

shoulder the heavy burden of playing watchdog to this industry and that the creation of a self-sustaining system could be possible.

My legislation changes the current disclosure rule that previously prevented the Department of Justice from publishing the name and firm of anyone in violation of the Lobbying Disclosure Act. We will now know the names of the lobbyists who continue to file late or to file incorrect information. This change reminded me of a phrase I heard recently: "What you can't get through altruism, you must get through shame."

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS and the Judiciary Committee staff, who worked with me on this bill, as well as the majority leader for giving me the opportunity to speak to this bill this afternoon on the floor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill,

H.R. 5751, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force that will be responsible for investigating cases referred to the Attorney General under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5822, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1559 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1559

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5822) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 63, line 4. Points of order

against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, except as provided in section 2, no amendment shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

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

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of August 1, 2010, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 1559 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes the violation of section 426(a).

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

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Maine each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order today not because of unfunded mandates in the bill, although, there are probably some, but because it is about the only opportunity we have here in the minority to protest the

kind of treatment that these appropriation bills are getting in the Rules Committee and to protest the manner in which they are coming to the floor.

It used to be that it was a time-honored tradition in this House to have appropriation bills come to the floor under an open rule. Over the past couple of years, that has turned into a structured rule, so many Members in this body, in the minority and the majority, have not had this opportunity. Let's take last year, for example.

Every appropriation bill, all 12, came to the floor under structured rules. There were some Members on both sides of the aisle who offered multiple amendments throughout the year. That is the one chance they have to actually offer amendments on appropriation bills—the things that we are supposed to be doing here in Congress—and they weren't allowed to offer one. Many Members were denied the opportunity to offer any amendments.

□ 1420

There were some 1,500 amendments offered last year. Just 12 percent, fewer than 200, were made in order. And, in fact, I offered about 635 myself. I was only permitted to offer 50, after the structured rule took effect.

Now, the leadership on the majority side will often say, well, we have to keep order in this place, and people would simply offer dilatory amendments and take too long in the process. I remember times in years past, and I haven't been here that long, but just a couple of years ago where we would spend 2 or 3 or 4 days on one appropriation bill because that's what we do here. That's the important part of what we do. Yet, the majority can't seem to find time to allow all amendments to these bills.

Instead of allowing debate on amendments to appropriation bills, let me give you some idea of what we've been doing over the past couple of months and why the statement that we simply can't allow people to offer this many amendments would be proper because we don't have time. Well, here's what we've had time for. And let me note that each one of these that I mention, and this is just a fraction of these kind of suspension bills that we've dealt with, each one of these allows for 10 minutes of debate. That's as much time as we allow on any amendment coming before on the appropriation bill.

H.R. 1460, Recognizing the important role of pollinators. That one we dealt with just a month or so ago.

H.R. 1491, Congratulating the University of South Carolina, the Gamecocks, for winning the 2010 NCAA Division I College World Series.

H. Res. 1463, Supporting the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day.

Now, these things may be nice to do and nice to those who receive these kind of accolades, but it's not the important business of this House. And so to say that we don't have time to actually debate amendments to these appropriation bills, and the one that we

are dealing with today, many amendments that were submitted by Members were turned away, were not allowed in this structured role.

Another thing we dealt with, supporting the goals of National Dairy Month. Now, how in the world is that more important than allowing Members to strike funding from appropriation bills?

I need not remind this Chamber that 42 cents of every dollar we spend this year, 42 cents of every dollar we spend this year will be borrowed from our kids, from our grandkids, from whom-ever overseas who buys our bonds. And yet we can't allow time to let Members offer amendments to strike spending from these bills. We only allow a certain percentage of them.

Supporting the goals and ideals of American Craft Beer Week. That was H.R. 1297 that we dealt with in the last couple of months, the time that we usually designate in this body to deal with appropriation bills.

Congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks. That was H.R. 1439.

Supporting National Men's Health Week.

Recognizing June 8, 2010, as World Ocean Day.

As I mentioned, these might be good things to do, but when they're taking up time that the majority seems to say now we don't have time for appropriation bills, that's wrong.

And when they, in the Rules Committee, will say, sorry, the gentleman from Colorado or wherever else can't offer his amendment because we've taken too much time recognizing National Nurses Week or supporting the goals and ideals of National Learn to Fly Day or expressing support for the goals and ideals of Children's Book Week, recognizing the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the East Bay Regional Park District in California, I think you're getting the picture here.

It's a hollow statement to say that we don't have time to deal with these amendments on appropriation bills. The truth is the leadership simply doesn't want these things debated all that much.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I will explain why in a minute.

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

I appreciate the thoughts of my colleague from Arizona.

I would say that I wouldn't stand up here and criticize nurses, dairy farmers, small breweries, which I have many of in my State, or even the pollinators. I actually have a daughter who's a beekeeper, and I think we all recognize the importance of pollination.

But let me get serious here. Once again, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I think, are trying to block important legislation by using a procedural tactic. They want to prevent this rule and the underlying legislation

from going forward without any opportunity for debate, without an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on the legislation itself.

I think that's wrong. I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" so we can consider this legislation on its merits and not kill it with a procedural motion.

I say, let's not waste any more time on unrelated parliamentary measures. Those who oppose the bill can vote against it on final passage. We must consider this rule, and we must pass the bill today.

I have the right to close but, in the end, I will urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to consider the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the gentlelady.

The gentlelady says that I am criticizing pollinators or beer distillers or whomever. I'm not. I'm just saying the Congress doesn't need to congratulate everybody who wins a championship or everybody who distills beer. I mean, it's just nutty for us to spend so much time on these things and then say, I'm sorry, we don't have time for Members to offer amendments on appropriation bills to actually strike spending so that we're not borrowing 43 cents on every dollar that we spend this year.

