

NOES—266

Ackerman Gingrey (GA) Palazzo
 Adams Gohmert Paul
 Aderholt Goodlatte Pearce
 Akin Gosar Pence
 Alexander Gowdy Peterson
 Altmire Granger Petri
 Amash Graves (GA) Pitts
 Austria Graves (MO) Platts
 Bachmann Green, Gene Poe (TX)
 Bachus Griffin (AR) Pompeo
 Barletta Griffith (VA) Posey
 Barrow Grimm Price (GA)
 Bartlett Guthrie Price (NC)
 Barton (TX) Hall Quayle
 Bass (NH) Hanna Rahall
 Benishkek Harper Rangel
 Berg Harris Reed
 Biggert Hartzler Rehberg
 Bilbray Hastings (WA) Reichert
 Bilirakis Hayworth Renacci
 Bishop (UT) Heck Ribble
 Black Hensarling Rivera
 Blackburn Herger Roby
 Bonner Herrera Beutler Rogers (AL)
 Boren Hochul Rogers (KY)
 Boustany Holden Rogers (MI)
 Brady (TX) Huelskamp Rohrabacher
 Brooks Huizenga (MI) Rokita
 Brown (GA) Hultgren Rooney
 Buchanan Hunter Ros-Lehtinen
 Bucshon Hurt Roskam
 Buerkle Issa Ross (AR)
 Burgess Jenkins Ross (FL)
 Burton (IN) Johnson (OH) Rothman (NJ)
 Calvert Johnson, Sam Royce
 Camp Jones Runyan
 Campbell Jordan Ruppertsberger
 Canseco Kelly Ryan (WI)
 Cantor King (IA) Sanchez, Loretta
 Capito King (NY) Scalise
 Cardoza Kingston Schiff
 Carney Kinzinger (IL) Schilling
 Carter Kline Schmidt
 Cassidy Labrador Schmitt
 Chabot Lamborn Schock
 Chaffetz Lance Schweikert
 Clyburn Landry Scott (SC)
 Coble Lankford Scott, Austin
 Coffman (CO) LaTourette Sensenbrenner
 Cole Latta Sessions
 Conaway Lewis (CA) Shimkus
 Cooper LoBiondo Shuler
 Costa Long Shuster
 Costello Lowey Simpson
 Cravaack Lucas Smith (NE)
 Crawford Luetkemeyer Smith (NJ)
 Crenshaw Lummis Smith (TX)
 Critz Lungren, Daniel Smith (WA)
 Cuellar E. Southerland
 Davis (KY) Manzullo Speier
 Denham Marchant Stearns
 Dent Marino Stivers
 DesJarlais Matheson Stutzman
 Diaz-Balart Matsui Sullivan
 Dicks McCarthy (CA) Terry
 Dold McCaul Thompson (CA)
 Donnelly (IN) McClintock Thompson (PA)
 Dreier McCollum Thornberry
 Duffy McCotter Tiberi
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Tipton
 Duncan (TN) McKeon Turner
 Ellmers McKinley Upton
 Emerson McMorris Velázquez
 Eshoo Rodgers Visclosky
 Farenthold Meehan Walden
 Fincher Mica Walberg
 Fitzpatrick Miller (FL) Walden
 Flake Miller (MI) Walsh (IL)
 Fleischmann Miller (NC) Walz (MN)
 Fleming Miller, Gary Webster
 Flores Mulvaney West
 Fortenberry Murphy (PA) Westmoreland
 Foxx Myrick Whitfield
 Franks (AZ) Neugebauer Wilson (SC)
 Frelinghuysen Noem Wolf
 Gallegly Nugent Womack
 Gardner Nunes Garamendi
 Garrett Nunnelee Chu
 Gerlach Olson Yoder
 Gibbs Owens Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer Hinchey Towns
 Bono Mack Keating Watt
 Culberson Mack Young (AK)
 Giffords McIntyre
 Quintera Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1909

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, on July 6, 2011, I missed 3 recorded votes because my return flight from Tennessee to Washington was significantly delayed.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on recorded vote numbers 495, 496, and 497.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 167, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—253

Ackerman Costello Gutierrez
 Altmire Courtney Hanabusa
 Amash Critz Hanna
 Andrews Crowley Harris
 Baca Cuellar Hartzler
 Bachmann Cummings Hastings (FL)
 Baldwin Davis (CA) Heck
 Barrow Davis (IL) Heinrich
 Bass (CA) DeFazio Herrera Beutler
 Becerra DeGette Higgins
 Berkeley DeLauro Himes
 Berman Dent Hinchey
 Bilirakis Deutch Hinojosa
 Bishop (NY) Dicks Hirono
 Boren Dingell Hochul
 Boswell Doggett Holden
 Brady (PA) Donnelly (IN) Holt
 Braley (IA) Doyle Honda
 Brown (FL) Duffy Hoyer
 Burgess Edwards Huelskamp
 Burton (IN) Ellison Hurt
 Butterfield Engel Inslee
 Calvert Eshoo Israel
 Camp Farr Jackson (IL)
 Capps Fattah Jackson Lee
 Capuano Filner (TX)
 Cardoza Fincher Johnson (GA)
 Carnahan Fitzpatrick Johnson (IL)
 Carney Fortenberry Johnson (OH)
 Carson (IN) Frank (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Castor (FL) Fudge Jones
 Chabot Gallegly Kaptur
 Chandler Kildee Kildee
 Chu Gardner Kind
 Cicilline Gibson Kinzinger (IL)
 Clarke (MI) Gonzalez Kissell
 Clarke (NY) Goodlatte Kucinich
 Clay Labrador Langevin
 Cleaver Green, Al Larsen (WA)
 Clyburn Green, Gene Griffith (VA)
 Coble Grijalva Larson (CT)
 Cohen Grijalva Latham
 Connolly (VA) Grimm Lee (CA)
 Conyers Guthrie Lee (CA)

Levin Pascrell Scott, David
 Lewis (CA) Pastor (AZ) Sensenbrenner
 Lewis (GA) Paul Serrano
 Lipinski Paulsen Sessions
 LoBiondo Payne Sewell
 Loeb sack Pelosi Sherman
 Lofgren, Zoe Perlmutter Sires
 Lowey Peters Slaughter
 Lujan Peterson Smith (NJ)
 Lummis Petri Smith (WA)
 Lungren, Daniel Pingree (ME) Southerland
 E. Poe (TX) Speier
 Lynch Polis Stark
 Maloney Price (GA) Stearns
 Manzullo Price (NC) Sutton
 Markey Quigley Terry
 Matheson Rahall Thompson (CA)
 Matsui Rangel Thompson (MS)
 McCarthy (NY) Reichert Tierney
 McCollum Renacci Tipton
 McDermott Reyes Tonko
 McGovern Richardson Tsongas
 McMorris Richmond Turner
 Rodgers Roe (TN) Upton
 McNeerney Van Hollen
 Meehan Meehan Ross (AR) Velázquez
 Meeks Meeks Rothman (NJ) Visclosky
 Michaud Michaud Roybal-Allard Walden
 Miller (MI) Miller (MI) Runyan Walz (MN)
 Miller (NC) Miller (NC) Ruppertsberger Wasserman
 Miller, George Rush Schultz
 Moore Ryan (OH) Waters
 Moran Sanchez, Linda Waxman
 Mulvaney T. Welch
 Murphy (CT) Sanchez, Loretta West
 Nadler Sarbanes Westmoreland
 Napolitano Schakowsky Wilson (FL)
 Neal Schiff Wilson (SC)
 Olver Schilling Woodall
 Owens Schrader Woolsey
 Palazzo Schwartz Wu
 Pallone Scott (VA) Yarmuth

