to abandon the budget gamesmanship, drop Sequester 2.0, and work with us and the President to implement a budget that is fair to all Americans.

RAISING THE ISSUE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding President Obama's upcoming meeting with President Xi Jinping of China.

Tuesday marked the 24th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre in Beijing, an event that reminds us of the importance of human rights, democracy and freedom across China and the world. I encourage the president to remember the tragic events of June 4, 1989, and to bear in mind the important issue of human rights when meeting with President Xi.

I also believe it is important that, as he prepares for his weekend meeting with President Xi, President Obama continues to recognize the important relationship between the United States and Taiwan. We have built an important alliance, one that has positive implications for both our economy and national security and, most importantly, helps with the spread of democracy and freedom throughout Asia and the world.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in encouraging President Obama to be mindful of the many intricacies of our relationship with China and advocate for stronger human rights standards in China and for improved coordination and partnership with Taiwan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BARDSTOWN POLICE OFFICER JASON SCOTT ELLIS

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Bardstown Police Officer Jason Scott Ellis. Officer Ellis was shot and killed while on patrol in the early morning hours of Saturday, May 25. Believed to be an ambush, this senseless act has left Bardstown and its surrounding communities mourning the loss of a husband, father and police officer.

A seven-year veteran of the force, Officer Ellis also served as Bardstown's canine officer and training officer. He is the first police officer in the history of the Bardstown Police Department to be shot and killed in the line of duty.

Bardstown Police Chief Rick McCubbin was quoted as saying Officer Ellis ''paid the ultimate sacrifice doing what he loved: being a police officer.'' Mayor Bill Sheckles said, ''The city and community of Bardstown lost a class act officer of the law in Jason Ellis, and his shoes will be hard to fill.'' I could not agree more.

I join with the Bardstown community and all of Kentucky's Second District in sending my thoughts and prayers to the family of Officer Ellis, especially his wife Amy and their sons, Hunter and Parker.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER BRIZENDINE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christopher Brizendine. Christopher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christopher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christopher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 34 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Christopher has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Christopher researched and reconstructed sheep feeders at Watkins Mill State Park in Lawson, Missouri, to be used during historical reenactments at the historic site.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christopher Brizendine for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

VA BACKLOG

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, America's veterans deserve better.

Right now there are more than 865,000 claims pending before the Veterans Administration, and, of these, more than 575,000 have remained unresolved for 125 days or more.

It is completely unacceptable that the brave men and women who have served our nation in uniform should have to wait months, or even years, before they receive the benefits they have earned.

That's why I'm proud to join my colleagues in supporting a package of ten bills that would help clear the existing backlog and fix the flaws in the current system.

The VA Claims, Operations and Records Efficiency Act, H.R. 1729, would help to reduce the amount of time spent waiting for the Department of Defense to provide information in a more timely manner.

The Claims Adjudication Centers of Excellence, H.R. 2088, would establish a pilot program to help expedite the adjudication of the most difficult medical conditions afflicting American veterans.

There are eight other bills that would help remedy a range of problems and enable policymakers to get more definitive information to solve this problem. I encourage my colleagues to join us in this important effort.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF EQUAL PAY ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 119 years ago, in 1894, a study by the AAUW and the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor found that men were making more than twice as much as women for jobs like bookkeeping.

Forty-eight years later, as millions of women like my mother entered the factories to help fight World War II, the War Labor Board issued General Order 16, declaring that men and women working the same job in the same factory should be paid the same wage.

In 1945, the first Equal Pay Bill was introduced in the House by Chase Going Woodhouse, the second woman and first Democratic woman to be elected to the House from Connecticut. It was reintroduced every year for 18 years. President Dwight Eisenhower called it ''a matter of simple justice'' in his State of the Union.

And 50 years ago this week—on June 10th, 1963—President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law.

The Equal Pay Act was supposed to end, and I quote, ''the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job.'' But fifty years later, women are still paid only 77 cents on the dollar compared to men.

It has been 50 years since the Equal Pay Act, and 120 years since we first studied pay inequity. Haven't America's women waited long enough? It is time to come together, give the Equal Pay Act real teeth, It is time to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act so that men and women in the same job—get the same pay. It is that simple.

RECOGNIZING MIRIAM HUGHEY-GUY FOR HER EXTRAORDINARY WORK AT BARCROFT ELEMENTARY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miriam Hughey-Guy on her retirement following 20 years of extraordinary service as the principal of Barcroft Elementary School in Arlington, Virginia.

For 20 years, Ms. Hughey-Guy has been the energizing force motivating Barcroft students to be active learners. The innovative educational programs she brought to Barcroft have produced one of the best, most flexible schools in the County, which has some of the best schools in the country.

Ms. Hughey-Guy was the first to introduce the modified school year to Arlington County, reorganizing Barcroft's school year to provide more continuous learning, dividing the long summer vacation into shorter, more frequent breaks. Ms. Hughey-Guy recognized the benefit children received from these shorter breaks, and ensured that the intersessions between telins kept the students engaged, supported, and challenged.

She was also the leader in bringing the Leonardo da Vinci Project to Barcroft, which brings creative and scientific thought to the learning experience, challenging students with focused thinking and problem-solving activities. Ms. Hughey-Guy promotes this type of learning every day, by engaging the children directly in conversations about experiential learning and consistently calling on them to make a difference with their new found knowledge.

Her dedication, and these innovations, are just part of the reason she is consistently recognized as a leader within her profession. In 2001–02 she was awarded the Woman of Vision Award. In 2002–03, she was Arlington Public Schools' Principal of the Year. In 2003, the Washington Post awarded her with a Distinguished Leadership Award. And, in 2003, Miriam Hughey-Guy was given the Ebone Image Leadership Award from the National Coalition of 100 Black Women's Northern Virginia Chapter. Further, she is recognized as a leader among the numerous organizations that call on her to speak, such as NPR, CNN, the Virginia State Reading Association, and within the Arlington County school system.

Miriam has shared her life with hundreds of children and families over the years, many who continue to call for her advice. She has supported her staff with their ideas, goals, and professional growth. Mrs. Hughey-Guy has truly led by example. She is a mentor, boss, leader, teacher and advocate for Barcroft's children, their families, and the teaching profession.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to salute her for a job well done and wish her a happy and healthy retirement.

HONORING BEN LAUGHLIN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ben Laughlin. Ben is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ben has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ben has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ben has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ben Laughlin for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

THE KIDNAPPING OF FORMER MARINE ARMANDO TORRES IN MEXICO

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern for former Marine Corporal Armando Torres who was reportedly kidnapped by members of the Mexican Cartel during a visit to Las Barrancas, Tamaulipas, Mexico while visiting his father and uncle.

On May 14, 2013, Mr. Torres crossed on an Internat'l bridge into Mexico and had planned to return the next day. Family members in Mexico report that Mr. Torres along with his father and uncle were forcibly taken by members of the Mexican Cartel.

Corporal Torres is a combat veteran who served his country honorably in Iraq. I have asked the F.B.I in McAllen, Texas and the U.S. Consulate General in Matamoros, Mexico to help bring this marine and his relatives back safely to their loved ones. Each agency has been working on this case every day. They report the Mexican Government is cooperating with them on their efforts to find the victims of this outrageous crime.

I commend the quick action taken by both the F.B.I. and the U.S. State Department. I urge them to continue to do all they can to find and return our former Marine, Armando Torres, back safely to the U.S. and to bring his relatives back home.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2216) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important amendment.

As I'm sure my colleagues know, last November Coloradans voted overwhelmingly in favor of Amendment 64, which legalized the recreational use of marijuana in our State.

Marijuana policy is a public health issue, and should be regulated like one.

Americans across the country already know that the so-called 'War on Drugs' is a failed Federal policy that clogs our prisons, drains Federal resources and disproportionately penalizes African-American and Latinos.

But Amendment 64 represents even more than an acknowledgement of failure and a Triumph of common sense.

For Colorado veterans who suffer from post traumatic stress disorder, Amendment 64 measure offers them something more: relief.

And for combat veterans who have tried everything the VA has thrown at them to fight their symptoms medical marijuana may be their only relief.

Colorado service men and women have fought valiantly for their country in every American military conflict.

It is not just Iraq and Afghanistan—from Korea to Vietnam to military engagements around the globe, over 420,000 veterans live in Colorado today.

Our commitment to our veterans should not end once they are back on American soil, and in most cases, it does not.

But for a number of veterans—those who the system denies when they try to access one of the few treatments that actually works for them—we are not living up to our promise.

If we continue to prescribe powerful, addictive drugs with dangerous side effects—but prevent even preliminary medical research into the efficacy of medical marijuana—we are not living up to our promise.

Some estimate that nearly 20 percent of returning Iraq and Afghanistan war vets are suffering from PTSD.

If we continue to fail to provide relief to veterans suffering from this condition, we are not living up to our promise.

Eighteen States and the District of Columbia currently allow some form of marijuana use. A third of Americans live in one of these States, and more States are approving these common-sense measures every year.

But the Federal Government continues to stand in the way of progress. Is there any other situation where this would be acceptable? Where some of our bravest men and women could be denied effective care by their own government?

Our servicemen and women deserve better treatment from the country they defend.

I believe the Federal Government should get out of the business of telling states they can or cannot do something that States are perfectly capable of regulating themselves.

But that's a big step. At the very least, the government that sent our troops into harm's way should not turn around and stop them from accessing treatment that works for them—sometimes the only treatment that works for them.

How many more veterans have to suffer the emotional and physical scars of war before we listen to what they have to say?

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

GREAT FALLS MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day I had the privilege of attending a ceremony in Great Falls, Virginia, honoring those who have fought for our great Nation.

I was joined at the service with dozens of Great Falls residents, along with other community leaders, to pay tribute to the 25 men and women of Great Falls who died in battle or from attacks on America.