Let me mention why it is that the leadership and the Appropriations Committee may not be so anxious for Members to debate these bills—because there are a lot of earmarks in them. This chart shows 11 of the 12 appropriation bills that have gone through either the subcommittee or committee. It looks like a hungry Pacman here, but what this shows in the red is the percentage of earmark dollars associated with powerful Members of Congress. That includes members of the Appropriations Committee, members of leadership, or chairmen of committees. That represents about 13 percent of this body.

Yet, when you look at the number of earmark dollars or percentage of earmark dollars, Homeland Security, that 13 percent is garnering 52 percent of the earmark dollars. CJS, 57 percent; Agriculture, 76 percent of the earmark dollars are going to just 13 percent of this body, the 13 percent that are writing the rules here and are deciding that certain amendments simply won't be offered. That is wrong. We shouldn't be doing that. TTHUD, which we'll be doing just tomorrow, 42 percent of the earmark dollars are going to just 13 percent of this body.

Is it any wonder that the leadership on the majority side does not want certain amendments debated here?

MILCON VA, 51 percent going to just 13 percent of this body. Energy and Water, 53 percent; Labor/HHS, 66 percent; Interior, 60; Defense, 55.

In Defense, we just learned today that an amendment has been submitted—I'm sorry, an earmark has been submitted, \$10 million for the John Murtha Center, our beloved Member who deceased just a few months

ago. We're going to earmark \$10 million to create a center in his honor in the Defense bill. I think that that ought to be debated here, but chances are we won't even get to the Defense bill.

It's unlikely we're going to get to very many of the appropriation bills this year, and the ones that we do will come to the floor under a structured rule where Members will not be allowed to offer amendments, or just a few of them on the ones that the majority chooses to hear. They can choose the ones they don't want to hear and choose the ones that they hear.

I would like to hear a response from the Rules Committee as to what reasoning goes behind which amendments will be allowed under what is traditionally an open rule and which ones will not.

And I would yield to the gentlelady if she would explain the rule or how the Rules Committee arrives at this rule.

I guess the gentlelady doesn't want to respond on this. I wouldn't either. I wouldn't want to try to justify closed rules or structured rules coming to this body on appropriation bills when we're spending more time doing things like recognizing the 50th anniversary of Title VI international education programs, recognizing the importance of manufactured and modular housing in the United States. These are all goods things. It doesn't mean we should spend time that could otherwise be debating appropriation bills, which is what we do here. We prioritize by funding. That's what Congress does. We have the power of the purse. And yet we're shortchanging that process so that we can support the goals and ideals of Student Financial Aid Awareness Month and raise awareness of student financial aid. Like I said, not a bad thing, but not something that should supplanting what we should be doing here.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would just plead with the Rules Committee and, more importantly, the leadership on the majority side to realize that the traditions of this body, the institutional things that we have here, open rules on appropriations, should be honored.

Now, I've come here for the past 10 years and offered a lot of amendments, many of which when we were in the majority. My own party didn't like these amendments, but they suffered through them because they knew that things matter here like tradition or upholding the institution.

□ 1430

So they allowed all amendments, some of which targeted Members of our own party. But the majority in power now doesn't seem to want that. They want to shield their Members from difficult votes and also shield those who are getting these earmarks from any scrutiny. These amendments aren't really scrutinized in the Appropriations Committee. So if they aren't argued and debated here, they simply aren't going to get a vetting.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, to the questions of my colleague from Arizona, I have to say you have far more experience in this body than I do. As you know, I'm a freshman Member. So I have only operated under the current process that we have today. I can't speak to what the process was like in the past.

I can say, as a member of the Rules Committee, a tremendous number of amendments come before our committee. And if all of them were allowed to come to the floor, and if this were an open rule, I'm sure there would be some advantages and some opportunities for greater debate.

On the other hand, on the issues that we're about to take up today, the essential issue of veterans benefits, which I'm going to look forward to speaking to in a few minutes, assuming that we vote down this current point of privilege, I am looking forward to the opportunity to move forward on taking better care of our veterans. And if we had a tremendous number of amendments before us today, I am not sure we would ever get there.

In fact, when I look at some of the information that I have before me, I am reminded that during the DOD appropriations bill in 2009, when I was sitting on the Rules Committee, we actually had 606 amendments come before us. Many of them were just there, I think everybody would agree on both sides of the aisle, many of them were just there to score political points. So do our constituents want us to take up our time today with listening to political back and forth taking up day after day with 606 amendments, or do they want us to get right to the heart of the matter, and that is to move forward on the issue of taking better care of our veterans?

And let me make one other point. You know, you've talked about earmarks, and you are very eloquent on the topic of earmarks; and I appreciate that. I think a lot of our constituents have great concerns about earmarks, how are they handed out, how does the budgeting process work here. But I do have to say as a freshman Member, I have taken great care to have a tremendous amount of transparency around the topic of earmarks.

We hold appropriations meetings in our district. We invite individuals with any kind of issue to come before us that they would like to see appropriated, whether it's a highway bridge, or whether it's a community center, or whether it's a particular project that might benefit anyone in our district, the university, or some system. We actually ask each person who comes before us with an earmark request to make a 3-minute video. Then we post it on our Web site. Then we ask our constituents, do you have opinions on this?

So while I understand much of the concerns about the earmark process, I have to say as one Member who I can't

say is in the top 13 percent of the highest recipients of earmarks, I still appreciate the process which allows me to take my constituents' wishes before the Appropriations Committee and say, you know, this would benefit my district, this would benefit my university, this would create more jobs. And I do it in a fully transparent manner. So I believe my constituents have the benefit of knowing all of the information around earmarking and doing the very best we can with making sure that process isn't handled in back rooms or in the dark of the night, but is actually a very transparent process.

So I appreciate the concerns that you have brought before us today. I look forward to moving forward on the debate on this rule so that we can move forward on what I think is a vital part of our appropriations process, that's taking care of our veterans.

So again, I want to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to consider so we can debate and pass this important legislation today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1559.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1559 provides for consideration of H.R. 5822, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2011, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the report. All points of order against the amendments except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI are waived.