NOES—167

Adams Fleming Murphy (PA)
 Aderholt Flores Myrick
 Akin Forbes Neugebauer
 Alexander Foxx Noem
 Austria Franks (AZ) Nugent
 Bachus Frelinghuysen Nunes
 Barletta Garrett Nunnelee
 Bartlett Gerlach Olson
 Barton (TX) Gibbs Pearce
 Bass (NH) Gingrey (GA) Pence
 Benishkek Gohmert Pitts
 Berg Gowdy Platts
 Biggert Granger Pompeo
 Bilbray Graves (GA) Posey
 Bishop (GA) Graves (MO) Quayle
 Bishop (UT) Griffin (AR) Reed
 Black Hall Rehberg
 Blackburn Harper Hastings (WA)
 Bonner Bonner Riggle
 Boustany Boustany Hayworth
 Brady (TX) Brady (TX) Hensarling
 Brooks Brooks Herger
 Brown (GA) Brown (GA) Huizenga (MI)
 Buchanan Buchanan Hultgren
 Bucshon Bucshon Hunter
 Buerkle Buerkle Issa
 Campbell Campbell Jenkins
 Canseco Canseco Johnson, Sam
 Cantor Cantor Jordan
 Capito Capito Kelly
 Carter Carter King (IA)
 Cassidy Cassidy King (NY)
 Chaffetz Chaffetz Kingston
 Coffman (CO) Coffman (CO) Kline
 Cole Cole Lamborn
 Conaway Conaway Landry
 Cooper Cooper Lankford
 Costa Costa LaTourette
 Cravaack Cravaack Latta
 Crawford Crawford Long
 Crenshaw Crenshaw Lucas
 Critz Critz Luetkemeyer
 Cuellar Cuellar Marchant
 Davis (KY) Davis (KY) Marino
 Denham Denham McCarthy (CA)
 Dent Dent Stivers
 DesJarlais DesJarlais Stutzman
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart Sullivan
 Dicks Dicks Thompson (PA)
 Dold Dold McCotter
 Donnelly (IN) Donnelly (IN) McHenry
 Dreier Dreier McKeon
 Duffy Duffy Tiberi
 Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC) Turner
 Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN) Upton
 Ellmers Ellmers Velázquez
 Emerson Emerson Visclosky
 Eshoo Eshoo Walden
 Farenthold Farenthold Walberg
 Fincher Fincher Walden
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick Walsh (IL)
 Flake Flake Walz (MN)
 Fleischmann Fleischmann Webster
 Fleming Fleming West
 Flores Flores Westmoreland
 Fortenberry Fortenberry Whitfield
 Foxx Foxx Wilson (SC)
 Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) Wolf
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen Womack
 Gallegly Gallegly Nunes
 Gardner Gardner Nunnelee
 Garrett Garrett Smith (TX)
 Gerlach Gerlach Stivers
 Gibbs Gibbs Stutzman
 Hinchey Hinchey Sullivan
 Keating Keating Thompson (PA)
 Mack Mack Thornberry
 McIntyre McIntyre Tiberi
 Roe (TN) Roe (TN) Walsh (IL)
 Young (AK) Young (AK) Webster
 Young (FL) Young (FL) Whitfield

Wittman Young (FL)
Wolf Yoder Young (IN)

Blumenauer Guinta Towns
Bono Mack Keating Watt
Culberson Mack Young (AK)
Giffords McIntyre

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1914

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS NO. 21 AND 22 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment Nos. 21 and 22, to the end that they stand disposed of by the voice votes thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate each amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection?

Without objection, the requests for a recorded vote are withdrawn and amendment Nos. 21 and 22 stand as not adopted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 322, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—98

Amash Duncan (TN) Jones
Baldwin Edwards Kind
Bass (CA) Ellison Kucinich
Becerra Eshoo Labrador
Benishek Farr Lee (CA)
Boswell Filner Lewis (GA)
Braley (IA) Frank (MA) Loeb sack
Campbell Fudge Lofgren, Zoe
Capps Gibson Lummis
Capuano Graves (GA) Lynch
Carson (IN) Green, Gene Maloney
Chu Griffith (VA) Markey
Clarke (NY) Grijalva Matsui
Cohen Gutierrez McDermott
Conyers Harris McGovern
Crowley Higgins Michaud
Cummings Hirono Miller, George
DeFazio Mulvaney
DeGette Honda Nadler
Deutch Inslee Napolitano
Doyle Jackson (IL) Neal
Duffy Johnson, E. B. Oliver

Pallone Roybal-Allard Tierney
Paul Ryan (OH) Tonko
Payne Sarbanes Tsongas
Pelosi Schakowsky Velázquez
Peters Schrader Waters
Petri Sensenbrenner Waxman
Pingree (ME) Serrano Welch
Polis Slaughter Wilson (FL)
Quigley Speier Woolsey
Rahall Stark Yarmuth
Reed Thompson (CA)

NOES—322

Ackerman Donnelly (IN) Larson (CT)
Adams Dreier Latham
Aderholt Duncan (SC) LaTourette
Akin Ellmers Latta
Alexander Emerson Levin
Altmire Engel Lewis (CA)
Andrews Farenthold Lipinski
Austria Patah LoBiondo
Baca Fincher Long
Bachmann Fitzpatrick Lowey
Bachus Flake Lucas
Barletta Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
Barrow Fleming Luján
Bartlett Flores Lungren, Daniel
Barton (TX) Forbes E.
Bass (NH) Fortenberry Manzuolo
Berg Foss Marchant
Berkley Franks (AZ) Marino
Berman Frelinghuysen Matheson
Biggert Gallegly McCarthy (CA)
Biliray Garamendi McCarthy (NY)
Bilirakis Gardner McCaul
Bishop (GA) Garrett McClintock
Bishop (NY) Gerlach McCollum
Bishop (UT) Gibbs McCotter
Black Gingrey (GA) McHenry
Blackburn Gohmert McKeon
Bonner Gonzalez McKinley
Boren Goodlatte McMorris
Boustany Gosar Rodgers
Brady (PA) Gowdy McNerney
Brady (TX) Granger Meehan
Brooks Graves (MO) Meeks
Broun (GA) Green, Al Mica
Brown (FL) Griffin (AR) Miller (FL)
Buchanan Grimm Miller (MI)
Bucshon Guthrie Miller (NC)
Buerkle Hall Miller, Gary
Burgess Hanabusa Moore
Burton (IN) Hanna Moran
Butterfield Harper Murphy (CT)
Calvert Hartzler Murphy (PA)
Camp Hastings (FL) Myrick
Canseco Hastings (WA) Neugebauer
Cantor Hayworth Noem
Capito Heck Nugent
Cardoza Heinrich Nunes
Carnahan Hensarling Nunnelee
Carney Herger Olson
Carter Herrera Beutler Owens
Cassidy Himes Palazzo
Castor (FL) Hinchey Pascrell
Chabot Hinojosa Pastor (AZ)
Chaffetz Hochul Paulsen
Chandler Holden Pearce
Cicilline Hoyer Pence
Clarke (MI) Huelskamp Perlmutter
Coble Huizenga (MI) Peterson
Coffman (CO) Issa Price (GA)
Cole Conaway Connolly (VA) Price (NC)
Conaway Cooper Jenkins Quayle
Connolly (VA) Costa Johnson (GA) Rangel
Cooper Jenkins Johnson (IL) Rehberg
Costello Johnson (OH) Reichert
Courtney Johnson, Sam Renacci
Cravaack Jordan Reyes
Crawford Kaptur Ribble
Crenshaw Kellie Richardson
Crittzel Cuellar Richmond
Davis (CA) King (IA) Rigell
Davis (IL) King (NY) Rivera
Davis (KY) Kingston Roby
DeLauro Kinzinger (IL) Roe (TN)
Dent Kissell Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais Kline Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart Lamborn Rogers (MI)
Dicks Landry Rohrabacher
Dingell Landry Rokita
Doggett Landrevin Rooney
Dold Lankford Ros-Lehtinen
Larsen (WA) Roskam

Ross (AR) Sewell Turner
Ross (FL) Sherman Upton
Rothman (NJ) Shimkus Van Hollen
Royce Shuler Visclosky
Runyan Shuster Walberg
Ruppersberger Simpson Walden
Rush Sires Walsh (IL)
Ryan (WI) Smith (NE) Walz (MN)
Sánchez, Linda Smith (NJ) Wasserman
T. Smith (TX) Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta Smith (WA) Webster
Scalise Southerland West
Schiff Stearns Westmoreland
Schilling Stivers Whitfield
Schmidt Stutzman Wilson (SC)
Schock Sullivan Wittman
Schwartz Sutton Wolf
Schweikert Terry Womack
Scott (SC) Thompson (MS) Woodall
Scott (VA) Thompson (PA) Wu
Scott, Austin Thornberry Yoder
Scott, David Tiberi Young (FL)
Sessions Tipton Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer Guinta Towns
Bono Mack Keating Watt
Culberson Mack Young (AK)
Giffords McIntyre

□ 1920

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

AYES—212

Adams Calvert Flake
Aderholt Camp Fleischmann
Akin Campbell Fleming
Alexander Canseco Flores
Amash Cantor Forbes
Austria Capito Fortenberry
Bachmann Carter Foss
Bachus Cassidy Franks (AZ)
Barletta Chabot Frelinghuysen
Bartlett Chaffetz Gallegly
Barton (TX) Coble Gardner
Bass (NH) Coffman (CO) Garrett
Benishek Conaway Gibbs
Berg Cravaack Gibson
Biggert Crawford Gingrey (GA)
Bilirakis Davis (KY) Gohmert
Black Denham Goodlatte
Blackburn Dent Gosar
Bonner DesJarlais Gowdy
Boustany Diaz-Balart Granger
Brady (TX) Rogers (AL) Dold
Brooks Dreier Graves (MO)
Broun (GA) Duffy Griffin (VA)
Buchanan Duncan (SC) Griffith (AR)
Bucshon Duncan (TN) Guthrie
Buerkle Ellmers Hall
Burgess Farenthold Hanna
Burton (IN) Fincher Harper