The service began with a friendly welcome from Mr. Bruce Ellis Fein, a member of Friends of the Great Falls Freedom Memorial. In 2002, Friends of the Great Falls Freedom Memorial was created with the goal of building a memorial site in Great Falls dedicated to those residents who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom.

The highlight of the service was the keynote speech by Lt. Gen. Norman H. Smith who served our country in the Marine Corps for over 35 years. In his address, Lt. Gen. Smith discussed his recent trip to the island of Iwo Jima, specifically, his visit to Mt. Suribachi with several surviving veterans of the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Lt. Gen. Smith has had an established military career and has been awarded numerous decorations for his service. He now serves as president of the Iwo Jima Association of America and currently resides in my congressional district in Winchester, Virginia.

I submit Lt. Gen. Smith's remarks from the Great Falls Memorial Day Service and a recent news article from the Great Falls Connection.

ADDRESS BY LIEUTENANT GENERAL NORMAN H. SMITH, USMC (RET) OF WINCHESTER, VIRGINIA AT THE MEMORIAL DAY 2013, THE GREAT FALLS FREEDOM MEMORIAL

Good Morning.

I'm going to take a bit of keynote speaker's prerogative to point out one special guest for today's service, and he is Marine Tommy Cox, a veteran of the Iwo Jima campaign of World War 2.

I'm honored to speak to you this morning on this particular day, in this particular place, which is dedicated to those residents who have given their lives in the cause of freedom.

I'm a Marine, but it is my great privilege to be here today to represent all of our Armed forces. All of them contribute mightily to the security of our nation. It is an even greater honor, on this Memorial Day 2013, to speak about the tens of thousands of our fellow citizens who have given their lives in the defense of our country, its people, and its principles.

For me, Memorial Day came early this year, in mid-March on the island of Iwo Jima. I went there with a group that included military historians, writers, students from the Young Marines organization and, first and foremost, 14 veterans of the battle of Iwo Jima and the Pacific campaign of World War 2.

These men who are now in their late 80's and early 90's were, most of them, teenagers in February of 1945, when the battle began. The ultimate goal of the Iwo Jima campaign was to gain ever closer access to the Japanese home islands in the event that an invasion of Japan would be necessary in order to end the long, bloody war.

Iwo Jima in 1945 was a barren volcanic island covered with ash and stone. There was nowhere to take cover, no trees, nowhere even to be able to dig a fighting hole, for the soil was ashy sand that acquired a name of its own: the black sands of Iwo Jima.

Beneath this forbidding surface lay noxious sulphur beds that stank, and many miles of tunnels, caves and reinforced fighting positions crammed with small arms, machine guns, mortars and artillery pieces. The Japanese defenders, well prepared for an assault on the island, intended to inflict massive casualties on their enemies. They did.

Sixty-eight years later, the 14 Iwo Jima vets I traveled with returned to the site of a savage battle that went on without pause and without quarter, on either side, for 36 days. They went back to remember their own experiences and to keep alive the sacrifices they witnessed. Six thousand eight hundred Marines died during the 36-day battle. 22,000 were wounded. More than 20,000 Japanese were killed. In February 1945 the Iwo Jima veterans of today were fighting for their lives and the lives of their brother Marines and sailors. They were fighting, too, for the lives of many Army Air Corps crewmen who would have died were it not for the emergency landing field built by Seabees while the battle still raged. It is estimated that more than 20,000 U.S. airmen were saved by landing their battle damaged B–29s and B–24s as they returned from bombing raids over Japan. All the American Armed Forces contributed to the victory on Iwo: the Army, Navy, Navy Air, the Army Air Corps, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard and the often forgotten Merchant Marine.

The almost accidental photograph of the flag raising on Mt. Suribachi became an iconic image of American valor. Today, Mt. Suribachi is the site of a very different annual ceremony, a ceremony that none of the 14 returning veterans could have believed possible in 1945. This, the annual Reunion of Honor, is attended by American and Japanese alike, who meet every year to commemorate the historic battle and the post war U.S.-Japanese alliance.

The Reunion of Honor began in 1995, when the Iwo Jima Association of America joined with the Iwo Jima Association of Japan in order to honor warriors on both sides who died for their respective countries on that desolate island, 600 miles from Japan. This memorial service is not about lauding the victors nor humiliating the vanquished. Nor does it attempt to glorify war. Far from it. Iwo Jima was a killing ground and, like our own Civil War battlefields in the Shenandoah Valley and other places, it is also hallowed ground where the remains of the missing still lie. To the Japanese families of soldiers whose bodies were never recovered, it is an annual pilgrimage undertaken to honor their ancestors.

This year the hour-long service took place in perfect weather, on an island that looks far different from the hellish place it was 68 years ago. What was black sand and scarred rock is now green with scrub trees and shrubs. Dirt roads have been paved, memorial markers have been placed. The beaches, however, are still black sand. Japanese and American military and governmental officials spoke during the service and wreaths were laid on the memorial stone markers. A military band played, a band composed of both American and Japanese musicians.

Following the ceremony the American group boarded mini-vans for the trip up the serpentine road to the top of Mt. Suribachi. During the battle, this mountain—about the height of the Washington Monument—was honeycombed with gun emplacements that rained deadly fire on the U.S. forces. On the third day of the invasion, elements of the 28th Marine Regiment made a tortuous and deadly ascent up the steep side of the mountain, to its peak. It was here that the now famous flag raising took place. The photo taken was used to create the magnificent bronze monument in Arlington Cemetery: the Marine Corps War Memorial.

Atop Suribachi the Iwo vets and others visited the unit memorials placed there. Photos were taken and more stories from the vets were forthcoming as they gazed down upon the landing beaches and the now peaceful landscape of Iwo Jima.

As we stood on Mt. Suribachi some of the vets talked about their recollections of the battle . . . and the rest of us listened.

Donald Graves is 87. He was 18 then. He remembered having steak for breakfast at 0700 on the day he went ashore in the 3d wave. Once on the black beach he lay with his face in the sand, very scared. He told me he was clinging to a ledge on Mt. Suribachi with his flamethrower, just a few feet from where the flag was raised.

Bill Montgomery is 89. In 1945 he was not long out of high school. On Iwo Jima he was the only survivor of his small unit. When he saw the flag raised on Suribachi, he thought it was all over . . . but the battle went on for more than a month. He told me that he had not wanted to revisit the scene of so much tragedy, but decided to come now to remember, and to honor his fallen brother Marines.

Lieutenant General Larry Snowden, 92, a native Virginian, was a young company commander on Iwo Jima. When he talks about the battle he never fails to remember the men he lost there. To this day he holds them close in loving memory of their courage and honor.

In today's world, 68 years is a very long time. To the younger generations, it may seem like an eternity. In the 68 years since the battle of Iwo Jima, much has happened that we might prefer to forget. The young men who survived the battle, which was after all, but one of countless such battles in the European and Pacific Theaters of World War 2, may have wanted nothing more than merciful forgetfulness . . . and who could blame them?

The men I stood with on Suribachi have not forgotten. They spoke with quiet dignity about those who died there. They grieve for them still. The stakes during the dark days of any war are so high . . . so high. Those who make the greatest sacrifice have no tomorrows. They have given them to us. For those who have given their lives, we must and will be strong, be faithful, be free. To them we owe all that we now possess. Our duty is clear; we will never forget our Nation's debt of gratitude to those who died in the defense of our liberties.

Thank you.

[From the Great Falls Connection, May 28, 2013]

GREAT FALLS MARKS MEMORIAL DAY

(By Alex McVeigh)

Retired Lt. Gen. Norman H. Smith was commissioned into the United States Marine Corps in December 1955, more than 10 years after the Battle of Iwo Jima. But 68 years later, he accompanied 14 surviving veterans to the Japanese island, and he was struck by the stories he heard.

''As we stood on Mount Suribachi, some of the vets talked about their recollections of the battle. Donald Graves, 87, was 18 then. He remembered having steak for breakfast on the day he went ashore third wave. Once on the black beach, he lay with his face on the sand, very scared. He told me he was clinging to a ledge on Mount Suribachi with his flamethrower, just a few feet from where the [American] flag was raised,'' Smith said. ''Bill Montgomery, 89, was not long out of high school. On Iwo Jima he was the only survivor of his small unit. When he saw the flag raised on Suribachi, he thought the battle was over, but instead it raged on for more than a month. He told me he had not wanted to revisit the scene of so much tragedy, but decided to come to remember and honor his fellow Marine brothers.''

Smith was the guest speaker at the Great Falls Freedom Memorial's Memorial Day ceremony Monday, May 27. One Iwo Jima veteran was present at the ceremony. Tommy Cox of McLean was a member of the 5th Marine Division, 28th Regiment, and witnessed the famous raising of the American flag on Mount Suribachi.

Dozens of residents gathered at the memorial to pay tribute to the 25 men and women of Great Falls who died in battle or from attacks on America, as well as the thousands of Americans who had what Abraham Lincoln called ''laid so costly a sacrifice on the altar of freedom.''

After the names were read, scouts from Boy Scout Troop 55 raised the flags at the memorial from half-mast.

''According to the Flag Code, flags should fly at half staff until midday, to mourn the sacrifices of the past,'' said Bruce Ellis Fein of the Friends of the Great Falls Freedom Memorial. ''The flags should be raised at midday to full staff to celebrate the future that those sacrifices have made possible.''

After the ceremony, Del. Barbara Comstock (R–34) presented the family of Tony Blankley, a Great Falls resident and member of the Friends of the Great Falls Freedom Memorial who passed away in January 2012.

Blankley was a press secretary for Newt Gingrich while he was Speaker of the House, the editorial page editor for The Washington Times and a regular panelist on The McLaughlin Group. He was also a prosecutor with the California attorney general's office and even briefly a child actor, appearing in Humphrey Bogart's last film, ''The Harder They Fall.''