The rule provides that for those amendments reported from the Com-

mittee of the Whole, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides that after consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate. Finally, the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 9 years our country has been engaged in two conflicts halfway around the world. The number of wounded military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan has put a financial strain on the Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA expects to treat more than 6.1 million patients in 2011, including more than 439,000 veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, the constant training, deployment, and redeployment of our troops have put a significant burden on our military.

H.R. 5822 appropriates funding for military construction, veterans programs, and four related agencies. Our troops have performed admirably wherever they have been deployed, and Congress has an obligation to provide the care and compensation to every eligible veteran. This bill also provides additional funding for the Guard and Reserves to address critical unfunded requirements as a result of prolonged and repeated deployments. In my home State of Maine, thousands of Guard and Reservists have made invaluable contributions to our national defense, and I am proud to see this funding included in the bill.

H.R. 5822 renews our commitment to redevelop closed military bases and their surrounding communities. The bill provides necessary funding to implement the 2005 BRAC and address the enormous backlog of environmental cleanup projects from previous BRAC rounds. This funding is essential to communities across the country, including the towns of Brunswick and Topsham in my district, which are already experiencing economic difficulties from the closing of Brunswick Naval Air Station. We must do everything we can to support the communities that the BRAC bases leave behind.

While the investments in military construction are vital, they are only a small portion of this bill. The vast majority of legislation is devoted to veterans' programs. The bill provides the necessary funding for veterans' medical care, claims processors, and facility improvements, including increased funding for mental health services, assistance programs for homeless veterans, and innovative services for veterans in rural areas.

The military construction projects in this bill are vital to ensure that the

missions of each installation are carried out in the most efficient manner possible. One great example is the funding contained in this bill for Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, Maine. The shipyard provides world-class overhaul, repair, and modernization of nuclear submarines. The yard has a reputation of delivering subs back to the fleet on time and under budget.

This fall, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will welcome the first Virginia-class submarine to Maine for an overhaul. This bill contains \$11.9 million to modernize the structural shops at the yard, which will improve the equipment layout and streamline process flow within the shipyard. It will help workers at the yard continue to do high quality work while increasing their efficiency. And this funding is essential to this mission. Increasing maintenance efficiencies and eliminating redundancies will no doubt make the yard more competitive for Navy sub projects in the future.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is an economic success story in Maine. The yard is in the middle of adding approximately 160 new jobs this year, jobs like painters, sheet metal workers, electricians, welders, and engineers. And the construction work that this bill will fund will be done by outside contractors, bringing even more jobs to the area. The funding in this bill will help this economic engine in southern Maine remain competitive and create new, good-paying jobs.

Finally, I am very proud of what this bill does for our Nation's veterans. Their service has earned them world-class health care and benefits, and Congress has a moral obligation to provide the best benefits possible.

□ 1440

This bill is an example of what happens when politics is put aside and veterans come first. I strongly support this rule which provides for consideration of this essential legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Maine, for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Each year Congress undertakes its duty to fund the government through what is commonly known as the appropriations process. The appropriations process usually begins with the consideration of a budget. The budget sets the parameters of congressional spending for the upcoming year, allowing the Appropriations Committee to begin assembling the 12 appropriations bills.

But for the first time since the Congressional Budget Act was passed in 1974, the House of Representatives has failed to even vote on a budget because of what some suspect may be an attempt by the majority to protect their Members from a vote that would increase what are already record budget deficits.

Yet the dysfunction does not end with the majority's abandonment of one of the most basic duties of governing. It continues today with the consideration of the first appropriations bill, the Fiscal Year 2010 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse. It says, "No money shall be drawn from the treasury but in consequence of the appropriations made by law; and a regular statement of account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The Congress' constitutional obligation under Article I, section 9, clause 7 has traditionally manifested itself in an open appropriations process. That process allows every Member of the House to propose any amendments—any amendments that are germane—to the 12 appropriations bills. That's the way it's been done, certainly since I've been here, and I know for decades and decades and generations before.

Yet, last year the majority decided to close down the deliberative process of the House on appropriations bills. I came to the floor to oppose that procedure last year, and I stated that I felt that the majority's decision to block debate on amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle was unnecessary and it was unfair, unjust. I thought it was a mistake. I said the majority would come to regret that mistake.

Today, on the very first appropriations bill of this year, the majority has once again decided to close down the appropriations process, and that's unfortunate. Last year we were told that the majority was taking this unprecedented step in order to move the appropriations bills to the Senate so that Congress could avoid an omnibus appropriations bill. What happened was just the opposite. Despite the fact that the Military Construction-VA bill did in fact pass both the House and the Senate, the Democratic leadership never allowed the bill to go to conference, and instead that MILCON-VA appropriations bill was wrapped up in an omnibus appropriations bill—contrary to the reasoning that had been given by the majority.

So what is this year's reason? I believe that it is so that the majority can again use a restrictive process on appropriations bills so the leadership, the majority leadership, has the ability to pick and choose which amendments the House will consider.

Although I strenuously disagree with the manner in which the majority leadership has decided to close the appropriations process once again, and in this case it has allowed only 14 out of 35 amendments, I do wish to congratulate my friends, Chairman CHET EDWARDS, Ranking Member ZACH WAMP and Mr. CRENSHAW for their bipartisan work on the underlying legislation that is undoubtedly very important.

We owe our military veterans and their families an extraordinary debt of gratitude for their service and their sacrifices as a people, not just as a Congress. I think we have to ensure that our veterans and their families, who bear sacrifices and hardships as well, receive all the benefits and assistance to which they are entitled and that they deserve.

The underlying legislation that has been agreed to, it has been drafted in a fair and bipartisan manner, provides crucial funding for military construction and for housing, for quality-of-life projects for our troops and their families.

The legislation includes a total of \$141.1 billion in both mandatory and discretionary funding for these agencies. Of this, approximately \$120 billion is dedicated to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The underlying legislation continues our commitment to the brave men and women who sacrifice so much to keep the Nation safe, supporting our servicemembers on base, deployed abroad, and to care for them when they come home.