Harris	McCotter	Rooney	Rogers (AL)	Scott, David	Tonko	Griffin (AR)	Marchant	Rogers (MI)
Hartzler	McHenry	Roskam	Ros-Lehtinen	Serrano	Tsongas	Griffith (VA)	Marino	Rohrabacher
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Ross (FL)	Ross (AR)	Sewell	Van Hollen	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	Rokita
Hayworth	McKinley	Royce	Rothman (NJ)	Sherman	Velázquez	Gutierrez	McCaul	Rooney
Heck	McMorris	Runyan	Roybal-Allard	Shimkus	Visclosky	Hall	McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen
Hensarling	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Ruppersberger	Shuler	Walz (MN)	Hanna	McCotter	Roskam
Herger	Mica	Scalise	Rush	Stark	Wasserman	Harper	McHenry	Ross (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Schilling	Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Schultz	Harris	McKeon	Royce
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Schmidt	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (NJ)	Waters	Hartzler	McKinley	Runyan
Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary	Schock	T.	Smith (WA)	Waxman	Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Schweikert	Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Welch	Hayworth	Rodgers	Scalise
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Scott (SC)	Sarbanes	Stark	Wilson (FL)	Heck	Mica	Schilling
Hurt	Myrick	Sensenbrenner	Schakowsky	Sullivan	Wolf	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Schmidt
Issa	Neugebauer	Sessions	Schiff	Sutton	Woolsey	Herger	Miller (MI)	Schock
Jenkins	Noem	Shuster	Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wu	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary	Schweikert
Johnson (IL)	Nugent	Simpson	Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth	Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Scott (SC)
Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Scott (VA)	Tiberi		Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin
Johnson, Sam	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)	Scott, Austin	Tierney		Hultgren	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Jordan	Palazzo	Southerland				Hunter	Neugebauer	Sessions
Kelly	Paul	Stearns	Blumenauer	Guinta	Towns	Hurt	Noem	Shuster
King (IA)	Paulsen	Stivers	Bono Mack	Keating	Watt	Issa	Nugent	Simpson
King (NY)	Pearce	Stutzman	Culberson	Mack	Young (AK)	Jenkins	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Kingston	Pence	Terry	Giffords	McIntyre		Johnson (IL)	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Petri	Thompson (PA)				Johnson (OH)	Olson	Southerland
Kline	Pitts	Thornberry				Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Stearns
Labrador	Poe (TX)	Tipton				Jordan	Paul	Stivers
Lamborn	Pompeo	Turner				Kelly	Paulsen	Stutzman
Lance	Posey	Upton				King (IA)	Pearce	Terry
Landry	Price (GA)	Walberg				King (NY)	Pence	Thompson (PA)
Lankford	Quayle	Walden				Kingston	Petri	Thornberry
Latham	Reed	Walsh (IL)				Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Tipton
Latta	Rehberg	Webster				Kline	Poe (TX)	Upton
Lewis (CA)	Reichert	West				Labrador	Pompeo	Walberg
Long	Renacci	Westmoreland				Lamborn	Posey	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Whitfield				Lance	Price (GA)	Walsh (IL)
Lummis	Rigell	Wilson (SC)				Landry	Quayle	Webster
Lungren, Daniel	Rivera	Wittman				Lankford	Reed	West
E.	Roby	Womack				Latham	Rehberg	Westmoreland
Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Woodall				Latta	Reichert	Whitfield
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Yoder				Lewis (CA)	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Marino	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)				Long	Ribble	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)				Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Womack
McCaul	Rokita					Lummis	Rivera	Woodall
McClintock						Lungren, Daniel	Roby	Yoder
						E.	Roe (TN)	Young (FL)
						Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Young (IN)

NOES—208

Ackerman	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Altmire	Dicks	LaTourette
Andrews	Dingell	Lee (CA)
Baca	Doggett	Levin
Baldwin	Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)
Barrow	Doyle	Lipinski
Bass (CA)	Edwards	LoBiondo
Becerra	Ellison	Loebsack
Berkley	Emerson	Lofgren, Zoe
Berman	Engel	Lowe
Bilbray	Eshoo	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Luján
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lynch
Bishop (UT)	Filner	Maloney
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Markey
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Matsui
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Gerlach	McCollum
Butterfield	Gonzalez	McDermott
Capps	Green, Al	McGovern
Capuano	Green, Gene	McNerney
Cardoza	Grijalva	Meehan
Carnahan	Grimm	Meeks
Carney	Gutierrez	Michaud
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Chandler	Heinrich	Moore
Chu	Higgins	Moran
Cicilline	Himes	Murphy (CT)
Clarke (MI)	Hinches	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Clay	Hirono	Neal
Cleaver	Hochul	Olver
Clyburn	Holden	Owens
Cohen	Holt	Pallone
Cole	Honda	Pascarell
Connolly (VA)	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Conyers	Inslee	Payne
Cooper	Israel	Pelosi
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter
Costello	Jackson Lee	Peters
Courtney	(TX)	Peterson
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Critz	Johnson, E. B.	Platts
Crowley	Jones	Polis
Cuellar	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kildee	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Rangel
DeFazio	Kucinich	Reyes
DeGette	Langevin	Richardson
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Richmond

NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Guinta	Towns
Bono Mack	Keating	Watt
Culberson	Mack	Young (AK)
Giffords	McIntyre	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1925

Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON
LEE of Texas changed their vote from
“aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TURNER and NUGENT
changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 217, noes 204,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—217

Adams	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Ellmers
Akin	Calvert	Farenthold
Alexander	Camp	Fincher
Amash	Canseco	Flake
Austria	Campbell	Fleischmann
Bachmann	Cantor	Fleming
Bachus	Carter	Flores
Barletta	Cassidy	Forbes
Bartlett	Chabot	Fortenberry
Barton (TX)	Chaffetz	Fox
Bass (NH)	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Benishek	Coffman (CO)	Frelinghuysen
Berg	Conaway	Gallely
Biggart	Connolly (VA)	Gardner
Bilbray	Cravaack	Garrett
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gerlach
Black	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Gibson
Bonner	Denham	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Dent	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Goodlatte
Brooks	Diaz-Balart	Gosar
Broun (GA)	Dold	Gowdy
Bucshon	Dreier	Granger
Buerkle	Duffy	Graves (GA)
	Duncan (SC)	Graves (MO)

NOES—204

Ackerman	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Altmire	Dicks	LaTourette
Andrews	Dingell	Lee (CA)
Baca	Doggett	Levin
Baldwin	Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)
Barrow	Doyle	Lipinski
Bass (CA)	Edwards	LoBiondo
Becerra	Ellison	Loebsack
Berkley	Emerson	Lofgren, Zoe
Berman	Engel	Lowe
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lucas
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Luján
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Lynch
Boren	Filner	Maloney
Boswell	Fitzpatrick	Markey
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Matheson
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Matsui
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)
Butterfield	Gonzalez	McCollum
Capito	Green, Al	McDermott
Capps	Green, Gene	McGovern
Capuano	Grijalva	McIntyre
Cardoza	Grimm	McNerney
Carnahan	Hanabusa	Meehan
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Heinrich	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Himes	Miller, George
Chu	Hinches	Moore
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Moran
Clarke (MI)	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Hochul	Nadler
Clay	Holden	Napolitano
Cleaver	Holt	Neal
Clyburn	Honda	Olver
Cohen	Hoyer	Owens
Cole	Inslee	Pallone
Conyers	Israel	Pascarell
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
Costa	Jackson Lee	Payne
Costello	(TX)	Pelosi
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Critz	Jones	Peterson
Crowley	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Cuellar	Kildee	Platts
Cummings	Kind	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kissell	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	DeFazio	Quigley
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rahall
DeGette	Langevin	Rangel
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	

Reyes	Scott (VA)	Tierney
Richardson	Scott, David	Tonko
Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Rogers (AL)	Sewell	Turner
Ross (AR)	Sherman	Van Hollen
Rothman (NJ)	Shimkus	Velázquez
Roybal-Allard	Shuler	Vislosky
Ruppersberger	Sires	Walz (MN)
Rush	Slaughter	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Waters
T.	Speier	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Stark	Welch
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Sutton	Wolf
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Wu
Schwartz	Tiberi	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Guinta	Watt
Bono Mack	Keating	Young (AK)
Culberson	Mack	
Giffords	Towns	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
One minute remains in the vote.

□ 1930

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8123. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the approximately \$100,000,000,000 in efficiency savings identified by the military departments in the defense budget covering fiscal years 2012 through 2016 that are to be reinvested in the priorities of the military departments. Such report shall include an analysis of—

(1) each savings identified by the military departments, including—

(A) the budget account from which such savings will be derived;

(B) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such savings;

(C) the estimated reductions in the number and funding of contractor personnel caused by such savings; and

(D) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such savings, including the locations of such activities or services; and

(2) each reinvestment planned to be funded with such savings, including—

(A) with respect to such reinvestment in procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts, the budget account to which such savings will be reinvested, including, by line item, the number of items to be procured, as shown in annual P-1 and R-1 documents;

(B) with respect to such reinvestment in military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts, the budget account and the subactivity (as shown in annual—1 and O-1 budget documents) to which such savings will be reinvested;

(C) the number of military personnel and full-time civilian employees of the Federal Government affected by such reinvestment;

(D) the estimated number and funding of contractor personnel affected by such reinvestment; and

(E) a specific description of activities or services that will be affected by such reinvestment, including the locations of such activities or services.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendments to this title that cut funds, reduce our military footprint, and move to bring our troops home from Afghanistan. And I rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

I want to commend the ranking member of the committee, Congressman NORM DICKS from Washington, for his leadership in calling for a fresh look at how we carry out military operations in Afghanistan and the need for a strategy that brings our troops home sooner rather than later.