''It's fitting that we honor Tony today, because he and [his wife] Linda were very committed to the military, and were so involved in setting up this memorial, and Linda continues that legacy today,'' Comstock said. ''Tony was truly a Renaissance man. He led such a rich, interesting and well-led life, and he was well respected by all his friends and colleagues, which many of us here are proud to call ourselves.''

Blankley's wife Linda Davis, her mother and their daughter Anna accepted the resolution awarded by Comstock. Davis is still active with many military causes, and spent last weekend volunteering with the Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors.

''I'm so thankful for this tremendous honor, and I know Tony would be very humbled by it as well,'' she said.

Smith said in his concluding remarks that though many of the men and women of the armed forces may wish to forget the tragedies, injuries and losses they have endured in service of country, ''Those who have made the greatest sacrifice have no tomorrows,'' he said. ''They have given them to us, and for those who have given their lives, we must be strong, we will be faithful and we will be free.''

HONORING WILL ORDING

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Will Ording. Will is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Will has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Will has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Will has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Will Ording for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL PETER FORD

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Peter Ford for his extraordinary service to the Nation while serving in the United States Army Reserves and National Guard for the past 32 years.

Lieutenant Colonel Ford started his military career in 1981 as an enlisted Soldier—an infantryman—in the Virginia National Guard. After graduating from Gustavus Adolphus College, where he was the only ROTC Cadet at Gustavus, Lieutenant Colonel Ford was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army Ordinance Corps. After the Officer Basic Course, Lieutenant Colonel Ford in his civilian capacity was sworn in as a Special Agent with the State Department Diplomatic Security Service.

While serving as the Regional Security Officer (RSO) at the embassy in Switzerland, Lieutenant Colonel Ford was assigned as a Military Intelligence Officer at the Military Intelligence Group at the 7th Army Reserve Command in Germany. In 1997, he was called up to support the war in Bosnia. Upon his return to the United States, he joined the Office, Chief of the Army Reserves, as a Reserve Congressional Liaison Officer and also served as a Reservist with the 157th Individual Mobilization Augmentee Detachment.

In 2003, Lieutenant Colonel Ford was assigned as a Congressional Detailee to the Homeland Security Committee and was named Executive Officer of the 157th that same year. After serving as RSO in Armenia, he was detailed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In the fall of 2007, at the beginning of the ''surge'' in Iraq, Lieutenant Colonel Ford volunteered to serve as an Army Reservist in Iraq. He was attached to the American Embassy in Baghdad and, as the Director of the Office of Hostage Affairs, was responsible for resolving U.S. kidnapping cases in Iraq. Following the completion of his military tour, Peter continued his service in Iraq. For an additional year, he worked as a DSS Agent with the State Department in the same position.

Returning to the U.S., Peter obtained a Masters Degree from the National Defense Intelligence College and joined Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Affairs as a drilling Reservist. He was subsequently assigned to the Diplomatic Security's Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC). In October 2011, Lieutenant Colonel Ford took command of the 157th Individual Mobilization Augmentee Detachment. During his military and civilian careers, Lieutenant Ford has worked in over 110 countries.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the grateful Nation, I join my colleagues today in saying thank you to Lieutenant Colonel Peter Ford for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the country throughout his distinguished career in the United States Army.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF AVENEL FIRE COMPANY NO. 1

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Avenel Fire Company No. 1 on its 100th Anniversary. The volunteer fire company continues to provide exemplary service to the residents of Woodbridge Township's Fire District #5 and is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Organized and chartered as Avenel Chemical Company No. 1, it legally changed its name to Avenel Fire Company No. 1 on July 12, 1913. There were 12 charter members, with Joseph Szabo serving as the first Fire Chief (a position he held through 1915) and Edward Moran serving as the first President. The first firefighting equipment purchased for the company was kept in a shed owned by member Joseph Praver. Over the years, the company was housed at different locations, finally settling at its current property on Avenel Street in 1929. It was renovated in 1995 to update and expand the structure.

Avenel Fire Company No. 1 continues to ensure the safety of its residents by replacing outdated equipment and adding new tools and apparatus to its fleet, including a ladder truck and zodiac boat. In its 100 year history, it has seen the installation of emergency response apparatus throughout the district, including fire hydrants, fire alarm systems and fire alarm boxes. Today, its 42 volunteer members answer approximately 600 alarms each year and service over 5000 addresses.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in recognizing the 100th anniversary of Avenel

Fire Company No. 1. Since its inception, Avenel Fire Company No. 1 upheld its duty to serve and protect the community and its dedication is to be celebrated.

THANKING RODRIC J. MYERS FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire House of Representatives, today I pay tribute to Mr. Rodric J. Myers, Director of House Garages and Parking Security with the Sergeant at Arms. Rod has served this institution with distinction for over 40 years, as an officer with U.S. Capitol Police and with the Office of the Sergeant at Arms. On June 14, 2013, Mr. Myers will retire from the House of Representatives. His capable guidance, trusted mentorship, and steady leadership have been invaluable assets not only to his staff and colleagues, but to every Congressional office.

A native of Indianapolis, Indiana, Rod Myers joined the U.S. Capitol Police in June 1972. He began as a uniform patrol officer eventually working his way to an Administrative Specialist for the Capitol Division. Rod was responsible for nearly 100 officers, the daily roster assignment of those officers, all while still working active policing assignments outside of his administrative duties. His 29 years of service were marked by a remarkable attention to detail, devotion to the institution, and professionalism of the highest order.

During Rod's tenure with the U.S. Capitol Police he had the distinct honor of working ten Presidential Inaugurations, 40 State of the Union addresses, and countless special events in between. Over the years, he met numerous dignitaries and heads of state, but as a loyal Dallas Cowboys fan, those meetings paled in comparison to greeting the Super Bowl Champions. As the U.S. Capitol Police administrative specialist, he knew this assignment needed his personal attention.

On July 9, 2001, Rod was appointed Director of House Garages and Parking Security with the Sergeant-at-Arms. Over the last 11 years, he has worked tirelessly to strengthen parking procedures to enhance the safety and security of Members and staff Coordinating with the U.S. Capitol Police and the Office of the Attending Physician, Rod created comprehensive on-going training programs for all Garages and Parking Security staff, ensuring the House is prepared for any eventuality. His involvement in continuity and contingency planning with the Sergeant at Arms has been invaluable. He worked closely with the Committee on House Administration over the years, and will be sorely missed by our Members and Staff

Rod Myers' deep and profound commitment to this institution is second to none. From the tragedy of September 11, to the anthrax scare, to an unprecedented earthquake, his gentle nature projected a sense of calm and assurance to all who encountered him. His leadership by example and ability to motivate are benchmarks in a long and distinguished career.

Please join me in commending the outstanding service of Mr. Rodric J. Myers, to the Congress of the United States and congratulating him on his retirement. We wish you well in all your future endeavors.

COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE TOWN OF GATES, NEW YORK

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the bicentennial celebration for the Western New York town of Gates, New York, which is appropriately known as "a community for all people."

Incorporated on April 1, 1813, the Town of Gates, New York was named in honor of American Revolutionary General Horatio Gates. The Town was one of the very first in Monroe County, New York, when in the year 1821 the New York State Legislature approved creating a new county named after the 5th President of the United States.

Today the Town of Gates, New York is comprised of over 28,400 residents and remains the geographic center of Monroe County. It is also the proud home and nationwide headquarters of Wegmans' Food Markets. As well, the Town hosts the Greater Rochester International Airport, Rochester Tech Park and other essential businesses which positively impact the economic vitality of Monroe County, the Greater Rochester area and the State of New York.

A most notable former resident of the Town of Gates is the revered leader of the American Women's Suffragist movement, the incomparable Miss Susan B. Anthony. History records that in the year 1845, she and her family first resided in the Town of Gates upon their arrival in the Rochester area and that their Gates farmhouse actually became a meeting place for anti-slavery activists, including Frederick Douglass.

Among notable living Americans who were born, raised and educated in Gates, New York is famed rock vocalist and songwriter, Lou Gramm, who is recognized around the world for his monumental contributions to the American and global music industries.

Today it is my esteemed honor and great privilege to recognize in front of this august body, the Town of Gates, New York and its government and residents, as we joyfully commemorate the 200th anniversary of its establishment.

It is from small towns like Gates where the American Dream was defined. Whether it is a parade through the town square on Memorial Day, the crack of the bat at local ball fields, or the crackle and boom of fireworks on the Fourth of July, towns like Gates imbue our nation with the richness of American life that we hold dear.

So I rise today to commemorate all that Gates, New York has contributed to American life, to congratulate the people of Gates on achieving such a milestone, and to wish this special New York town the fortune and providence to celebrate 200 years more.

HONORING PARKER WRIGLEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Parker Wrigley. Parker is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1394, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Parker has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Parker has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 34 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Parker has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Parker raised funds for the purchase and installation of a monument sign for Hobby Hill Park in Gladstone, Missouri, in addition to providing landscaping and painting improvements to the park.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Parker Wrigley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183. I had to return to Georgia due to the death of a longtime friend, and to attend the wake/funeral.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

EQUAL PAY ACT

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equal Pay Act and to call for the passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

On June 10, our nation celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act.

Yet, women still earn on average only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. In Columbus, Ohio women are paid only 81 cents for every dollar paid to men.

Equal pay is not simply a women's issue—it's a family issue.

Families increasingly rely on women's wages to make ends meet, and with less take-home pay women have less for the everyday needs of their families.

90,527 households in the Columbus metro area are headed by women. Eliminating the wage gap would provide much-needed income to women whose salaries are of critical importance to them and their families.

When women succeed, so does our economy.

RECOGNIZING DAVID J. STEINBERG

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dr. David J. Steinberg for a long and very distinguished career in higher education. It is my honor to recognize my former employer and one of Long Island's most respected leaders on the occasion of his retirement as president of Long Island University.