The Pentagon recognized two important projects to south Florida, which were included in the President's budget and received funding in the underlying legislation. This legislation provides \$41 million to construct a permanent headquarters for Special Operations Command South. Currently Special Operations Command South is headquartered at Homestead Air Force Reserve Base. Headquarters personnel are supported by temporary, leased trailers. The trailers were not intended to support the headquarters mission beyond 3 years, and they require significant repairs for continued use.

The project in this legislation will consist of a command and control building with a secure compartmentalized information facility, sensitive items storage, standby generator, and general purpose administrative areas. It will include anti-terrorism measures to protect military personnel stationed there and will be able to withstand—and this is very important—a category 5 hurricane. And, Mr. Speaker, as you know in Homestead, we had a category 5 hurricane the year I was elected to Congress. Hopefully we won't see that again. But it's important that this facility be able to withstand such force.

I am pleased that this legislation also includes funding for construction of a new commissary to be located at the Southern Command Headquarters in Doral, in the congressional district that I am honored to represent. Construction of this commissary will greatly benefit the over 13,000 military personnel and retirees within 20 miles of SOUTHCOM and the thousands more beyond. It will greatly reduce the high cost of living in south Florida for these men and women, and it will improve their quality of life.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to

the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I especially want to thank Chairman EDWARDS and Ranking Member WAMP for providing the resources our Nation's veterans desperately need and for providing additional funding for FY2012. This advanced funding helps the VA avoid disruption of critical programs. We must take care of our brave men and women who serve this country, and this funding goes a long way to address many of their needs.

I also want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including report language on veterans' burial benefits. I am deeply concerned about the eroding value of the plot allowance and burial benefits provided to our Nation's veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Because the benefits are not indexed to inflation, their value continues to diminish with each passing year. As a result, families and State veterans' cemeteries have been left to cover the increasing costs.

In FY09, the subcommittee included my report language urging the VA to assess the viability of increasing the plot allowance and burial benefits to cover the same percentage of veterans' burial benefits that they covered in 1973, when they were first initiated. The Department of Veterans Affairs has still not yet heeded our recommendations. I'm glad the subcommittee recognizes the importance of the issue and has again included the burial benefits report language.

□ 1450

However, we need to move on this, and I think having it included once again is a step in reminding the VA that this is an important issue.

This Congress I have reintroduced the Veterans' Burial Benefits Improvement Act, H.R. 4045. This bill would increase the plot allowance from \$300 to \$745 for the burial costs of veterans who are buried in a State veterans' cemetery or a private cemetery; increase burial allowance benefits from \$2,000 to \$4,100 for veterans who die as a result of service-connected injuries and are buried in a national cemetery; increase the burial allowance from \$300 to \$1,270 for a veteran who wishes to be buried in a national veterans' cemetery and whose cause of death is not service-connected.

I urge my colleagues to become a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

I want to make it clear that I'm very much in favor of the underlying legislation, but this legislation is being

brought to us today under a rule that will restrict our Members, both Democrats and Republicans, from offering amendments, having them considered.

I thought I would give you a little perspective because this bill has come to us this day through the regular order, a very open and fair process. Sixteen hearings took place. All the members of the subcommittee had an opportunity to ask questions and feel like they were being treated fairly, listened to their input. At the subcommittee level, six amendments were offered: four by the minority, two by the majority. They were all adopted unanimously in a bipartisan way. Then we went to the full committee, the full Appropriations Committee. At that point, eight amendments were offered, discussed, and they were adopted as well, in a bipartisan way, four from the Democrats, four from the Republicans.

Yet, when we got to the Rules Committee, that's where the fair and open process ran into a roadblock, the graveyard, if you will, because now we come to the floor with no longer a process where Members can stand up, offer amendments, maybe make a good bill even better, because this rule does not allow that.

I would think that at this time, when deficits are at record levels, when spending is more important to be looked at with a wise and efficient look, that we would allow Members to come to the floor and offer their input, but no, that's not the case.

So while the underlying legislation is very important and very good, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and bring this back under an open rule and allow their participation.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, Mr. BUYER from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Thank you very much.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

When the majority went to this process to be restrictive here on the floor with regard to amendments on appropriations, that was really a dark day for liberty, and it's really very, very unfortunate. And I understand the Speaker wants to rule the House with a mighty hand and is utilizing the Rules Committee to make Congress an undemocratic institution. The American people are watching. They know that there's something going on in Washington, DC, that's not right. They don't completely understand all this process, but something they do know and understand and that's freedom and that's liberty.

So we're charged with this responsibility to care for those who wear the uniform who now have been injured not only in the workplace but also on the battlefield. But when it comes time then for us to have an open discussion and debate on how best to do that, free-

doms are denied. Pretty weird, pretty strange, very peculiar.

As the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I have three amendments that were made in order, but there are also two amendments that were not made in order. The first amendment that was not made in order would have transferred \$230 million from the information technology system account to fund improvements in various other programs. In 2010, the VA conducted a major review of its major IT initiatives. Of over 300 programs that were reviewed, about 100 are still active or are in planning and about 100 are still being reviewed and about the other hundred have been stopped permanently or have been paused.

This amendment would have taken the \$230 million in savings from this review and put \$120 million toward deficit reduction and use the remaining \$100 million to increase the following VA accounts: medical and prosthetic research by \$50 million to fund further research into new innovative treatments, such as the hyperbaric oxygen therapy for TBI; prosthetic devices for female amputees who often have difficulties with the fit and size of the traditional prosthesis tailored to the male physique; and helmets that measure the G-force impact and protect our servicemembers from these blast injuries.

Also, with regard to the VBA general operating account, increase it by \$2 million for VA to conduct an authorized longitudinal study for the VRE participants to assess the effectiveness of the program. Also, then increase the VHA medical services account by \$48 million; \$30 million to improve VA's suicide prevention programs, including \$100 million for the national broadcast suicide prevention advertising campaign; \$10 million for the VA to improve its services for homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children; and \$8 million for innovative treatments for TBI and mental health.