Mr. Chairman, I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan. I cannot describe how impressed I am with the commitment, the dedication, and the work carried out every single day by our men and women in uniform, and those in the civilian services. I met and spoke with them in Kabul, Marja, at large bases like Bagram Air Force Base, and in small villages. Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, they are incredible.

But over and over and over again I heard the same message: This is not sustainable. The strategy that we are pursuing in Afghanistan is not sustainable. And it is costing us too much in human lives and financial resources to continue. It can't continue for another 18 months, as called for by the President, let alone even longer.

I stand here tonight more convinced than ever that it is time to forge a new path, a new strategy, built upon past and present accomplishments, but more aggressively focused on more rapidly reducing the U.S. military footprint in Afghanistan than the plan described last month by the President, accelerating the transition of combat operations to Afghanistan authorities, and an intense international and regional effort to secure a political solution to the Afghan conflict and define a genuine regional coordinated effort that safeguards the region and the world from terrorist threats.

While I was in Afghanistan, General Petraeus invited me and two Members I was traveling with, Congressman ALLEN WEST and DUNCAN HUNTER, Jr., to attend a ramp ceremony. We may not always agree on policy, but we were united in how respectful, emotional, and moving we found the ceremony honoring the fallen soldiers who were being transported by the C-130 on their final journey home.

Mr. Chairman, 1,650 American service men and women have sacrificed their lives in the Afghanistan war. While I was in Afghanistan, six more were killed. It was a reminder of the enormous sacrifice that our soldiers are paying. 2010 was the deadliest year of conflict to date in the Afghanistan war for U.S. and coalition forces, and for Afghan civilians. This year, 2011, is on pace to be the deadliest year of the war. We need to end the war, not sustain it, Mr. Chairman.

We are borrowing \$8 billion to \$10 billion each month for military operations alone. Borrowing, Mr. Chairman, borrowing. We know we can't sustain that. And we know that the Afghan Government and security forces don't have the resources or the political will to sustain that level of resources once we leave. We need to find a new strategy and purpose to help bring this conflict to an end.

The President and congressional leaders are in negotiations, grappling with how to deal with the national debt. It can't be done if we don't find the means and the political will to end this war sooner rather than later. According to CBO, we could save \$1.3 trillion by ending these wars. That's trillion with a "t," Mr. Chairman. We have spent approximately \$3.7 trillion since 9/11 in Iraq and Afghanistan. We cannot afford another decade like the last one. It is simply not sustainable.

We need to also understand that jobs and economic security and economic strength are central parts of our national security. While we serve as an ATM machine for a corrupt government in Kabul, we tell our own people that we have no money for roads, and bridges, and schools, and teachers, and police, and firefighters, and jobs here at home. Enough. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support amendments that reduce our spending and military footprint in Afghanistan, help bring our troops home sooner rather than later, and call for a new strategy and a new direction in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I will be submitting for the RECORD two articles, one from the Washington Post entitled "CBO: Ending the Wars Could Save \$1.4 Trillion," and an article that appeared in Scientific American entitled "Legacy of Mental Health Problems From Iraq and Afghanistan Wars Will Be Long-lived."

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to come together and find a different strategy in Afghanistan, one that will bring our troops home sooner rather than later. It is time to end this war.

[From The Washington Post, June 23, 2011]

CBO: ENDING THE WARS COULD SAVE \$1.4

TRILLION

(By Ezra Klein)

It's increasingly clear that a deal on the budget deficit will have to include a lot of spending cuts that Democrats can deny are spending cuts and at least some tax increases that Republicans can deny are tax increases. I'll get to the tax increases in a future post. But if you're looking for the spending cuts, look no further than the wars.

Last night, President Obama announced that "the tide of war is receding," and that he will soon bring the Iraq and Afghanistan wars "to a responsible end." Left unsaid is the effect that could have on our projected deficits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we're talking big money: \$1.4 trillion, to be exact.

That has less to do with the likely cost of the wars than the way CBO officials estimate future spending. In the case of discretionary spending—which is the pot of money that

goes to the wars—they simply take current spending and assume it grows at the rate of inflation. So though it's clear our wars are winding down, they won't count the savings from them in their projections until there's explicit government policy that winds them down.

But if they can be convinced, they've made clear that they're willing to count big savings. "In 2010, the number of U.S. troops (active-duty, reserves, and National Guard personnel) deployed for war-related activities averaged about 215,000," CBO said its *January budget outlook* (pdf). "In the alternative scenario presented here, the number of military personnel deployed for war-related purposes would decline over a five-year period to an average of 180,000 in 2011, 130,000 in 2012, 100,000 in 2013, 65,000 in 2014, and 45,000 in 2015 and thereafter. Under this scenario, total discretionary outlays over the 2012-2021 period would be \$1.1 trillion less than the amount in the baseline. Debt-service costs would bring the cumulative savings relative to the baseline to about \$1.4 trillion over the coming decade."

I'm told that a big chunk of these savings were included in the debt-ceiling deal that, until today, Eric Cantor and Jon Kyl were negotiating with the Democrats. But eventually, we're going to have some kind of deal on the debt ceiling, and I'd bet quite a bit of this money will be in there. The best type of deficit reduction, after all, is the kind you were going to do anyway.

[From the Scientific American, June 27, 2011]
LEGACY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS FROM
IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN WARS WILL BE
LONG-LIVED

(By John Matson)

As Operation Enduring Freedom, the war on terror in Afghanistan, winds down and some 33,000 U.S. servicemen and service-women return from overseas in the next year, a plan announced by President Obama on June 22, the psychological issues that veterans face back home are likely to increase.

Some of the key psychological issues affecting the approximately two million American troops deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 have been traumatic brain injury (TBI), depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)—and the diagnoses often overlap. A 2008 report by the RAND Corp. think tank estimated that more than 26 percent of troops may return from the wars on terror with mental health issues.

It is reasonable to expect a continuation of these brain and mental health trends, only multiplied by the anticipated dramatic uptick in returning troops. On top of that, such issues also tend to crop up several months or even years after service members settle in, rather than directly after homecoming, as researchers learned following America's wars in the late 20th century. A false honeymoon can deceive health care workers and family into a perception that all is well among members of the military reentering society stateside.

After the withdrawal of U.S. soldiers from Vietnam in 1973 "the only thing that happened is that rates of problems went up," says George Mason University assistant professor of clinical psychology Keith Renshaw. "The longer people are back, the more people come forward as potentially struggling." A study in the April issue of the *Journal of Affective Disorders* showed that among service members injured in Iraq or Afghanistan, health care usage—and psychiatric problems—increased over time.

The influx of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan into the military mental health system has yet to peak, but it is already well underway. There is some concern, however,

that the health care system is unprepared to handle the care of returning troops. A 2010 report from the Institute of Medicine identified a "critical shortage of health care professionals—especially those specializing in mental health—to meet the demands of those returning from theater in Iraq and Afghanistan and their family members."

TBI is especially common: roughly 30,000 servicemembers were diagnosed annually in 2008, 2009 and 2010, according to U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) figures. Most of those diagnoses were for concussions or other relatively mild forms of brain injury. PTSD is also worryingly prevalent—in a RAND survey, 13.8 percent of veterans and returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan met the criteria for PTSD, meaning that some 275,000 U.S. service members may be affected in total.

The RAND report predicted that the mental health needs of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans will increase over time. "There are a lot of concerns that what we see now are underestimates, if anything," Renshaw says.

Many of the afflicted veterans will not seek help, and others will not do so for some time. "There's a lag time between when people serve and when they actually come in," says Shira Maguen, an assistant professor at the University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine and a psychologist at the San Francisco Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center. "For many of those people there are a lot of barriers at this point, the biggest of which is probably stigma." Renshaw notes that some soldiers who remain active in the armed forces resist seeking help because they do not want to endanger their military careers by acknowledging psychological issues. Others seek help in civilian practice rather than in the military health system.

The DoD and the VA have taken steps to prepare for the forecast rise in PTSD cases, highlighting two approaches to treatment—cognitive processing therapy and prolonged exposure therapy—that studies have shown to be effective. And June 27 has been designated National PTSD Awareness Day. "They're rolling out a massive dissemination effort," Renshaw says. "But I don't think we're at the point that we're ready yet." New veterans suffering from PTSD may well fare better than their predecessors who served in Vietnam, as the disorder was only recognized by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980. "I think we've learned a tremendous amount from Vietnam and from prior conflicts," Maguen says. "I think we're in a unique position now to deal with it."

Even with lessons learned from Vietnam and the Persian Gulf wars, however, veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom present a special treatment challenge. In some ways the new crop of veterans have had similar combat experiences to Vietnam veterans. Both groups fought in wars without clearly delineated front lines, where ambush and insurgency are a constant threat. But the types of combat exposure have changed, as have the potential triggers for negative psychological reactions later in life. For instance, Renshaw says, the urban component of the wars on terror and the threat of improvised explosive devices have made driving and traffic jams problematic triggers for some veterans. "Our methodology is still evolving to catch up with the nature of these conflicts," he says. "I think this is something we're going to be working on and dealing with for a long time."

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1940

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I join in this effort.