Over the course of his life and career, David has possessed all the attributes of a strong leader and set a shining example for all those he has taught and guided. He is a brilliant and gifted administrator who has achieved tremendous success and enjoys an impeccable reputation in the higher education community and across New York.

David began to make his mark when he started teaching in the history department of the University of Michigan, where he soon became a full professor. Before coming to LIU, he served as vice president and university secretary of Brandeis University.

An accomplished scholar, David has written several books and articles about Southeast Asia. He became an expert in the history of the Philippines and was a member of the international observer team that monitored the presidential elections in which Corazon Aquino defeated Ferdinand Marcos.

David spent a year at Columbia University on a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship, and he holds three degrees from Harvard University, where he earned his undergraduate degree, and completed his M.A. in East Asian studies and a Ph.D. in history.

In 1985, David was chosen to lead LIU. I was fortunate to be the provost and chief executive officer of the university's Southampton Campus while he was president. It was my privilege to work under him and learn to appreciate that at the core of David's vision was the goal of expanding access and affordability for students in the pursuit of a quality private education.

Since 2009, David has increased institutional student financial aid from $65 million to more than $100 million, and he expanded LIU into one of the largest and most comprehensive private universities in the United States, with six campuses and three overseas centers. In addition, LIU's endowment increased from $4.8 million to nearly $80 million, and enrollment expanded from 19,000 to 24,000 students.

David's vision has also enabled LIU maintain its competitive edge as a leader in the use of technology in education through LIU Online and LIU Global; the launch of programs in emerging fields like forensic science, genetic counseling, mobile GIS, homeland security management and environmental sustainability; and the realization of a groundbreaking cloud computing initiative, which included the largest iPad deployment in American higher education.

Perhaps most important is David's emphasis on the value of community service as an integral component of LIU's commitment to enhancing the quality of life for the university's neighbors on Long Island. Students attending LIU Post alone volunteer 27,500 hours devoted to the community each year through local initiatives involving health and wellness; providing resources for individuals and families dealing with autism, aphasia, and post-traumatic stress syndrome; and offering instruction in literacy and life skills. In fact, both of LIU's residential campuses were named to President Obama's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.

Additionally, David's leadership forged LIU's long tradition of complementing its educational mission with cultural and artistic endeavors by offering world-class performances and arts programs at the Tilles Center for the Performing Arts, which is located at LIU Post in Brookville. He has indeed nurtured a culture of access and excellence that has transformed the lives of countless students and in the process made an indelible impression on the educational and cultural landscape of New York for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that David will embrace his retirement with his usual enthusiasm and energy. On behalf of New York's first congressional district, I wish him all the health and happiness throughout a long retirement with his wife, Joan, his two sons, Noah and Jonah, and his grandchildren.

HONORING SEAN BAKER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Sean Baker. Sean is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Sean has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Sean has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Sean has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Sean Baker for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,778,336,691.59. We've added $6,111,901,787,778.51 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 179, I had to return to Georgia due to the death of a long time friend, and to attend the wake/funeral.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

IN MEMORY OF SHARON O'KEEFE EVANS

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Sharon O'Keefe Evans. Sharon was an inspirational woman who touched many lives throughout her 56 years. She passed after a brief, yet courageous battle with cancer.

Sharon grew up in the Chicago suburbs and relocated to central Florida to pursue career opportunities. Before moving to Florida, she attended the University of Illinois, Champaign. After graduating in 1974, she became an accomplished advertising executive serving in a variety of senior positions with leading national advertising agencies such as J. Walter Thompson and Foot, Cone & Belding. After relocating to Florida she held account management positions with some of our state's leading advertising firms, including Fry, Hammond, Barr and PP+K. She was an avid golfer, enjoying the many beautiful courses our state has to offer. During her illness, Sharon was treated at Moffitt Cancer Center in Tampa, a national leader in cancer research and treatment.

Sharon is survived by her parents, William O'Keefe and Gay Japinga of Evanston, Illinois, and her husband, Doug Evans, of Valrico, Florida. As a senior executive with Source Interlink Media, Doug is a leading voice in the motorsports and automotive industry, publishing magazines such as 'Hot Rod' and 'Motor Trend,' which I have read for many years. As a fellow automotive enthusiast, I count him as a friend and offer my heartfelt condolences to him and his family for this great loss.

Sharon's final days were spent with Doug courageously by her side. It is with sadness that we pay tribute to Sharon's life. This is yet another reminder of the need to redouble our efforts to find a cure for cancer so that institutions like Moffitt Cancer Center can successfully treat those, like Sharon, so that their days are no longer cut short by this disease.

HONORING THE NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA MEN'S GOLF TEAM

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 2013 University of Alabama Men's Golf

Team for having captured its first National Championship. On June 2, the team emerged victorious from a field of 30 qualifying teams over six days to win the NCAA Golf Championship. The Tide golf team represents only the second University of Alabama men's sport other than football to take a national title in school history.

The Crimson Tide defeated Illinois 4–1 in the match play championship round at the par–70, 7,319 yard Capital City Club Crabapple Course in Milton, Georgia. Junior Bobby Wyatt of Mobile birdied five of his first seven holes and finished his match on the 13th green with a chip into the hole from more than 50 feet. Juniors Trey Mullinax and Cory Whitsett as well as senior Scott Strohmeyer helped clinch the title by winning their matches.

Before entering into the 2013 NCAA Championship, Alabama was ranked No. 2 nationally behind the University of California. The Crimson Tide went on to win eight of their nine tournaments including the SEC Championship, the NCAA Baton Rouge Regional and the NCAA Championships. Three members of the team entered the championship tournament ranked in the top 10: Bobby Wyatt—No.3, Cory Whitsett—No.4, and sophomore Justin Thomas—No. 8.

The Crimson Tide National Champion team members and staff include: Lee Knox, Dru Love, Tom Lovelady, Trey Mullinax, Robby Prater, William Sellers, Scott Strohmeyer, Justin Thomas, Cory Whitsett, Bobby Wyatt, Coach Jay Seawell, and Assistant Coach Rob Bradley.

On behalf of the people of Alabama and my colleagues in the Alabama Delegation, I wish to extend personal congratulations to Coach Jay Seawell, Assistant Coach Rob Bradley and the University of Alabama Men's Golf Team for their rising to the challenge and bringing home the NCAA Championship trophy to Tuscaloosa. Roll Tide!

HONORING ALEX WESTHUES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Alex Westhues. Alex is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Alex has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Alex has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Alex has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Alex Westhues for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATING DR. TRIFON LASKARIS ON RECEIPT OF HIS 200TH U.S. PATENT

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable individual and prolific inventor whose pioneering research into medical imaging has helped to transform modern day medicine. Dr. Trifon Laskaris, a Chief Scientist at General Electric's Global Research Center, was recently awarded his 200th U.S. patent—a benchmark previously reached by only one other GE researcher—the inventor of the light bulb and founder of the company's research center, Thomas Edison.

For the past four decades, Dr. Laskaris has worked at GE Global Research on technology to advance magnetic resonance imaging, or MRI. He has spent much of his career directing GE's research into superconducting magnets. It is these high-power magnets that make MRI possible. Suffice it to say that without the work of Dr. Laskaris and his team, MRI would not be where it is today—a vital diagnostic tool used in hospitals around the world. There is no telling how many millions of people are leading healthier lives today because of the technology that Dr. Laskaris developed.

New York's Capital Region has a rich history as a hub for cutting-edge science and technology. From the birth of General Electric more than 120 years ago, to the emergence of ''Tech Valley'' as a center for nanotechnology research and development, upstate New York continues to be at the forefront of invention and innovation that is making America and the world a better place. Dr. Laskaris is an inspiration to us all, and his achievement is a testament to the fruits that creativity and steadfast pursuit of technological advancement can bear.

I congratulate Dr. Trifon Laskaris on this milestone achievement and, on behalf of this body and the citizens of the 20th District of New York, I thank him for his lifelong dedication to scientific research in the service of humanity.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2216) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, on Memorial Day, we remembered the patriotic sacrifice of those that have lost their lives in service to our country and today, we renew our commitment to keep our promise to our nation's more than 2 million troops and reservists, their families, 22.2 million veterans, and 35.5 million family members of living veterans or survivors of deceased veterans.

This committee has a strong history of working in a bipartisan way to produce a bill that supports our active duty servicemembers, our veterans and their families, and this bill is no exception.

I commend the Chairman and Ranking Member for their hard work in ensuring that this bill is another significant step in fulfilling the promise our country made to leave no veteran behind.

For example, even though Congress has fully funded the VA budget request for additional staffing and technology, the disability claims backlog continues to grow.

While the VA has taken steps to rectify this deplorable backlog, we owe it to our veterans to exercise our Congressional oversight responsibilities to ensure that the VA actually fixes the backlog.

I am pleased the bill before us today includes language I requested, with some of my Northern CA colleagues, that would add additional oversight requirements for the Veterans Benefits Administration and require regular updates from the VA on of the status of the backlog.

Through regular updates from the VA, we ensure accountability and end the backlog.

Additionally, I am pleased to see that this bill again recognizes the burial needs of our veterans in rural areas. The National Cemetery Administration has repeatedly stated that 10% of all veterans will not have access to a burial option in a national, state or tribal cemetery within 75 miles of their home.

While the VA strategy outlined in the FY13 budget request to extend burial services to some rural veterans is a good first step, it fails to address a long-term strategy. The FY13 bill and report instructed the VA to correct this oversight and the FY14 report language reaffirms the need for the VA to develop a long-term strategy to provide burial services for all our nation's veterans, including those who live in rural areas. Veterans in my congressional district do not have access to a VA burial option, so I look forward to the Secretary's report on the VA's long-term strategy to address their burial needs.