Does that sound radical? That was made not in order. It is hard. That was not made in order. And so, okay, why? I don't know. The Rules Committee didn't give me an answer. That should have been made in order. That's something that should have been discussed.

We have had a challenge here with regard to the IT systems at the VA, and I leave here in 6 months and the appropriators and the authorizers are going to have a real challenge here, especially as you go forward.

Now, fortunately once we centralize the IT architecture you've got a really good—Roger Baker as the chief information officer, very talented individual, doing assessments. The Secretary's Shinseki. He gets it, he understands it. He's doing this review. But when you take down projects, and we've got those moneys, we can make judgments and choices with regard to how to use some of those dollars, and that's what we sought to do here, and that amendment should, in fact, have

been made in order, and it's really unfortunate.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BUYER. There is another amendment, and I know, Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Chairman EDWARDS, had some concerns about one of the amendments that, in fact, was made in order, and I understand, and we can have a colloquy and we can get into that because I know you agree with what we're doing. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Chairman EDWARDS agrees with the initiatives in working with—I guess we can call them green initiatives, green management initiatives, but it's the renewable energy portfolio that's being done down at the VA.

And it's really this advance appropriation is making it hard on how we move moneys between accounts, at the same time, what type of amendments can be brought to the floor. I mean, I tried to do this a couple of years ago, and the parliamentarian knocked an amendment out. And so I wanted to raise this issue on the floor that we have about 60 projects out there, around \$162 million, and we've got to figure out how to best fund these, and I will get into that with the Speaker later.

My intention is not to offer that amendment that has been authorized to offer, and I will work this out with Chairman EDWARDS. But I'm going to ask to oppose the rule, even though I compliment the good work the committee has done. But we need an open process.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER from California.

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

□ 1500

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Miami for his very thoughtful remarks in his opening statement in which he talked about the greatness of this bill.

This is a bipartisan bill, as has been pointed out by Mr. CRENSHAW, as has been pointed out by Mr. BUYER. Democrats and Republicans alike have come together because, obviously, if we don't take care of our Nation's veterans, how are we going to incent our fellow Americans to join the armed services?

When commitments are made to them, they need to be kept. We all want to do everything we can for the brave men and women who have fought on behalf and served on behalf of the United States of America.

Obviously, I am here with a degree of sadness. I wasn't here for the exchange

that took place when our friend, Mr. FLAKE, was here, but I have been told that my good friend from North Haven, who is managing this rule for the majority, indicated that if we had had an open amendment process, we would be allowing partisan obstructionism or something along that line to take place.

Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting that we have made what I consider to be rather sad history in this place. My friend from North Haven is a new Member of this institution and has not once, in her 18 months as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, been able to witness or participate in a bill being debated under an open amendment process.

I have got to say that until it is tried, I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, until it's tried, I would think that the notion of passing judgment on the problems of an open rule should really not be brought forward.

I will tell you that it is clear that an open amendment process is messier and uglier and more difficult than having everything shut down, but that's really what the framers of our Constitution wanted. They wanted there to be a free-flowing discussion. I just listened to Mr. BUYER a few minutes ago talking about the green initiative, and he wanted to engage in a colloquy with Chairman EDWARDS about this.

The fact is, when we get into an open amendment process, which, by the way, was done for every single year up until last year for almost all appropriations bills—in fact, virtually every appropriations bill has begun under an open amendment process. Then, if a bipartisan consensus and agreement cannot be struck to bring about some kind of limitation of debate between the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, the Rules Committee has, on occasion, been called on. But the difficulty here for me to understand, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not even beginning with even a modicum of regular order.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I talked about William Natcher, who was a great Member of this institution and served for a period of time as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Two decades ago, when I joined the Rules Committee, I discussed the appropriations process with Chairman Natcher. He was probably best known—well, he was known for lots of accomplishments, probably best known as the only human being to go, for all the years that he served here, without missing a single vote. In fact, he gave me advice when I got here. He said, Make a speech in the well and miss a vote. This guy never missed a vote, and he was bound to that.

But one of the things that he was was a great institutionalist, and he understood what regular order consisted of. He believed that since appropriations bills are considered to be privileged resolutions, that those measures didn't have to go upstairs through the Rules

Committee. They, instead, could come directly to the House floor. By virtue of doing that, it would mean that legislating an appropriations bill could be stricken by a point of order that a Member would raise, but he believed that that was the best way to do that.

Well, we moved away from that, and he said he didn't think that it was a wise thing. But we moved to the point where the Rules Committee would say, gosh, if there are items in an appropriations bill that consisted of things like legislation, there was an agreement with the authorizing committee that the Rules Committee would protect those. It was understood and done pretty much with bipartisan consensus.

But then Democrats and Republicans, alike, would be able to, under that sacrosanct appropriations process, offer germane amendments to the appropriations bill. Now we have gotten to the point, again, and for the first time in the history of the Republic, of shutting down the appropriations process, limiting the opportunities for Members to offer amendments.

While this is a very, very, very good and a critically important bill which virtually all of us will support at the end of the day, it's not the right way to do it. Process is substance. The American people learned that very clearly when we had the 300-page amendment dropped on us up in the Rules Committee at 3 o'clock in the morning, that, in fact, said that we had just a few hours to look at that measure before it was to be debated on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just close by saying that it's very, very important for us to recognize that process is substance. The American people get that. They understand that we are preventing their voice, Democrat and Republican alike, from being heard in this appropriations process.

It is wrong, and I hope very much that as we move through the appropriations process this year we will get back through to regular order. I certainly hope that beginning next year, when a new appropriations process will begin, that we will have the kind of open amendment process that the American people expect and, through their elected representatives, deserve.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I appreciate the words of my colleague and far more experienced Member from California. Thank you very much.