I tell you, without any pride but with humility, that this past weekend I signed 31 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

At this time I have signed over 10,374 letters because of my mistake in voting to send our kids to Iraq, which was an unnecessary war with misinformation led by the previous administration. So I join my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle, and I thank those who offered this amendment.

This past weekend I decided to email my adviser, who is a former commandant of the Marine Corps, and said, "What do you think about President Obama's plans?"

I will read just two short points to you: "I think the time is too long. I think he needs to increase the number of troops coming out of the country more and quicker."

And his last point: "Get real with training and army and police force. All we are doing is training eventual new members of the Taliban. Trainers are doing a wonderful job, but we don't have the time to make an army. Every day someone dies. Every day an American dies or gets his or her legs blown off."

Mr. Chairman, to the left of me is a poster that was in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper. Too many times, as we debate and there are eloquent speakers on the floor of the House, but we don't see any faces. We don't see any broken arms or legs.

Here is a young lady holding a little baby in her arms, and the little baby is looking at the officer who is presenting her with a draped flag. How often does this happen throughout America? We never see it.

It is time to bring our troops home. They have done everything they were asked to do by President Bush, to get al Qaeda, who was responsible for 9/11, to get bin Laden. We have done all of that. We have done everything we can do.

And as my friend from Massachusetts said, \$10 billion a month and we can't fix the schools, we can't fix the roads here in North Carolina and throughout America.

I'm from North Carolina. I know what's happening to my State. I know what's happening to the other States.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to bring them home. We don't need any more babies coming to their moms and dads and saying, when is daddy coming home? When is mother coming home? And they are being told they are not coming home. They are gone.

They have given their lives for America. We have done enough for Afghanistan. It has a corrupt leader and a corrupt government, and we need to come home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, there will be a number of amendments offered in the next little while by Mr. GARAMENDI, by Ms. LEE, myself and Mr. JONES and by others all in various ways seeking to speed our exit from Afghanistan. I support them all.

Two weeks ago, the President proposed that we continue fighting in Afghanistan for at least 3½ more years. In those 3½ years, more of our soldiers will die, more of our Treasury will be spent and, in the end, we will not be any closer to creating a stable Afghanistan or to enhancing our safety.

The whole premise of this war is wrong. Fighting in Afghanistan does not enhance the security of the United States. Ten years ago we were attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda. Al Qaeda had bases in Afghanistan, and at that time it made sense to go in and destroy those bases, and we did.

But the CIA tells us that there are now fewer than 100 al Qaeda personnel in all of Afghanistan. So why are we still fighting there? Why will we still have 70,000 troops in Afghanistan at the end of 2012, troops who will continue to risk their lives every day in a war that has already claimed too many American lives?

And we will continue pouring billions of dollars into an intractable mess when we should be devoting taxpayer funds to our own economy, to our own jobs, our own housing, our own social programs and our own education.

Afghanistan is in the middle of what is so far a 35-year civil war. If we continue on this course, in 3 years there will be several thousand more American soldiers dead, several hundred billion more dollars wasted, and two or three more provinces labeled pacified.

But as soon as we leave, now, or in 2014, or 2016 or whenever, those provinces will become unpacified. The Taliban and the warlords will step up the fighting, and the Afghan civil war will resume its natural course.

Our troops are fighting valiantly, Mr. Chairman, but they are in the wrong mission. We should recognize that rebuilding Afghanistan is both beyond our ability and beyond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States.

To delay withdrawal of our forces and continue this terrible policy at so high a cost is quite simply unconscionable. It is unjustifiable to sacrifice more lives and more money on this futile endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, we should withdraw our troops now, all of them, as rapidly as physically possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, on March 16, 2011, I joined my cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus Task Force on Peace and Security and 76 other Members of Congress in sending a letter to the President asking him to move swiftly to end America's longest war, the war in Afghanistan.

Since then, the cochairs have continued to call on the administration to move towards a significant, swift and sizeable reduction in our troops in Afghanistan, meeting or exceeding the number of troops on the ground before the escalation.

Similarly, the Democratic National Committee, of which I am vice chair, called for a "sizeable and significant" drawdown beginning in July. Even the U.S. Conference of Mayors called for an end to the Afghanistan war. In poll after poll, the majority of Americans are consistently calling for an end to this war.

A significant redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan, beginning of this month, would have sent a clear message that the United States does not seek a permanent presence in Afghanistan.

This move would recognize that we cannot afford the war in Afghanistan, costing nearly \$10 billion per month, while American families struggle to stay afloat amid the slow recovery of our Nation's economy.

The cochairs of the CPC Task Force on Peace and Security believe that a significant, swift, and sizeable troop reduction in Afghanistan is necessary, especially given the fact that the CBO reported recently that ending the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq will save this country \$1.7 trillion, and especially given the fact that a recent Brown University study shows that the United States has spent \$3.7 trillion in these wars since 2001.

Anything less hurts our Nation's future and is unacceptable. It is time to focus on securing a future of economic opportunity and prosperity for the American people, and the President must move swiftly and boldly to end the war in Afghanistan and bring our troops home now.

The President's announcement last month does not reflect a significant policy change in Afghanistan. This strategy does not represent a drawdown in Afghanistan, but rather aims at maintaining the status quo through the end of 2012.

Simply removing the 30,000 surge troops from Afghanistan means that by the end of the summer of 2012 we will be exactly where we were in late 2009. Tens of thousands of American soldiers will continue to fight a battle that their commanders insist will only end with a political solution.

Peace in Afghanistan will depend ultimately on an Afghan solution, not on American soldiers. Everyone seems tired of this war, from Republicans and Democrats in Washington, to Afghans in Kabul, to Americans in Kansas. Administration officials acknowledged

that due to America's mounting debt and deficits, war costs at nearly \$120 billion annually for Afghanistan alone are no longer sustainable.

□ 1950

Republicans gave similar ground with Appropriations Chair HAROLD ROGERS and Defense Subcommittee Member JACK KINGSTON expressing concern about the costs, the mission, and the lack of progress—bolstering Republican Senator DICK LUGAR's call for troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. Nearly half the House weighed in during the recent Defense authorization debate with a call for an accelerated plan to draw down troops and transition to Afghan control.

Moving beyond what Washington wants, consider the Afghans, who are at the receiving end of all of this. After a series of serious civilian casualties resulting from multiple indiscriminate NATO bombings, Afghan President Hamid Karzai had declared opposition to any and all air strikes on Afghan homes. This adds to Karzai's insistence that foreign forces must end night raids, stop unilateral operations, and stay off roads and out of Afghan villages.

The Afghan people are no more pleased than Karzai with America's continued presence, hardly a surprise given that General Petraeus has increased bombing throughout the country by 80 percent in the last year alone. According to a recent poll, nearly six out of 10 Afghans said Western troops must leave on or before the original July 2011 withdrawal date. Only 17 percent say that the deployment should be maintained longer.

After spending hundreds of billions of American tax dollars, the security and day-to-day life in many regions of Afghanistan aren't improving. Crime, economic opportunity, and freedom of movement are getting worse, not better. Availability of electricity, food, medical care, and schools has shown little or no improvement in recent years.

So, for all these reasons and more, the case is clear: We need to end this war in Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise in opposition to the underlying bill and will seek an amendment shortly.

Memorial Day was a time when four of my colleagues and I traveled throughout Afghanistan. We learned a great deal, and what we did learn we brought home.

1,650 American men and women have died in Afghanistan, and yet the incredible dedication of American soldiers was easy to see. They risk their lives every day. And it is with the utmost respect that we honor them on Memorial Day and beyond. I have great respect for the President and recognize

the difficult situation, the decisions that he must make; but, frankly, I think he made the wrong decision.

The killing of bin Laden gave us the opportunity to pivot, to go in the direction that we must ultimately go, which is to focus like a laser on al Qaeda, wherever it is in this world, including our own country. We must do that. And yet the decision to maintain in Afghanistan a troop level that really reflects what existed in 2009 is not sustainable. It's costing us a fortune, a fortune that we can ill afford.

This entire town is caught up in a debate over the deficit and the pending default crisis, and yet we seem to want to continue to pour money into Afghanistan, into a five-way civil war for which there is no military solution. Negotiations are essential. Yet is this country pushing forward the negotiations? If so, it's in secret, and I certainly hope it is there, because therein lies the solution.

I think we don't need 100,000, 50,000, 60,000, troops in Afghanistan. We really only need a handful to focus on al Qaeda, wherever they may be in that region. And so if we were to draw down our troops in the next 18 months to 25,000 in Afghanistan and then 10,000 in 2013, we would begin to get to a level over an appropriate course of time. And it is this House's responsibility to put forth an appropriation bill that provides money for only that, and no more, to limit the funding.

It's pretty clear the President has the power to initiate a war. It's equally clear that we have the only power, the only power to fund the war. And if we say no, then this war will cease. If we say only this amount of money for only this purpose, then this war will rapidly diminish. There will be amendments on the floor shortly to achieve that goal. And we ought to proceed in that way.

We need to rebuild America. We need to bring the money and the troops home and rebuild this Nation. We can do so when this war is over. Until then, this is a sump in which we are pouring the lives of American men and women and even more Afghan men and women and our treasure to the detriment of this Nation's economic strength.