I would note that while this bill is $1.4 billion above last year's enact level, it is also $1.4 billion less than the President's request. While I am glad to see this bill has been protected from senseless cuts imposed by sequestration, I strongly believe this Congress needs to get back to the balanced approach we agreed to in the bipartisan Budget Control Act.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago when President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act of 1963, he stated that ''when women enter the labor force they will find equality in their pay envelopes.'' Yet a half century later, women still do not have equality in their pay. In 1963, women made an average of 59 cents

for every dollar earned by men. Today, women nationwide make on average 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. According to a new report from the American Association of University Women, women in my Congressional District still earn only 74 cents for every dollar earned by men–progress, but not nearly enough.

With the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act upon us, and as American women continue to encounter lower pay in the workplace, I can think of no better action to take than to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Here's why.

If the United States adopts a policy of paycheck fairness, it will put $200 billion more into the economy every year. That comes out to about $137 for every white woman per pay check, and approximately $300 for every woman of color who are doubly discriminated against.

And with a record number of women in the workforce, wage discrimination is hurting the majority of American families, both in terms of their economic security today and their retirement security tomorrow. This means fewer resources to pay the mortgage, send kids to college, or have a decent retirement.

Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act will close loopholes that allow pay discrimination to continue. The bill requires employers to demonstrate pay disparity is related to job–performance–not gender. It prohibits employer retaliation for sharing salary information with coworkers, and it strengthens remedies for pay discrimination by increasing compensation women can seek.

Fifty years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, the law has brought more equity to the workplace, but neither President Kennedy nor today's leaders can say our job is done.

Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act because pay equity means economic growth for America's women and their families.

IN HONOR OF DR. JOSEPH T. COX, THE 8TH HEADMASTER OF THE HAVERFORD SCHOOL

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, we honor Dr. Joseph T. Cox, the 8th Headmaster of The Haverford School, who is retiring after 15 truly transformative years at Haverford School, an all boys Pre-K through 12 independent school located in the suburbs of Philadelphia. Dr. Cox came to The Haverford School in the summer of 1998 as a decorated Vietnam War veteran who had risen to the rank of Colonel in the United States Army. Colonel Cox provided great service to our country as a Commander of the 101st Airborne Division Battalion. Not only was Dr. Cox a successful military officer, but he was also a gifted poet who graduated from Lafayette College and earned his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina.

Despite this somewhat unique combination of talents and skills, Dr. Cox came to The Haverford School as a largely unknown person with no experience in the world of independent schools in 1998. However, fifteen glorious years later, Dr. Cox leaves The Haverford School with his personal imprint imbedded throughout the entire community. Dr. Cox's strong servant leadership, his vision, his passion and his compassion had a lasting impact on the many boys and young men who attended Haverford during his fifteen year tenure.

During his tenure, Haverford graduated 1,240 young men. Dr. Cox opened the doors of Haverford to a much broader and more diverse group of boys and young men and he pushed to meaningfully increase the financial assistance for the boys by five-fold in order to assure that Haverford attracted a truly remarkable group of talented boys and young men of character.

Dr. Cox also implemented a nationally recognized and highly acclaimed faculty performance system coupled with a program of performance pay and he obtained a strong commitment from the Board of Trustees to pay Haverford's teachers at the top of the pay scale for local independent day schools. This program was critical to attracting and retaining a group of extraordinary teachers, coaches, and senior administrators to Haverford.

Dr. Cox led and carefully oversaw a facilities renaissance at Haverford with the building of a new Field House, a new Lower School and a new and expanded Upper School during his tenure. He also lead a series of record-setting capital campaigns and he led fund raising efforts which resulted in contributions of more than $100 million to Haverford during his tenure.

Most importantly, Dr. Cox installed and encouraged the development of a series of game changing programs designed to make Haverford a more holistic place. Included among his programmatic accomplishments were development of a novel and now much copied schoolwide decision education program. He also put in place a student-run Honor Code, a schoolwide servant leadership program, numerous character education programs and an important community guidepost with his Principles of Community.

Dr. Cox encouraged excellence in academics, the arts and athletics. During his tenure, the arts programs flourished with new studios, new programs and the establishment of an annual Arts Week celebration. Athletics enjoyed a strong resurgence during Dr. Cox's tenure with Haverford teams winning 41 Inter-Ac championships.

In short, Dr. Cox, a man of passion, compassion, and vision led a remarkable renaissance at The Haverford School and his servant leadership made a genuine difference in the lives of the entire Haverford School community.

HONORING THOMAS MILTON WILSON, JR. FOR LIFETIME SERVICE TO OUR NATION

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas Milton Wilson, Jr. for a lifetime of courageous service to our nation as a pilot in the United States Air Force.

Wilson was born on April 12, 1919, following the First World War. As a young man, he entered the U.S. Army Air Corps to begin training to become a pilot, as it was becoming apparent to the world we would soon be at war again. He proudly earned his wings and began flying the first of countless combat missions from North Africa and Italy and into enemy territory in fortress Europe during World War II.

Following his valiant wartime service in the Air Force, Wilson decided to continue the mission of preserving the freedoms we hold so dear. He remained in the USAF Reserves for an additional 20 years and retired as a Colonel.

Our country and many more around the globe are the beneficiaries of his selflessness and vigilance. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Thomas Milton Wilson, Jr. and extending thanks from a grateful nation.

HONORING COLONEL MARK C. GARDNER'S RETIREMENT

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Mark C. Gardner and to recognize his lifetime of service to our country.

On June 28, Col. Gardner will retire from the United States Army after thirty years of sacrifice and service to this great nation.

While he currently serves as the Georgia National Guard's State Inspector General, he has worked in many different capacities. In 1983, Col. Gardner's first assignment was with U.S. Army Missile Command, and he has since been assigned to infantry, maintenance, and forward support duties across the world. His career has taken him to Korea, Panama, Afghanistan, Iraq, and several military installations here in the United States.

For his distinguished leadership throughout his career, Col. Gardner has been awarded with decorations like the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with six Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Korea Defense Service Medal, the Army Reserve Service Medal, the Parachutist Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

Col. Gardner has played an invaluable role in the U.S. Armed Forces for decades and he will surely be missed.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 11th District of Georgia, my deepest thanks to Col. Gardner for devoting his life to upholding the Constitution of the United States and to the protection of its citizens. I wish him a happy—and well-deserved—retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF EVANGELIST DELLA MAE KING SUTTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to the life and legacy of Evangelist Della Mae King Sutton of Nesbit, Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Evangelist Sutton was a mighty woman of God. She devoted countless hours to empower those around her in formal and Christian education. Born July 20, 1941 in Desoto County, MS, Ms. Della was the first daughter to the late Turner King, Sr. and the late Remell Bridgeforth King.

Ms. Sutton began her education at Shiloh M.B. Church in Desoto County, MS where her father was the instructor. She continued her education as an honor student at Hernando High School, which taught students up until eighth grade, and completed her studies as class Valedictorian. Upon leaving Hernando High, Ms. Della finished her secondary education at the age of sixteen at Eastern High School in Olive Branch, MS, where she was Salutatorian of her graduating class before enrolling in Mississippi Industrial College in Holly Springs, MS. It was there where she would meet her companion in life, her husband, Mr. Jesse Sutton, Jr. After completing studies at Mississippi Industrial College, Ms. Sutton earned her Master's of Science degree from Jackson State University.

Ms. Della Mae sincerely believed in children and the value of educating them. Ms. Sutton served as a devoted educator for more than thirty years throughout Mississippi. These schools included East Side High School in Olive Branch, Mississippi; Oakley Training School in Learned, Mississippi; Mendenhall Junior High School in Mendenhall, Mississippi; and Northside Elementary School in Pearl, Mississippi, from which she retired.

Throughout the years, Ms. Sutton has been recognized on several occasions. Most notably, she was recognized by former Governor and First Lady Ronnie Musgrove as one of the Most Outstanding Women for the Reach One-Each One Mother of the Year contest. She served as Chairperson of the Elementary Language Arts and was recognized for a host of other achievements. Ms. Sutton was the recipient of a number of awards, among them are the Who's Who Among Teachers, Teacher of the Year and most recently the Jackson District Association's Living Legacy Award.

Ms. Sutton was a socially engaged woman. She was a member of Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, member of ''Keep Jackson Beautiful'', instructor of the Jackson District Ministers' Wives/Widows group, and an avid supporter of the Mississippi Baptist Seminary. She was an active member of the General Missionary Baptist Convention and a devoted member of the New McRaven Hill M.B. Church, where she served as a Sunday School teacher, member of the Mother's Ministry, devotional leader of the Mission Society and Vacation Bible School teacher.

This spiritual steward for Christ lived a life of both passion and purpose. She was an advocate of education, a champion of civility and a true lover of the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in celebrating the life and legacy of a true champion, Evangelist Della Mae King Sutton.

RECOGNIZING THE 109TH BIRTHDAY OF MR. ROOSEVELT LEE, SR. OF KOSCIUSKO, MS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Roosevelt Lee, Sr. of Kosciusko, MS as a father, husband and agricultural entrepreneur in recognition of his 109th birthday. Born October 23, 1902 to Mr. Tom Lee and Mrs. Mary Young Lee, Roosevelt is the eldest and last surviving of nine siblings, all of which he helped his father care for. Mr. Lee is the father of eighteen (18) children, grandfather to sixty (60) grandchildren, and great-grandfather to more than fifty (50) great-grandchildren.

During a period when educational resources for African Americans were scarce, Mr. Lee managed to receive a third-grade education which was offered out of a local church in Kosciusko, where he is a native. At a very young age Mr. Lee committed his time and talent to working to help support his family; he worked as a farmer, mechanic, and raiser of cattle and other livestock.