I take your criticism that perhaps, although you didn't hear my words earlier today, that had I been here for the amount of time that you had or had the previous experience, I wouldn't have said exactly what I said about the political posturing that could go on under an open rule.

You are right, 18 months I have been here. I have never had any experience in this legislative body about the process of which of you speak. So, far be it from me to say what the differences were from then until today, but I will say a little bit about my own experience.

I have the good fortune of sitting on the Rules Committee, and perhaps some day, if I am here long enough, and I move my way up the chairs and I am the ranking member or the chair, I will want to advocate for doing things differently. But I only know the experience that I have had up to today, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee.

Now, I see frequent meetings of the Rules Committee. I see a tremendous number of amendments come before us. As my fellow members well know, Mr. Speaker, we often spend hours listening to potential amendments that could be heard here on the floor. I think this afternoon we will have the pleasure of joining the other members of the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and hearing 120 or more amendments to the next potential appropriation bill that could come to the floor.

I hear lively debate. I have been there to submit amendments. Sometimes they are accepted; sometimes they are not. I see amendments come to the floor that I agree with and I disagree with. So I see a lot of back-and-forth about the number of amendments. Perhaps it's not an open rule. You are right, I have never had the experience of an open rule here in this Chamber, but I have also had the experience of a tremendous number of amendments, some of which are politically motivated, some of which could take up a tremendous amount of our time, and I feel that generally the Rules Committee pares down the number of amendments to a reasonable number from each side, probably more for the majority than the minority, and I am sure that happened when the other party was in control, too.

But the fact is, I hear a lot of lively debate. I have only the experiences that I have had, and I can't defend what might have happened in the past or what may happen in the future.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield, very briefly?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to my friend that she is absolutely right, having this 18-month experience.

The fact is, if the Rules Committee were to follow regular order and report out open rules, the meetings upstairs would last a grand total of 5 minutes because we would have the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee come forward, say we have got this bill, we have an open amendment process, any Member can stand up on the House floor and offer a germane amendment to the measure. It is

considered under the 5-minute rule. We would end the meeting upstairs and we would allow the House to work its will, which is, again, what was done up until last year when we had this shut down for the first time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my friend for those words.

I happen to enjoy many of the meetings we have when we have the time consider both sides, the rules on both sides and the opportunities for what discussion will come to the floor. I appreciate being a member of the Rules Committee and being a part of that filtering process. I don't know if the process will change in the future, but I will say today we have a goodly number of amendments that will be considered on this.

From my perspective, the most important thing that we are doing today is moving forward on this rule, which I hope will pass with a great majority, and moving forward to the consideration of this bill which, I will remind my colleagues, holds a tremendous amount of benefit for our home communities and our veterans, and that is actually why we are here today.

I wouldn't want to see extensive consideration of so many amendments that we never got to the point of what people asked us to do. In this case, it's taking care of our veterans and making sure that they get the services that they deserve after they have served our country.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

□ 1510

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to this closed, or partially closed, rule.

Thirty-four amendments is not overwhelming. Back just a couple years ago, heck, we would have double or triple that many on an open rule. And it really saddens me to hear that if something will take time to debate or it's controversial, that we are not going to allow it on the floor anymore. Mr. Speaker, democracy isn't supposed to be easy; dictatorships are.

Now, I will rise in support of the underlying bill because I'm going to stand with our men and women in uniform, whether it's current or retired; those are our veterans.

This bill does a great deal of good for Offutt Air Force base, the Bellevue/Omaha area, for our veterans. One of the most significant is \$56 million for the design of a new VA inpatient hospital facility for that entire regional area. The current facility was built 60 years ago. It is dilapidated to the point where it is no longer even safe, let alone meets the appropriate standards. So I am proud that the VA has decided and agrees with the entire congressional delegation and the community that this inpatient facility must be replaced and we begin that process.

The second has been a vision of our veterans community. There is no national veterans cemetery within the area of eastern Nebraska, western Iowa, northwest Missouri. The previous administration realized that the rule that was applied needed to be changed, and that was under Secretary Peake, and continued under the current administration—and I want to thank General Shinseki and this administration for following through—in rightfully determining that the service area for a veterans cemetery was actually 112,000 veterans that could be served. By doing that, that shot the eastern Nebraska, Omaha area to the top of the list. And so inside this bill is the appropriation to start the design and purchase of land of a new national veterans cemetery in the Omaha/Bellevue area. That has been a labor of love that started with a small group of veterans in my office just a few years ago, and now I get to see it come to reality.

The last is specific to Offutt Air Force Base. It makes a reference in the MILCON provisions that the new STRATCOM headquarters will begin construction in 2012 and that the costs need to be borne throughout all of the branches and the DOD. This is important for the community and the psyche of the Offutt Air Force Base community.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. TERRY. I want to point out, in conclusion, that these are based on the merits of the project—the need for the hospital, the veterans cemetery, and the need for the headquarters. These aren't earmarks; these are things that are determined by merit by the VA and the Department of Defense. And I want to go on record as the Representative of this area in complete support of this bill and those projects.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

My amendment that was proposed to the Rules Committee is one of those that's been denied under this very closed rule.

This appropriation bill does much to honor our Nation's commitment to veterans who have sacrificed for our freedoms, but I'm concerned that our own government is unfairly taking away freedom from those veterans.

Many Americans should be shocked to learn that an outrageous Department of Veterans Affairs process is arbitrarily stripping the Second Amendment rights of veterans and their families who simply receive assistance managing their financial affairs. I offered an amendment to reform the VA practice that wrongly denies gun ownership rights to veterans. Despite the

support for this change by a number of veterans organizations, like the American Legion, as well as the National Rifle Association, I am disappointed that the majority did not allow my amendment to go forward and be heard and offered on the floor today.

Federal law prohibits certain individuals from possessing firearms because they pose a danger to society or themselves, such as convicted felons, illegal aliens, and those who are adjudicated mentally ill. The Brady Act requires the FBI to maintain a database of these individuals called the National Instant Criminal Background Check System which prevents them from purchasing firearms.