I oppose this war, along with my colleagues, and I would ask this House, Democrat and Republican alike, to use the power of the purse to bring this war to a rapid and appropriate close and fund the negotiations, fund the war on al Qaeda, not the war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue of cost, but I want my colleagues to understand what we are actually paying for military operations in Afghanistan.

We are borrowing \$10 billion per month, \$2.3 billion per week, \$328.3 million per day, \$13.7 million per hour, \$228,000 per minute. And we are having a debate right now over how we get the

debt under control. And these borrowed moneys are not even a subject of discussion. If you want to get the debt down, you've got to deal with these war costs. And I can't believe that for those who are advocating the status quo that they don't want to pay for it, it's going on our credit card, and I think that is unacceptable. This is an enormous cost to us here in our own country.

I thank the gentleman.

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

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. I am opposed to the underlying bill because it does not do enough to withdraw our troops from Afghanistan.

Earlier this month, the President made an important announcement. He plans to withdraw 10,000 troops from Afghanistan in the next 6 months and another 20,000 by next summer. This is a step in the right direction, and I commend the President for following through with the drawdown plan.

But the American people are crying for a significant and sizable drawdown, and we are still too far from that. Even after these troops come home, which won't be for another year and a half, we will still be exactly where we were in 2009. Seventy thousand American soldiers will still be serving in Afghanistan, and I can't help but wonder why.

The ongoing financial and human costs of this war are now indefensible. We spend \$2 billion a week on the war effort in Afghanistan. And what's worse is that our own money is working against us.

Last year, I was outraged to learn that taxpayers are spending \$2.16 billion on private contractors in Afghanistan. These contractors use part of the money to pay off local warlords, which then ends up in the Taliban's hand. So, in effect, we are funding both sides of the same war.

This corruption and waste of hard-earned American dollars is the direct result of unreliable counsel and a lack of perspective, and it's costing us a whopping \$100 billion a year. That's five times more than we spend on Pell grants every year, financial aid to put American kids through college. That's double what we spend on Medicaid that keeps all Americans healthy regardless of income. And \$100 billion would completely pay for the Homeland Security Department, Commerce Department, Department of Science and the entire judicial branch combined. When money is tight and Congress is trying to slash Medicare and Social Security to keep this Nation afloat, it is irresponsible to keep writing blank checks for this war.

But, sadly, that's not the largest toll of this war. Since 9/11, we've lost over 1,600 American lives. Over 11,000 troops have been wounded, and an untold number of Afghan civilians have lost their lives after a decade of war.

□ 2000

And it is not getting any better. In fact, last year was the most deadly year on record for U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

Al Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan but scattered around the world. It did not take 100,000 troops to find Osama bin Laden, and it does not take a military occupation of Afghanistan to protect us from terrorist threats. By failing to significantly draw down the number of troops in Afghanistan, we continue to focus efforts away from the terrorists and needlessly put American soldiers in the line of fire.

But this story is about more than just numbers and figures; it is about real people who sacrifice everything to keep us safe. On Sunday, April 3, of this year, a 21-year-old young marine named Harry Lew died while serving the country in Afghanistan. He was the son of Sandy and Allen Lew, the brother of Carmen Lew, and he was my nephew.

Harry died while serving on watch duty in Helmand Province. His unit's goal was to provide security to locals and to promote development in the region. But 3 short months before he was set to return home, he was gone.

Ending this war will save American lives. Ending it will let us focus on fighting terrorism around the globe. Ending the war will save money at a time when we need it the most. It is time to end the war in Afghanistan, bring our troops home, and begin seriously addressing our real security needs.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I very much appreciate the time, Mr. Chairman, and I rise only because I can't help but be moved by the Progressive Caucus' interest in getting us out of Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

I know of those who are very concerned about America being involved in wars anywhere. It was not my intention to speak about this subject until I heard my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) who has an amendment later that would strike the funding for approximately 2½ months of the proposed cost of this effort in Afghanistan.

And as I thought about that, I would want to caution my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, and others, about the role in Afghanistan. Indeed, it is important for us to note, those of us who may have read "Charlie Wilson's War," and I am sure my colleague has read it thoroughly, but Charlie Wilson was a colleague of mine on the Subcommittee on Defense who first raised the prospect of challenges in Afghanistan.

At that point in time, the Soviet Union was attempting to move into Afghanistan to take over that entire country, giving them access to the entire region, a warm water port, and

otherwise. If it had not been for, in my judgment, the effort as a result of Charlie Wilson's war and the efforts of Pope John Paul, who was then the bishop from Poland, perhaps it is very possible that the Soviet Union never would have fallen. But, indeed, Charlie Wilson's war created a circumstance where the Soviets did withdraw from Afghanistan. And so we were right on the edge of opportunity and peace and freedom in Afghanistan.

And what I would caution my colleague from California about is, following that, what did America do? America did what we often do in the world where there is strife and struggle, where we are asked to play a role in leadership, providing for opportunity and change for peace. The vacuum that was left in Afghanistan as a result of our walking away after the war, after the Soviets left, was that vacuum. And within the vacuum, there came terrorists who would have America and freedom in mind. Indeed, as a result of that vacuum, al Qaeda, Taliban, and others got strength and found a terrorist center. And now we are involved in a war that involves the future of the world, not just peace for the world but American peace as well.

Indeed, I would be very cautious as we go about suggesting that we ought to automatically walk away from the commander in chief's plan. Indeed, if we are not careful, the vacuum will catch up with us, and America will find itself in a much broader and a much more intense struggle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRIMM). The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to my colleague from California to respond, I would like to mention, and I appreciate Mr. LEWIS' history, but I would suggest to you that al Qaeda could have found a base in Yemen, they could have found a base in the Sudan, they could have found a base in other places. There was nothing particularly unique about Afghanistan that allowed them to have that base there. The fact is that we went into a country to fight al Qaeda, which was all in the mountains in Pakistan, and even in the cities in Pakistan, probably with the knowledge of the Pakistani government, and we have wasted a lot of money and lives in an area where we didn't need to be because that war will continue.

There are only 100 al Qaeda, give or take, left in Afghanistan, but there are al Qaeda in other spots in the Middle East, and al Qaeda's people have plotted terrorist activities from Germany and from other places in Europe. They don't need Osama bin Laden's base to have activity. There is nothing unique with Afghanistan.

As far as the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union went down for goodly reasons, because of all of the money they spent in Afghanistan. True, we were

there fighting them; but their attempt at gaining empire, which has been the cause of the loss of many empires, stretching too far and going beyond their supply lines, killed them. They spent money there. And they'd like us to stay there. They are being real nice to us. They're helping us with bases to bring in armaments and troops and supplies.

Come on, America, spend your money. Break your government. Come like we are, broken.

It was a mistake.

I believe that we need to get out of Afghanistan because we are losing lives and money, and doing it for a reason that is not going to make our country any better.

Mr. LEWIS talked about strife in places in Afghanistan. I will tell you about strife—in the United States of America, in my city, in Detroit, in Philadelphia, in Boston, in Chicago. You go to the inner cities of America, and you will see people without hope and without opportunity. That is where infrastructure needs to be built. That is where education needs to be affirmed, not in projects in Afghanistan, but in the United States of America. And that is what the Conference of Mayors said, that we cannot afford this; while our cities go to decay and our people lose their opportunity and our middle class is destroyed, we fight a war in Afghanistan which was the war of another generation, which we should have learned from history and the Soviets' experience and what happened to them. If you don't learn from history, you are doomed to make the same mistakes. I see that happening.

Admiral Mike Mullen said national debt is our biggest security threat. Admiral Mullen: National debt is our biggest security threat.

He said at a breakfast just last month in a tribute to our troops that that is the biggest problem we have. And when you have a problem like that that is a security interest, you go to your biggest spot where you can save money, which is the defense budget, and this war that is draining and has cost us so much—Afghanistan and Iraq.

I have some amendments coming which I am going to offer that would reduce the amount of money that we spend with the forces, and also the amount of money that we spend with the infrastructure and the development there in Afghanistan.

The fact is, just like in Iraq, we put in equipment and buildings and then we leave, and they don't have the ability to maintain those buildings or maintain that equipment, and it goes to waste. We don't need to be wasting our resources, leaving them there where they will just go to waste. We need to spend those resources in America and create jobs in America, and hope and opportunity for America.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I just want to respond to something that Mr. LEWIS said, who is a good friend of mine and whom I respect very much. He talked about the need for us to be cautious. Well, I wish we were more cautious where we committed our young men and women in the field of battle.

It is politicians that put our service men and women in harm's way, and it is politicians that keep this war going. The fact of the matter is that we have an unreliable partner in Afghanistan. President Karzai is corrupt. He fixed the last election. I mean, he is denigrating our service men and women. When I was over there, one of our soldiers from Massachusetts said to me, What bothers me most is we are risking our lives to try to help improve the quality of life of people in this country, and the President of this country, Mr. Karzai, denigrates us, diminishes what we do, calls us names, accused the United States of using nuclear weapons in Afghanistan.

The Massachusetts soldier said to me, Do you know what that feels like?