He is a devoted Christian and passionate steward of the Lord. He was a member of the Mount Ollie Missionary Baptist Church in Kosciusko, MS for 67 years where he actively served as Sunday school superintendent, treasurer, head deacon, and trustee. Currently, he is a member of the Bell Grove Missionary Baptist Church of Clarksdale and has been for the past eight years.

Mr. Lee is a member of the Sir Knight Masons of Clarksdale, MS. He has selflessly devoted his time to helping other local farmers maintain and repair their farming equipment and vehicles. Mr. Lee's work ethic and commitment to providing for his family has allowed his family to keep its farm for 81 years. He was a producer of cotton, corn, soybeans and a number of other crops.

In October of 2007, Mayor Henry Epsy of Clarksdale, Mississippi, declared October 27th as Roosevelt Lee, Sr. Day. At the seasoned age of 109, Mr. Lee does not suffer from commonly prominent illnesses such as high blood pressure, high cholesterol, heart issues or diabetes. He enjoys boxing, wrestling, and he has a passion for the game of checkers. He has frequented Chicago, St. Louis, California, Atlanta and a host of other U.S. cities and states.

Mr. Lee truly believes that his commitment to Christ has sustained him throughout his life. He believes that if you serve the Lord and do the right thing, regardless of what the next person does, God will bless you. He is a true example of the wondrous works of the Lord and what it means to be a provider for your family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating a true champion of life, Mr. Roosevelt Lee, Sr., for his tenacity and zealous work as a farmer, father and fine American.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 and 4, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following rollcall votes: No. 184 for H.R. 1206 and No. 188 on Agreeing to the First Broun of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 2216. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 184 and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 188.

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM RASPBERRY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the honorable Mr. William Raspberry. Mr. Raspberry was born on October 12, 1935 to proud parents Mr. James Lee and Mrs. Willie Mae Raspberry. A native of Okolona, Mississippi, Mr. Raspberry has become a celebrated writer as a result of his commentary on social and political issues.

Mr. Raspberry received his Bachelor's of Science Degree from Indiana Central College, now known as The University of Indianapolis, in 1958. After receiving his degree, he served as a public information officer with the United States Army from 1960 until 1962, at which time he began working at the Washington Post as a teletypist. In 1966 he was named as a columnist for the Washington Post, and in that same year, Mr. Raspberry married Sondra Patricia Dodson and together they had three children Patricia D., Angela D., and Mark J.

As a result of his exemplary contributions in literature, Mr. Raspberry was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize in 1982, and received the Pulitzer Prize for Commentary in 1994.

Mr. Raspberry has dictated his strong opinions about the problems in American society through his work with the Washington Post. He has been noted for writing about education, criminal justice, family, and racial matters in America. Mr. Raspberry has often been quoted in many different publications and has also been asked to speak at various conferences and seminars.

In addition to providing a weekly column in the Washington Post, Mr. Raspberry has also served in other capacities throughout his lifetime. He served as a journalism instructor at Howard University from 1971–1973; Member of the Board of Advisers, Poynter Institute for Media Studies, 1984; Member of the Board of Visitors, University of Maryland School of Journalism, 1985; television commentator for WTTG, Washington, D.C., 1973–1975; Television Discussion Panelist, WRC–TV, Washington, D.C., 1974–1975, and a Member of the Pulitzer Prize Board, 1979–1986. As of 2008, Mr. Raspberry has also served as the President of ''Baby Steps'', a parent training and empowerment program based in Okolona, Mississippi.

He is also the author of Looking Backward at Us, a collection of his columns from the 1980's. Mr. Raspberry has received honorary

degrees from Georgetown University, University of Maryland, and the University of Indianapolis; he received an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Colby College. He was also the Knight Professor of the Practice of Communications and Journalism at the Sanford Institute of Public Policy at Duke University. During his career Mr. Raspberry, has also served as a member of the National Association of Black Journalists, Capitol Press Club, and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity Incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. William Raspberry for his exceptional contributions to our community and to our society as whole.

HONORING HOLLIS WATKINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Hollis Watkins who was born in July 29, 1941, in Lincoln County, Mississippi near the town of Summit. He is the youngest and twelfth child of sharecroppers, John and Lena Watkins who were able to purchase a farm during 1949.

Mr. Watkins graduated from Lincoln County Training School in 1960. During his youth, he attended the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) youth meetings led by Medgar Evers. He met Robert Parris Moses, commonly known as Bob Moses, who was organizing for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1961. Mr. Watkins joined SNCC and began canvassing potential voters around McComb, Mississippi. He participated in McComb's first sit-in at a Woolworth's lunch counter and was jailed for 34 days. During his time in jail, he was threatened on several occasions, including once being shown a noose and told that he would be hung that night. Later, his participation in a walk out at McComb's colored high school led to 39 more days in jail.

Mr. Watkins' activism had a personal price, as many of his extended family ostracized him and would not recognize him in public for fear of losing their jobs in white reprisals.

Veron Dahmer, president of the Forrest County, Mississippi NAACP asked SNCC for help with voter registration and Mr. Watkins moved to Hattiesburg, Mississippi to help with that project. He worked half days at Dahmer's sawmill to pay his way, and spent the rest of the time organizing voter registration projects.

Mr. Watkins was one of many people spied upon by the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, which investigated civil rights workers and created files on them for government use. His name appears in the files 63 times. Some of the reports refer to him as a communist, although he had little idea what that even meant at the time.

Mr. Watkins traveled to Atlantic City, New Jersey for the 1964 Democratic Party convention in support of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP), which attempted to unseat the regular Mississippi Democratic Party as the true representatives of the state. He was present when Fannie Lou Hamer gave her testimony to the credentials committee, and later when Hamer and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. debated over whether the MFDP should accept the compromise of two seats at the convention offered by Lyndon Baines Johnson.

In 1988, Mr. Watkins returned to the Democratic Party National Convention as a delegate for Jesse Jackson, Sr.'s Presidential Campaign. Beginning in 1989 Mr. Watkins joined, and now serves as President of Southern Echo, a group dedicated to providing assistance to civil rights and education-reform groups throughout the south. He was honored by Jackson State University with a Fannie Lou Hamer Humanitarian Award in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hollis Watkins for his dedication to serving others.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM LEE AND THE YMCA OF GREATER NEW YORK

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. William Lee and the YMCA of Greater New York for their impeccable efforts to provide support and services to all New Americans.

Born in Seoul, South Korea, Dr. ''Bill'' Lee became a student leader at the Korean YMCA. As he immigrated with his young family to New York to complete his graduate medical education, Dr. Lee became aware of the unique challenges facing newly arrived immigrants and he has worked diligently over the past decades to combat these challenges.

Bill Lee has served as a board member of the YMCA of New York City from 1982–1996 and again since 2005. He also served on the YMCA of the USA Board of Directors from 1995–2004, and continues to have a lifelong relationship with the YMCA both in Korea and in the United States. With support from Dr. Lee and others, the YMCA of Greater New York established New American Welcome Centers throughout the City, including the Flushing YMCA in my Congressional District. These Centers help immigrants achieve literacy, cultural competence, and self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, drawing on his own experience as a young immigrant who faced much adversity, Dr. Lee was able to turn his experiences into positive solutions for the newly arrived immigrants he saw in New York City. He successfully fundraised and organized the Korean Center of the Flushing YMCA, a branch of the YMCA of Greater New York that served new Korean immigrants with English-language classes and programs for newly arrived Korean families. As organizing chair of the International branch of the New York City YMCA, he championed the New Americans program, carefully outlining the needs of new immigrants, and the importance of working collaboratively with a strong referral network of service providers. He also closely monitored the initial years of the start-up and roll-out of six centers.

This week, Dr. Lee and Jack Lund, President of the YMCA of Greater New York, are visiting Washington, DC, to participate in a ''Champions of Change'' celebration hosted by the White House in honor of the Obama Administration's commitment to expanding programs and services to the immigrant population of the New York City.

A renowned cardiologist, Dr. Lee never fails to give back to his community. He has shaped one of the most successful programs in the YMCA through his belief that helping new arrivals succeed will be repaid many times over in society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in paying tribute to Dr. William Lee and to the YMCA of Greater New York for their years of assistance to Korean Americans and to the entire City of New York.

HONORING MRS. SARAH KIMBROUGH HART

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Sarah Kimbrough Hart, a remarkable public servant.

Mrs. Sarah Kimbrough Hart, a 90 year old native of Lexington, Miss., who is the widow of the late Harrison aka ''HB'' Hart, a well-known farmer and strong community leader. She was born May 9, 1922 to Daniel and Rebecca Kimbrough of the Shady Grove Community in the hills of Holmes County. She is the third of eight children (all females). Seven of whom are deceased.

Mrs. Hart and her husband marched and protested injustices during the civil rights movement in Holmes County. They were among the very early African Americans who registered to vote after meeting would-be opposition for the County Registrar.

Mrs. Hart often shares the story of how the Voting Registrar would ask them idiotic questions like ''how many bubbles are in a bar of soup'' or ''how many strains of hairs are on a person's head'' just to discourage them from registering, but they would not give up. They kept returning to the Holmes County Court House until they were allowed to register. She and her husband also housed civil rights workers (freedom riders) from up north in their home. They contributed money and resources to the movement. They were also integral parts of the efforts to bring the first black doctor to Holmes County. Mrs. Hart is the mother of eight adult children, one deceased, and a number of grands, greatgrands and great-great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Sarah Kimbrough Hart for her dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

HONORING BRENDA LOVE FOR HER INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS AS A MEMBER OF THE WARREN COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI BUSINESS COMMUNITY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a woman of great perseverance and determination, minority business owner Mrs. Brenda Love.

Originally of New Orleans, Louisiana, Mrs. Love and her family relocated to Vicksburg, Mississippi when she was fourteen years old. At an early age, Mrs. Love's mother instilled in her the importance of hard work and dedication. These values coupled with savvy business sense have earned Mrs. Love distinction as one of Warren County's most influential business owners.