Over the past 10 years, the VA has sent names of over 100,000 veterans, their spouses, and their children to the FBI, not because they pose any danger, but simply because the VA determined they could not handle their VA benefits. The VA appoints fiduciaries to help veterans who, for example, have a credit problem or who cannot manage their financial affairs due to health reasons.

The VA's review process for assigning a fiduciary only examines a veteran's financial responsibility and does not look at whether the veteran is a danger to himself or others. But when veterans are appointed fiduciaries, the VA automatically deems them as "mentally defective" and forwards their names to the FBI. Without so much as a hearing, these veterans are then prohibited by law from purchasing firearms. By comparison, the Social Security Administration has assisted over 5 million beneficiaries with their finances, but the Social Security Administration does not send those names to the FBI.

It is wrong to take away any veteran's constitutional right to keep and bear arms simply because they cannot manage their financial affairs. My amendment would have ended this unjust practice. The amendment would have required that before the VA can forward the veteran's name to the FBI, an appropriate judicial authority must rule that the veteran poses a danger to himself or to others should he own a firearm.

I am disappointed my amendment was denied, and as a result veterans will continue to be denied their due process and constitutional rights. I encourage my colleagues to support legislation that I and the gentleman from Texas have introduced called the Veterans Second Amendment Protection Act, H.R. 2547, to correct this wrong and restore gun rights to our country's veterans.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to a brilliant new Member of this House from Hawaii (Mr. DJOU).

Mr. DJOU. I thank my colleague from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my disappointment that my amendment was not allowed to be submitted to this body. I specifically wanted to highlight my amendment, which was asking to restore funding for the relocation of American forces away from Okinawa to Guam, as requested by President Obama. I think it is a major mistake that this body is not going to support the President's request for the relocation of American forces.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and a Member who represents a large portion of the Pacific fleet in Hawaii, I support restoring funds for construction to further the realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa to Guam in H.R. 5822. The committee reduced the appropriation request submitted by the President by 50 percent.

The Guam realignment will be one of the largest moves of military forces in decades. The postponement of construction of necessary military facilities and infrastructure will cause unnecessary delay and threaten our geopolitical positioning in the Asia-Pacific region.

My amendment was also completely offset by reallocating funds from military construction requests that were put above what President Obama had asked for. Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to highlight to this body that right now, as all of us talk, 2 days ago, the United States Armed Forces began the largest war game operations in the Korean peninsula in the Yellow Sea since the end of the Cold War. The reason we entered these war game operations is because of the instability that continues to unfortunately exist in East Asia and the Korean peninsula.

By failing to support the President in allocating sufficient funding to establish new force location in Guam, over the short term we might be okay; but over the long term, this is a major geopolitical mistake that this Congress is making. I hope that Congress reconsiders and I hope the Senate re-examines this. I am disappointed I was unable to offer this amendment on this very important and serious matter.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this rule is a vital step towards improving our military infrastructure and ensuring that the quality of care for our veterans and their families is worthy of their sacrifice.

My home State has one of the highest populations of veterans per capita in the country. In a State of 1.3 million people, Maine is home to over 155,000 veterans.

□ 1520

These men and women have served without question, without politics and without hesitation. We must make a

promise to them and to all of our veterans that we will do the same. We must provide them with the health care and the benefits that they deserve—without question, without politics, and without hesitation. By passing H.R. 5822, we will begin to keep that promise.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1559 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to:

H.R. 4692, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1543, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 5827, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 178, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—243

Ackerman	Dahlkemper	Holden
Adler (NJ)	Davis (AL)	Holt
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Honda
Arcuri	Davis (IL)	Hoyer
Baca	Davis (TN)	Inslee
Baird	DeFazio	Israel
Baldwin	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Barrow	Delahunt	Jackson Lee
Bean	DeLauro	(TX)
Becerra	Deuth	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Dingell	Kagen
Berry	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Driehaus	Killdeer
Bocciardi	Edwards (MD)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boren	Edwards (TX)	Kilroy
Boswell	Ellison	Kind
Boucher	Engel	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kissell
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Klein (FL)
Braley (IA)	Farr	Kosmas
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kucinich
Butterfield	Filner	Langevin
Capps	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Cardoza	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Carnahan	Garamendi	Levin
Carney	Giffords	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Loeb sack
Castor (FL)	Gordon (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Grayson	Lowey
Childers	Green, Al	Lujan
Chu	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clarke	Grijalva	Maffei
Clay	Gutierrez	Maloney
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Markey (CO)
Clyburn	Halvorson	Markey (MA)
Cohen	Hare	Marshall
Connolly (VA)	Harman	Matheson
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Cooper	Heinrich	McCarthy (NY)
Costa	Higgins	McCollum
Costello	Hill	McDermott
Courtney	Himes	McGovern
Critz	Hinchey	McIntyre
Crowley	Hinojosa	McMahon
Cuellar	Hirono	McNerney
Cummings	Hodes	Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY) Price (NC) Smith (WA)
 Melancon Quigley Snyder
 Michaud Rahall Space
 Miller (NC) Rangel Speier
 Miller, George Reyes Spratt
 Molloyhan Richardson Stark
 Moore (KS) Rodriguez Stupak
 Moore (WI) Ross Sutton
 Moran (VA) Rothman (NJ) Tanner
 Murphy (CT) Roybal-Allard Taylor
 Murphy (NY) Ruppersberger Teague
 Murphy, Patrick Rush Thompson (CA)
 Nadler (NY) Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)
 Napolitano Salazar Tierney
 Neal (MA) Sánchez, Linda Titus
 Nye T. Tonko
 Oberstar Sanchez, Loretta Towns
 Obey Sarbanes Tsongas
 Olver Schakowsky Van Hollen
 Ortiz Schauer Velázquez
 Owens Schiff Visclosky
 Pallone Schrader Walz
 Pascrell Schwartz Wasserman
 Pastor (AZ) Scott (GA) Schultz
 Payne Scott (VA) Waters
 Perlmutter Serrano Watt
 Perriello Sestak Waxman
 Peters Shea-Porter Weiner
 Peterson Sherman Welch
 Pingree (ME) Sires Wilson (OH)
 Polis (CO) Skelton Wu
 Pomeroy Slaughter Yarmuth