□ 2010

Look, we need to rethink our policy in Afghanistan. Nobody is talking about walking away. What we're saying is that the current policy of counterinsurgency is going broke.

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

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

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

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlelady from California.

Previously, my good friend with whom I've worked for more than 35 years in various levels of government challenged me on the position I take with regard to winding down quickly the war in Afghanistan. His recitation of history, while accurate, is woefully incomplete.

Much of what we are now fighting was actually begun by Charlie Wilson, morphed over this period of time perhaps by Pakistan. But we're caught in the middle of a civil war, not just a civil war, but a five-way civil war, one that has gone on for at least the last 35 years. We are, as my friend Mr. MCGOVERN just stated, backing a government that is, on the face of it, corrupt by any standard.

So what are we doing here? What is this all about?

In fact, we went into Afghanistan to get al Qaeda, and we did. There is only a handful there. There are probably far more al Qaeda sympathizers—and maybe active members—in the United States than in Afghanistan.

So why do we have over 100,000 American troops and another 40,000 NATO troops in Afghanistan?

I did not suggest that we leave in a vacuum. Instead, I said we leave a

small force behind that goes after al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. Bring our troops back home. Go back to the original mission in Afghanistan. Go after al Qaeda.

You're quite correct, my colleagues. They're in Somalia; they're in Yemen; and they're in other parts of this world. The more troops we have in Iraq and Afghanistan, the more reason we give to those who want to recruit yet more al Qaeda members. This makes no sense going forward. Yes, we will have a continuing obligation, but if you take a look at the strategy that is now in place, one that calls upon America to maintain its troops, then you can count on a larger deficit. That makes no sense to me. Let's bring our troops home rapidly. The amendments that will be on the floor will cause that to happen.

We have the power of the purse here. This Nation can no longer sustain \$120 billion a year in Afghanistan when our bridges are crumbling, when our children are not educated, when we cannot afford in the budget you're putting forth to feed our children or to care for our elderly. This war must end, and it must end soon.

I have great respect for the President, but he has got the wrong strategy. He is continuing on the strategy that by the proof on the ground does not work. Pivot. Go back to what we once said was our goal. Get al Qaeda. Take them out wherever they happen to be. We know we can do it. We have done it.

Anybody who wants to play the al Qaeda game on their side, know that this Nation has the capability to take you out.

My good friend, Mr. LEWIS, the next time you want to recite the history of Afghanistan, recite the full history of Afghanistan, including this Nation's 10-year effort and all of the mistakes that we have made. Let us not compound those mistakes by continuing on the same course for another 3, 4, 5 years and beyond. It's time to end this war. It's time to focus on the true enemy here—al Qaeda.

Ms. LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 122, line 10, strike "Not" and insert "(a) Not".

Page 124, after line 7, insert the following: (b) It is the sense of Congress that suicide prevention programs should be a priority of the military departments with respect to reinvesting the efficiency savings described in subsection (a).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. This is a very simple amendment. It clarifies that the Defense suicide prevention programs are a priority and should always remain a priority.

I am not alone in my concern for the rates of suicide among our servicemembers in the active duty, Guard, and Reserve components. I, like some of the rest of you, have had that experience with my own constituency back in the Iowa Reserve.

The Department of Defense has identified large potential savings from improved efficiencies, totaling as much as \$100 billion over the next 5 years. Section 8128 directs the Secretary to report to Congress on how it will redirect those savings into priorities of the military departments. However, there is no direction that ensures that the Secretary include existing suicide programs as "priorities" for reinvestment from these savings.

This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will remain a priority. We must do everything in our power to reduce the suicide rates of our men and women in uniform, and this amendment fulfills that obligation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill; therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

This amendment proposes to state a legislative position, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, as you might expect, respectfully I rise in opposition to the point of order.

In accordance with clause 2 of rule XXI, this amendment does not make a new appropriation; it does not re-appropriate unused funds; it does not restrict the availability of funds; and it does not change existing law.

In fact, Defense suicide prevention programs have already been authorized by law, for example, the Yellow Ribbon Program, which helps support National Guard and Reserve servicemembers and families. This amendment simply clarifies that suicide prevention programs—which already exist and have already been authorized—are a priority and will always remain a priority. So I humbly suggest that no one in good conscience could suggest otherwise.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language expressing the sense of Congress.

The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

□ 2020

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8129. 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 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.

SEC. 8130. 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 of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months.

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$6,822,635,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$3,438,789,000)".

Page 125, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$445,117,000)".

Page 125, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$337,774,000)".

Page 125, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$665,978,000)".

Page 126, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$103,610,000)".

Page 126, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$20,878,000)".

Page 126, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$12,714,000)".

Page 126, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$13,411,000)".

Page 127, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$315,703,000)".

Page 127, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$4,719,000)".

Page 127, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$11,012,116,000)".

Page 127, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$2,021,929,000)".

Page 128, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$1,160,729,000)".

Page 128, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$3,010,749,000)”.

Page 128, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,948,995,000)”.

Page 130, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$70,707,000)”.

Page 130, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 130, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$11,731,000)”.

Page 131, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$119,794,000)”.

Page 131, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$10,159,000)”.

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,625,451,000)”.

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$154,418,000)”.

Page 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$4,161,156,000)”.

Page 138, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$21,099,000)”.

Page 139, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$5,546,000)”.

Page 139, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$34,740,000)”.

Page 139, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$223,174,000)”.

Page 140, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$6,847,000)”.

Page 140, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$52,352,000)”.

Page 140, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$40,179,000)”.

Page 141, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$210,224,000)”.

Page 141, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$4,738,000)”.

Page 142, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$15,423,000)”.

Page 142, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$483,835,000)”.

Page 142, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$61,480,000)”.

Page 143, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$941,192,000)”.

Page 144, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,419,000)”.

Page 144, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$8,253,000)”.

Page 145, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$22,523,000)”.

Page 145, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$30,609,000)”.

Page 145, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$133,194,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, relating to the spending reduction account, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$33,000,124,000)”.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Let me just first thank Chairman ROGERS, our ranking member, Mr. DICKS, and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in putting together this bill.

I rise today to offer the Lee-Jones amendment, joined by Representatives NADLER; WOOLSEY; OLVER; STARK; JESSE JACKSON, JR.; HONDA; CONYERS; GRIJALVA; PAUL; and AMASH. And I want to thank each of my colleagues for joining Representative JONES and me on this important amendment.

This amendment would end the war in Afghanistan by ending the funding for combat operations but would provide funds to bring our troops home in a safe and orderly manner. And while I would have preferred to offer the Lee amendment, which I have offered in the past—to fence off and to limit funding to the safe, orderly withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan—I was unable to do so today given that we are debating on an appropriations bill. So I want to emphasize again this important point: that while this amendment cuts war funding, it cuts combat operations funding, but it does leave enough funding to provide for the safe and orderly return of all U.S. forces from Afghanistan.

I speak today as the daughter of a lieutenant colonel who fought in several wars, one who knows the trauma and devastation of wars on families. I want to be clear that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and commitment in Afghanistan. They are doing everything we asked them to do. But the truth is that they have been put in an impossible position. They are fighting in a way with no military solution and no end in sight. Only a political and diplomatic solution and a regional stabilization strategy will end this war.

In fact, this concern of “war without end” is why I opposed the resolution authorizing military force on September 14, 2001. It began a series of blank checks that we have been writing for nearly a decade now.

There are few things that we know with certainty regarding the situation in Afghanistan:

We know that corruption persists unabated, and in many cases has been fueled by the U.S. occupation and influx of foreign cash. President Karzai has proven himself time and time again unwilling—or, at the very least, un-

able—to meaningfully root out corruption within his own administration;

We know that the United States troop presence has increased from 4,000 troops in 2002 to almost 100,000 in 2011. At the same time, military and civilian casualties have increased at record rates, and violence is on the rise;

We also know that al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan has been all but eliminated, and Osama bin Laden is dead. It's not feasible or in our national security interest to address this threat through a military-first, boots-on-the-ground strategy in Afghanistan;

And we know, as military and foreign policy experts from across the political spectrum have told us repeatedly, that the situation in Afghanistan will not be resolved by a military solution.

We need to bring our troops home safely and swiftly, and that is why I am offering this amendment.

This war is costing us too much. With over 1,600 troops killed and tens of thousands more seriously wounded in Afghanistan, the human toll continues to mount every day. And we have already spent over \$400 billion fighting in Afghanistan. It is past time to admit that we can no longer afford to send more blank checks for a war without end.

The United States has squandered more than \$1.1 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Economists estimate that the total direct and indirect costs of these two wars by their end may total as much as \$6 trillion.

With no military solution, we need to redirect these funds to job creation and supporting those efforts for the most vulnerable, including those who have been unemployed for over 2 years and have no more unemployment benefits. While we spend \$2 billion a week—mind you, \$2 billion a week—on this decade-long war, critical programs like Medicare are on the chopping block as we seek to get our Nation's finances in order.

The American people are sick and tired of this war and the massive unending spending that it requires.

Just last month, the United States Conference of Mayors passed a resolution to end the wars and to use the savings to build bridges and schools and infrastructure here at home where it is needed. The resolution specifically calls on the President and the United States Congress to end the wars as soon as strategically possible and bring these war dollars home to meet vital human needs, promote job creation, rebuild our infrastructure, aid municipal and State governments, and develop a new economy based on renewable, sustainable energy and reduce the Federal debt.