For more than 15 years, Mrs. Love has served as a model figure in the business community. She has extended services to her community as a trusted income service provider through her business, Love Income Tax Services. She and her husband are also owners of two other local businesses, Unique Impressions Restaurant and Lounge and Unique Banquet Hall, which provides event space for residents looking to host events in the Vicksburg area.

Mrs. Love is a respected member of the general community as well. Outside of her other businesses, Mrs. Love thrives as a realtor associate with Coldwell Banker All Stars. She is also a member of the Warren County Board of Realtors, and the board for the Vicksburg Convention Center and City Auditorium.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a minority business owner, Mrs. Brenda Love, for her leadership, entrepreneurial spirit, and invaluable contributions to Warren County as a valued member of the business community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SPECIALIST DWAYNE W. FLORES, GUAM ARMY NATIONAL GUARDSMAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and service of Guam Army National Guardsman Specialist Dwayne Westfall Flores from the village of Sinajana, Guam. Specialist Flores was one of the 600 Guam Army National Guard soldiers assigned to the 1st Battalion—294th Infantry Regiment that were recently deployed to Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. On May 16, 2013 Specialist Flores was killed during a suicide car bomb attack in Kabul, Afghanistan. He was 22 years old.

Specialist Flores was born on February 26, 1991 to Leonardo Arriola Flores and Eva Westfall Flores. Specialist Flores devoted every Sunday as an altar server at the 5:45 a.m. mass at the Dulce Nombre de Maria Cathedral Basilica in Haga. In his civilian employment, Specialist Flores worked as a body repairman for LamLam Tours, a tour bus operations company.

After graduating from George Washington High School, Specialist Flores enlisted in the Guam Army National Guard on May 19, 2008 and served as a Human Resources Specialist and was assigned to Echo Company, 1st Battalion, 294th Infantry Regiment. This was his first deployment.

For his service and performance, Specialist Flores received numerous awards and achievements, including the Bronze Star Medal Purple Heart Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal with M Device, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Army Reserve Component Overseas Training Ribbon, NATO Medal, Combat Action Badge, Guam Cross of Valor and Overseas Service Bar.

I join our community in mourning the loss of Specialist Flores, and I extend my deepest condolences to his parents, Leonardo and Eva; his siblings, Stephanie Westfall Flores Taitano and Steven Westfall Flores; and his extended family, close friends, and loved ones.

Specialist Flores served with honor and distinction, and like the many sons and daughter of Guam who served before him, he gave the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country. Our nation will be eternally grateful for his service.

May God bless the family and friends of Specialist Dwayne Westfall Flores and may God bless the men and women of our United States Armed Forces and keep them safe.

HONORING REVEREND WILLIE E. BLUE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a civil rights activist and known legend from Mississippi, Rev. Willie Blue. He is from Charleston, Mississippi.

Civil rights and the movement was a necessary part of American culture. It helped to seal cracks in the American society by making great improvements in its foundation and Rev. Willie E. Blue was a part of that effort.

In 1963 he joined SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee). SNCC was founded by Ella Baker at Shaw University as a direct response to segregated public facilities. SNCC's aim was to desegregate those public facilities by organizing ''Sit-ins''. From 1963–1966 he was the field secretary for SNCC and he has worked alongside people like Julian Bond, Stokely Carmichael, Kwame Ture, Bob Moses, and Hollis Watkins to name a few. He became a member of the Veterans of the Mississippi Civil Rights Movement in 2007.

Although the years have passed since the start of the Civil Rights Movement, Rev. Blue has continued his efforts by working with young people to make sure they are educated on the movement and its contribution to society. He is building the fire inside of them to continue the fight for a better America for all citizens. ''It's their turn now'' he says, ''and the veterans have to show them the way.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Willie E. Blue for his dedication to fighting oppression, discrimination, and injustice in Mississippi.

HONORING ELIZABETH MICHELLE WOODS FOR HER CONTINUED SERVICE TO HER COUNTRY AND COMMUNITY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable veteran from the Mississippi Delta, Sergeant Elizabeth Michelle Woods.

Ms. Woods's desire to serve her country began at an early age. As a senior in high school she joined the ranks of the United States Army Reserves and served eight years with the 479th Ordnance Company.

Following her tenure with the 479th Ordinance Company, Sergeant Woods served as assistant squad leader during a tour of duty in Operation Desert Storm. Not only did Sergeant Woods return home a decorated soldier with distinctions such as the U.S. Army Achievement Medal and the U.S. Army Certificate of Achievement, but she also obtained an Associate of Arts Degree in Social Work.

As a result of her tireless work and leadership over her twelve years of service to her country, Sergeant Woods garnered the status of sergeant promotionable along with an Honorable Discharge. After her military service, she continued her educational pursuits and received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Social Work, a Masters Degree in Social Work, and an Executive Masters of Science Degree in Health Administration.

Sergeant Wood's knowledge of social work and love of serving her community inspired her to enter the field of victim advocacy and develop a Crime Victims Assistance Program within the Department of Veterans Affairs, and serve as Director of Social Work at the Delta Health Center and Aaron Henry Health Center.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sergeant Elizabeth Woods for her dedication to serving our country and her community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 6, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Byron Todd Jones, of Minnesota, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and Stuart F. Delery, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine department leadership.
SD–192

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.
SD–366

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine sex trafficking and exploitation in America, focusing on child welfare's role in prevention and intervention.
SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Strengthening America's Schools Act'', and any pending nominations.
SH–216

11 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SD–G50

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine deep sea challenge, focusing on innovative partnerships in ocean observations.
SR–253

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

6 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–232A

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation.
SR–418

2 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity, focusing on preparing for and responding to the enduring threat; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing in SVC–217.
SD–G50

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Yvette Roubideaux, of Maryland, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–628

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine crumbling infrastructure, focusing on outdated and overburdened highways and bridges.
SD–124

2 p.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine Syrian refugees in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region, focusing on the United States and international response to the humanitarian crisis that threatens to destabilize the entire region.
SD–562

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to continue to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.
SR–222

JUNE 20

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an oversight hearing to examine water resource issues in the Klamath River Basin.
SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Frank R. Lautenberg, in accordance with S. Res. 161, until 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2013.

During the Adjournment:

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3965–68**

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 2258–2271; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 249 were introduced. **Pages H3215–16**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3216–17**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 1092, to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center" (H. Rept. 113–97). **Page H3215**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Stewart to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3099**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:48 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3105**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Rev. Dr. Thomas Elliott, Cannon United Methodist Church, Snellville, Georgia. **Page H3105**

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014: The House began consideration of H.R. 2217, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 6th.

Pages H3110–61, H3162–H3214

Agreed to:

Reichert amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the United States Fire Administration by $1,838,000; **Page H3133**

Poe (TX) amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology by $10,000,000; **Pages H3135–36**

Runyan amendment that increases funding, by offset, for Firefighter Assistance Grants by $5,000,000; **Page H3137**

Grimm amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System by $7,667,000; **Pages H3137–38**

Lynch amendment (No. 11 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2013) that increases funding, by offset, for the Transportation Security Administration for surface transportation security activities by $15,676,000; **Pages H3138–39**

Tipton amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the National Predisaster Mitigation Fund by $7,655,000; **Pages H3140–42**

Tipton amendment that increases funding, by offset, for the Transportation Security Administration for detection equipment at rural airports by $3,000,000; **Page H3147**

Hudson amendment (No. 10 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2013) that redirects $12,500,000 in funding within the Transportation Security Administration aviation security account for the Federal Flight Deck Officer Program; **Pages H3147–49**

Mica amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2013) that increases funding, by offset, for the Screening Partnership Program by $31,810,000; **Pages H3149–50**

Brownley amendment that redirects $97,500,000 in funding within the Federal Emergency Management Agency for the Port Security Grant Program; **Pages H3157–58**

Swalwell amendment that redirects $97,500,000 in funding within the Federal Emergency Management Agency for mass transit security programs; **Pages H3158–59**

Pierluisi amendment (No. 12 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce section 1301(a) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the use of amounts made available by this Act for the ''Salaries and Expenses'' and ''Air and Marine Operations'' accounts of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the expenses authorized to be paid in section 9 of the Jones Act and for the collection of duties and taxes authorized to be levied, collected, and paid in Puerto Rico, as authorized in section 4 of the Foraker Act, in addition to the more specific amounts available for such purposes in the Puerto Rico Trust Fund pursuant to such provisions of law; **Pages H3179–80**

Grimm amendment that prohibits funds from being used to implement any change in the list of sharp objects prohibited under section 1540.111 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, from being carried by passengers as accessible property or on their person through passenger screening checkpoints or into airport sterile areas and the cabins of a passenger aircraft; **Pages H3180–82**

Bustos amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract with an offeror for the purchase of an American flag if the flag is certified as a foreign end product; **Page H3190**

Grayson en bloc amendment consisting of the following amendments: an amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if that offeror has, within a three-year period preceding this offer, been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of a fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; an amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of the First, Second, or Fourth Amendments to the Constitution; and an amendment that prohibits funds from being used for the purchase, operation, or maintenance of armed unmanned aerial vehicles; **Pages H3191–92**

Collins (GA) amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; **Page H3193**

Salmon amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; **Pages H3194–96**

Jackson Lee amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 44917 of title 49, United States Code; **Pages H3197–98**

Gingrey amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; **Page H3198**

Cassidy amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2012) that prohibits funds from being used to implement, carry out, administer, or enforce section 1308(h) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (by a recorded vote of 281 ayes to 146 noes, Roll No. 203); **Pages H3184–90, H3202–03**

Meadows amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enter into a new contract for the purpose of purchasing ammunition before the date the report required by section 567(a) is submitted to Congress (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 192 noes, Roll No. 204); **Pages H3190–91, H3203**

Flores amendment that prohibits funds from being used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; **Pages H3205–06**