NAYS—178

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

NOT VOTING—11

Akin Lewis (GA) Watson
 Andrews Smith (TX) Woolsey
 Fallin Tiahrt Young (FL)
 Hoekstra Wamp

□ 1550

Messrs. MCCLINTOCK, GERLACH, and POSEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MANUFACTURING STRATEGY ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4692) to require the President to prepare a quadrennial National Manufacturing Strategy, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 38, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

YEAS—379

Ackerman Calvert Diaz-Balart, M.
 Aderholt Camp Dicks
 Adler (NJ) Cantor Dingell
 Alexander Cao Doggett
 Altmiere Capito Donnelly (IN)
 Arcuri Capps Doyle
 Austria Capuano Dreier
 Baca Cardoza Driehaus
 Bachus Carnahan Duncan
 Baird Carney Edwards (MD)
 Baldwin Carson (IN) Edwards (TX)
 Barrow Cassidy Ehlers
 Barton (TX) Castle Ellison
 Bean Castor (FL) Ellsworth
 Becerra Chandler Emerson
 Berkley Childers Engel
 Berman Chu Eshoo
 Berry Clarke Etheridge
 Biggert Clay Farr
 Bilbray Cleaver Fattah
 Bilirakis Clyburn Filner
 Bishop (GA) Coble Fleming
 Bishop (UT) Coffman (CO) Forbes
 Blackburn Cohen Fortenberry
 Blumenauer Cole Foster
 Blunt Connolly (VA) Foxx
 Boccieri Conyers Frank (MA)
 Boehner Cooper Frelinghuysen
 Bonner Costa Fudge
 Bono Mack Courtney Gallegly
 Boozman Crenshaw Garamendi
 Boren Critz Garrett (NJ)
 Boswell Crowley Gerlach
 Boucher Cuellar Giffords
 Boustany Cummings Gingrey (GA)
 Boyd Dahlkemper Gonzalez
 Brady (PA) Davis (AL) Goodlatte
 Brady (TX) Davis (CA) Granger
 Braley (IA) Davis (IL) Graves (MO)
 Bright Davis (KY) Grayson
 Brown (SC) Davis (TN) Green, Al
 Brown, Corrine DeFazio Green, Gene
 Brown-Waite, DeGette Griffith
 Ginny Delahunt Grijalva
 Buchanan DeLauro Guthrie
 Burgess Dent Gutierrez
 Butterfield Deutch Hall (NY)
 Buyer Diaz-Balart, L. Hall (TX)

Halvorson Marshall
 Hare Matheson
 Harman Matsui
 Harper McCarthy (CA)
 Hastings (FL) McCarthy (NY)
 Hastings (WA) McCaul
 Heinrich McCollum
 Heller McCotter
 Herseth Sandlin McDermott
 Higgins McGovern
 Hill McHenry
 Himes McIntyre
 Hinchey McKeon
 Hinojosa McMahan
 Hirono McMorris
 Hodes Rodgers
 Holden McNeerney
 Holt Meek (FL)
 Honda Meeks (NY)
 Hoyer Melancon
 Hunter Mica
 Inslee Michaud
 Israel Miller (MI)
 Issa Miller (NC)
 Jackson (IL) Miller, Gary
 Jackson Lee Miller, George
 (TX) Minnick
 Jenkins Mitchell
 Johnson (GA) Mollohan
 Johnson (IL) Moore (KS)
 Johnson, E. B. Moran (KS)
 Johnson, Sam Moran (VA)
 Jones Murphy (CT)
 Jordan (OH) Murphy (NY)
 Kagen Murphy, Patrick
 Kanjorski Murphy, Tim
 Kaptur Nadler (NY)
 Kennedy Napolitano
 Kildee Neal (MA)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Nye
 Kilroy Oberstar
 Kind Obey
 King (NY) Olson
 Kirk Oliver
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Ortiz
 Kissell Owens
 Klein (FL) Pallone
 Kline (MN) Pascrell
 Kosmas Pastor (AZ)
 Kratochvil Paulsen
 Kucinich Payne
 Lamborn Perlmutter
 Lance Perriello
 Langevin Peters
 Larsen (WA) Peterson
 Larson (CT) Petri
 Latham Pingree (ME)
 LaTourette Pitts
 Latta Platts
 Lee (CA) Polis (CO)
 Lee (NY) Pomeroy
 Levin Posey
 Lewis (CA) Price (NC)
 Lipinski Putnam
 LoBiondo Quigley
 Loeb sack Radanovich
 Lofgren, Zoe Rahall
 Lowey Rangel
 Lucas Rehberg
 Luetkemeyer Reichert
 Luján Reyes
 Lummis Richardson
 Lungren, Daniel Rodriguez
 E. Roe (TN)
 Lynch Rogers (AL)
 Maffei Rogers (KY)
 Maloney Rogers (MI)
 Manzullo Ros-Lehtinen
 Marchant Roskam
 Markey (CO) Ross
 Markey (MA) Rothman (NJ)

NAYS—38

Bachmann Graves (GA)
 Barrett (SC) Hensarling
 Bartlett Herger
 Broun (GA) Inglis
 Burton (IN) King (IA)
 Campbell Kingston
 Carter Linder
 Chaffetz Mack
 Conaway McClintock
 Djou Miller (FL)
 Flake Myrick
 Franks (AZ) Nunes
 Gohmert Paul

Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Teague
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Peters
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walzen
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yarmuth
 Pence
 Poe (TX)
 Price (GA)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Royce
 Shadegg
 Smith (NE)
 Stearns
 Thornberry
 Westmoreland
 Young (AK)