Meehan amendment that prohibits funds from being used for U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance operations at Abu Dhabi International Airport in the United Arab Emirates; **Pages H3206–07**

Engel amendment that prohibits funds from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011; **Page H3208**

Ellison amendment that prohibits funds from being used in contravention of (1) the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution; (2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; (3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; or (4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act of 1994; and **Pages H3212–13**

Barletta amendment that prohibits funds from being used for official reception and representational expenses until the Secretary of Homeland Security complies with section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. **Page H3214**

Rejected:

Broun (GA) amendment that sought to eliminate funding for the Transportation Security Administration for expenses related to providing civil aviation security services and apply the $4,872,739,000 to the spending reduction account; **Pages H3146–47**

Moore amendment that sought to increase funding for the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties by $3,346,000 and reduce funding for the U.S. Customs Border Protection Automation Modernization account by $4,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 194); **Pages H3132–33, H3159**

Polis amendment that sought to reduce funding for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Salaries and Expenses account by $43,592,000; strike funding for the 287(g) program; and increase funding for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties by $4,359,200 (by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 195); **Pages H3133–35, H3159–60**

Heck (NV) amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for the Urban Area Security Initiative by $22,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 156 ayes to 268 noes, Roll No. 196); **Pages H3136–37, H3160–61**

Garcia amendment that sought to increase funding, by offset, for U.S. Customs and Border Protection Salaries and Expenses for staffing at airports (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 197); **Pages H3139–40, H3161**

Deutch amendment that sought to strike the provision in the bill requiring that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2014 (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 198); **Pages H3142–46, H3162–66**

Murphy (FL) amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used for the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection Program; **Pages H3192–93**

Bishop (NY) amendment that sought to eliminate the National Bio- and Agro-defense facility and apply the $404,000,000 in savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 80 ayes to 345 noes, Roll No. 199); **Pages H3166–70, H3199–H3200**

Moran amendment that sought to amend section 533 of the bill to apply to detainees transferred to the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense, after December 31, 2005 (by a recorded vote of 165 ayes to 261 noes, Roll No. 200); **Pages H3170–78, H3200–01**

Garrett amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used by the Transportation Security Administration or a Visible Intermodal Protection and Response team to conduct a security screening other than pursuant to section 44901 of title 49, United States Code (by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 247 noes, Roll No. 201); **Pages H3178–79, H3201**

Ryan (OH) amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to issue visas to individuals for whom Brazil is the beneficiary's place of birth (by a recorded vote of 50 ayes to 373 noes with 1 answering "present", Roll No. 202); **Pages H3182–84, H3201–02**

Thompson (MS) amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2013) that sought to prohibit funds from being used by the Transportation Security Administration for the Behavior Detection Officer program (by a recorded vote of 146 ayes to 280 noes, Roll No. 205); and **Pages H3193–94, H3203–04**

Runyan amendment that sought to prohibit funds from being used to carry out the amendments made by section 100207 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 with respect to any property located in the State of New Jersey or the State of New York (by a recorded vote of 148 ayes to 278 noes, Roll No. 206). **Pages H3196–97, H3204–05**

Withdrawn:

Mica amendment (No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2013) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased, by offset, funding for the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing by $23,334,000. **Pages H3150–57**

Point of Order sustained against:

Section 563 of the bill. **Page H3175**

Proceedings Postponed:

Ben Ray Luján amendment that seeks to increase funding, by offset, for state and local programs within the Federal Emergency Management Agency for wildfire preparedness by $10,000,000; **Pages H3207–08**

King (IA) amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the "Morton Memos" described in the amendment; and **Pages H3208–12**

Blackburn amendment that seeks to prohibit funds from being used for any activity by Transportation Security Administration Transportation Security Officers outside an airport as defined in section 47102 of title 49, United States Code. **Pages H3213–14**

H. Res. 243, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2216) and (H.R. 2217), was agreed to yesterday, June 4th.

Oath of Office—Eighth Congressional District of Missouri: Representative-elect Jason Smith presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Julie A. Allen,

Director of Elections and Information Technology, Missouri Secretary of State's Office, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 4, 2013, the Honorable Jason Smith was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Missouri.

Page H3214

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Smith, the whole number of the House is 435.

Page H3162

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Page H3214

Quorum Calls—Votes: Thirteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3159, H3159–60, H3160–61, H3161, H3162–63, H3200, H3200–01, H3201, H3202, H3202–03, H3203, H3203–04, H3204–05. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:32 a.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2013.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies held a markup on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for FY 2014. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

Subcommittee on Defense held a markup on Defense Appropriations Bill for FY 2014. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 1960, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014".

REFORMING SGR: PRIORITIZING QUALITY IN A MODERNIZED PHYSICIAN PAYMENT SYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Reforming SGR: Prioritizing Quality in a Modernized Physician Payment System". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy began a markup on "Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013"; the "Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013"; the "Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013"; and the "Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013". The hearing will reconvene on Thursday, June 6, 2013.

EXAMINING THE MARKET POWER AND IMPACT OF PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled "Examining the Market Power and Impact of Proxy Advisory Firms". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CRISIS MISMANAGED: OBAMA'S FAILED SYRIA POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled "A Crisis Mismanaged: Obama's Failed Syria Policy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled "U.S. Relations with Vietnam". Testimony was heard from Joseph Y. Yun, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; and Daniel Baer, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing on H.R. 1493, the "Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2013". Testimony was heard from Thomas W. Easterly, Commissioner, Indiana Department of Environmental Management; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1947, the "Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

OPM'S REVOLVING FUND: A CYCLE OF GOVERNMENT WASTE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census held a hearing entitled "OPM's Revolving Fund: A Cycle of Government Waste?". Testimony was heard from Patrick E. McFarland, Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management; Charles D. Grimes III, Chief Operating Officer, Office of Personnel Management; and a public witness.

EXAMINING EPA'S ROLE IN THE RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy and Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a hearing entitled ''Up Against the Blend Wall: Examining EPA's Role in the Renewable Fuel Standard''. Testimony was heard from Christopher Grundler, Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL EFFORTS TO REDUCE THE IMPACTS OF WINDSTORMS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research; and Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing entitled ''Federal Efforts to Reduce the Impacts of Windstorms''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REDUCING DUPLICATION AND PROMOTING EFFICIENCY AT THE SBA: THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S VIEW

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Reducing Duplication and Promoting Efficiency at The SBA: The Inspector General's View''. Testimony was heard from Peggy Gustafson, Inspector General, Small Business Administration.

REVIEW OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHIEF'S REPORTS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''A Review of the United States Army Corps of Engineers Chief's Reports''. Testimony was heard from Major General Michael J. Walsh, Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

HOW SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTS THE BENEFITS OF THOSE WHO CANNOT PROTECT THEMSELVES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on How Social Security Protects the Benefits of Those Who Cannot Protect Themselves. Testimony was heard from Daniel Bertoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; LaTina Burse Greene, Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Retirement and Disability Policy, Social Security Administration; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Architect of the Capitol, Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms and the United States Capitol Police, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Justice, 10:45 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Labor, 10:45 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy, to hold hearings to examine the state of the American Dream, focusing on economic policy and the future of the middle class, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 534, to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 11 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to consider the nomination of Brian C. Deese, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine a progress report 3 years after the Deepwater Horizon disaster, focusing on Gulf restoration, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine programs and activities of the Department of the Interior, 9:15 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Michael Froman, of New York, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, 11 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine labor issues in Bangladesh, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 394, to prohibit and deter the theft of metal, and the nominations of Patricia E. Campbell-Smith, of the District of Columbia, and Elaine D. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Derek Anthony West, of California, to be Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, and Valerie E. Caproni, of the District of Columbia, and Vernon S. Broderick, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, 10 a.m., S–216, Capitol.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, continued markup on "Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act of 2013"; the "Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013"; the "Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013"; and the "Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013", 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet, hearing on H.R. 1123, the "Unlocking Consumer Choice and Wireless Competition Act", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 412, the "Nashua River Wild and Scenic River Study Act"; H.R. 585, the "Anchorage Land Conveyance Act of 2013"; H.R. 664, the "Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act"; H.R. 1495, the "Arizona Land Sovereignty Act"; H.R. 1497, the "War Memorial Protection Act"; H.R. 1513, to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes; H.R. 2166, the "Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act of 2013"; and H.R. 2192, to amend the Act popularly known as the Antiquities Act of 1906 to require certain procedures for designating national monuments, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 2231, the "Offshore Energy and Jobs Act", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Collected and Wasted: The IRS Spending Culture and Conference Abuses", 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight and Regulations, hearing entitled "Financing America's Small Businesses: Innovative Ideas for Raising Capital", 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Ongoing Intelligence Activities", 9 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9 a.m., Thursday, June 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, the Farm bill. At 10 a.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 954, followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1003, Student Loans, and a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 953, Student Loan Affordability Act.

The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to S. 954, the Farm bill is at 1 p.m., on Wednesday, June 5, 2013, and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill is at 9:45 a.m., on Thursday, June 6, 2013.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Thursday, June 6

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La.,E807
Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E804
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E805
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E805
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E810
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E804
Cicilline, David N., R.I., E800
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E805
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E800
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E799
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E806
Farr, Sam, Calif., E806
Gabbard, Tulsi, Hawaii, E799
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E807
Graves, Sam, Mo., E800, E801, E803, E804, E805, E806
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E800
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E801
Holt, Rush, N.J., E799
Keating, William R., Mass., E808
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E799, E800
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E807
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E809
Moran, James P., Va., E801
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E803
Polis, Jared, Colo., E801
Posey, Bill, Fla., E805
Shimkus, John, Ill., E803
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E804
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E808, E808, E808, E809, E809, E810, E810, E810
Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E806
Westmoreland, Lynn A., Ga., E804, E805
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E799, E802

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.