We need to bring our troops back and use the savings to address our Nation's fiscal challenges. The American people recognize this. It's time to say that enough is enough. It's time to begin with safe and orderly withdrawal of United States troops from Afghanistan. This amendment does just that by ending the funding of combat operations in

Afghanistan while maintaining funds for a safe and orderly withdrawal.

This is not a cut-and-run amendment. This is a responsible amendment to bring our troops home now. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, helping to bring our servicemen and -women home safely and ending the war in Afghanistan.

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

Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has an amendment to reduce the overseas contingency operation—aka the war on terror—by \$33 billion. She intends for this amendment to support, as she says, an orderly withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan. However, such a reduction would, in fact, severely disrupt and suspend a redeployment from Afghanistan. The magnitude of her funding reduction would also threaten the ability to support troop pay and safety.

The committee has provided funds to begin the redeployment of troops in Afghanistan. If the redeployment from Afghanistan were to be accelerated, there would be significant increases in personnel, equipment, and transportation costs in fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my dear friend Congresswoman LEE and the rest of the authors.

Congresswoman LEE is a courageous voice for peace in Afghanistan and around the world, and what she says—this is the bottom line of this amendment—is clear: We should not spend one more dime waging war in Afghanistan. The only money we appropriate must be used to wind down the war with the safe, orderly, complete, and long overdue military redeployment out of Afghanistan.

□ 2030

The White House announced about 2 weeks ago that we would have a troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. I believe that announcement was tragically inadequate. Actually, I was hoping to hear that at least 50,000 troops would be coming home by the end of 2011. Instead, the President announced his intention to wait another year, the summer of 2012, before removing the 33,000 troops that were added with the surge. Too slow, too cautious, too modest.

I don't know how much clearer the writing on the wall has to be, Mr.

Chairman. Afghanistan remains in terrible disarray, with a terribly corrupt central government and a security force actually incapable of enforcing security. Our military footprint isn't doing enough in Afghanistan. It is actually causing more harm than good. Meanwhile, the human cost here at home is nothing short of devastating. Casualties have spiked. Americans are dying in Afghanistan at an unacceptable rate, more than 200 troops so far this year and over 1,600 troops since the war began nearly a decade ago.

And, Mr. Chairman, making it home alive doesn't mean making it home whole. Thousands upon thousands of servicemembers will spend the rest of their lives coping with the wounds and the scars they acquired in this unnecessary war. Many have left limbs behind in Afghanistan. Others will never regain their mental health or their peace of mind, suffering the devastating effects of PTSD.

Why would we continue to throw another dollar at a war that has done so much to hurt our people and Afghan civilians and done so little to help Afghanistan in general? This week, as a matter of fact, all of Washington is abuzz about the debt ceiling negotiations. Commentators are asking us, where will we find consensus that preserves the full faith and credit of the United States of America? Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus in the United States, a consensus among the American people, and that is that the \$10 billion a month that we're spending in Afghanistan is roughly \$10 billion too much. But war spending is not on the table in these talks. Instead, Medicare cuts are on the table, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are clinging tight to loopholes and subsidies for oil companies, corporate jets, and the horse racing industry. Their spending priorities are just totally warped.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to bring all this in line with the priorities of the American people. It's time to end this war. It's time to stop investing money that we need right here at home, and it is time to invest only in bringing our troops home safely.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. NADLER. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I won't take 5 minutes.

I rise to speak in support of the Lee amendment, which I have the honor of cosponsoring. My views on Afghanistan, I expressed a little while ago, but I just want to make a couple of comments.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) said we have to be careful, that we have to be wary of a vacuum should we pull out. He analogized it to what

happened with the Soviets when the Soviets lost and there was a vacuum because we turned our backs on it. And he was right. We should not have turned our backs on helping, on helping with schooling and other things in Afghanistan at that time. But the fact of the matter is the world's history is full of empires that threw away their substance on silly military adventures. This is a silly military adventure. It's a total waste, because it is a classic, where we are fighting when we have forgotten why we are fighting.

We went into Afghanistan to get rid of the al Qaeda bases. That took a week. For good measure we spent another week and got rid of the Taliban government. And now what are we fighting for for the last 8 years? To put a government in our image? It's not going to happen. To install and see that there is a government that can rule from Kabul? There hasn't been a government in Kabul who has run the entire country since Alexander the Great. That's not going to happen.

We can't settle their civil war, which has now gone on for 35 years, nor will settling their civil war aid our security, which we can't do anyway, and we don't have to. Our security is fighting the terrorists, but the terrorists are all over the place. And maybe we have to, if they develop a base in Pakistan, maybe we have to bomb it or send in special forces. Ditto for Somalia, Yemen, or God knows where.

Every sovereign country as a condition of its sovereignty must make sure that its territory is not used to attack someone else, and if territory of some country is being used to attack us, or to plot mayhem against us, we have the right and the duty, if necessary, to deal with that. But that's not the question in Afghanistan. The CIA, as I said before, tells us there are fewer than 100 people there. Why do we need 70,000 troops? Those troops could be better occupied back home in the United States training, helping fight disasters. Our money could be better occupied dealing with our serious fiscal problems, building up our infrastructure, building up our schools, building up our social services, and even building up our military for real threats.

There are real threats in the world. Pakistan is dangerous because they have nuclear weapons. We have to pay attention to it. But I fail to see any purpose whatsoever for having tens of thousands of troops, tens of billions of dollars in Afghanistan where we vanquished the enemy 10 years ago. We ought to declare victory, we should have pulled out, and we should do so right now.

I thank the gentlelady for her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,695,031,000)”.

Page 125, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$348,845,000)”.

Page 125, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$264,718,000)”.

Page 125, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$521,937,000)”.

Page 126, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$81,201,000)”.

Page 126, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$16,362,000)”.

Page 126, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,964,000)”.

Page 126, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,511,000)”.

Page 127, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$247,421,000)”.

Page 127, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,698,000)”.

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$8,662,596,000)”.

Page 127, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,584,616,000)”.

Page 128, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$909,681,000)”.

Page 128, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,359,569,000)”.

Page 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,527,457,000)”.

Page 130, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$55,414,000)”.

Page 130, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,674,000)”.

Page 130, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,193,000)”.

Page 131, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$93,884,000)”.

Page 131, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,962,000)”.

Page 133, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,748,000)”.

Page 139, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$17,697,000)”.

Page 139, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$113,688,000)”.

Page 140, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,488,000)”.

Page 140, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$26,669,000)”.

Page 140, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,468,000)”.

Page 141, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$107,091,000)”.

Page 141, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,414,000)”.

Page 142, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$7,857,000)”.

Page 142, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$246,473,000)”.

Page 142, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$31,319,000)”.

Page 143, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$737,626,000)”.

Page 144, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$723,000)”.

Page 144, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,204,000)”.

Page 145, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,474,000)”.

Page 145, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,593,000)”.

Page 145, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$104,386,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,887,651,000)”.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with reading the rest of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2040

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank my colleagues for bringing that recitation to an end, but I also urge my colleagues to pay careful attention to what we’re trying to accomplish here. I’ll try to explain it without reading each and every one of those lines.

The Afghan Study Group, Richard Haas and many others who are very familiar with the Afghanistan war and the way in which it is being conducted have suggested that by the end of 2012, America should have no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan and then further, wind down the war in 2013 to 10,000 troops focused on terrorists, focused on al Qaeda.

As I spoke a few moments ago on this issue, this amendment is to accomplish that goal, to wind down the war in a responsible way over the next 18 months so that at the end of the 18 months—that would be December 31, 2012—that there’d be no more than 25,000 troops in Afghanistan.

Now, unfortunately, I can’t add the rest of it, but I will at least give the reason for this. And that is to pivot on the success of getting bin Laden. We went to Afghanistan to get al Qaeda. We succeeded. And now we are involved in a civil war, a great civil war, a five-sided civil war, maybe a six- or seven-sided civil war; and we are supporting a government in that war that is at best corrupt and quite possibly even more inept. So what are we doing there besides spending \$120 billion a year?

Well, we are kind of fighting it out. We’re losing a lot of Americans, and even more Afghans are dying. We’re not going to be able to solve this with troops on the ground. This war needs to be negotiated. As much effort as we are spending on the troops, we should spend on negotiations. Unfortunately, little or no negotiations are going on that are at least talked about publicly; and I would hope they’re going on privately, secretly, but I don’t think that to be the case.

So we need a negotiated settlement; we need to pivot on the success of bin Laden. We need to focus like a laser on al Qaeda wherever they happen to be in the world. And we know that they are in Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, other places in the world—including the United States. So our focus must be on that, not on this civil war. We cannot solve it with our troops in Afghanistan.

This amendment would cause us, as Members of Congress, to exert the au-

thority given to us by the Constitution, that is, the power of the purse, and by denying funding for more than 25,000 troops at the end of 2012, we will accomplish the goal of rapidly, appropriately winding down the war. Not my words, but the words of the Afghan Study Group and Richard Haas—people who know these issues.

We must do this for our own good, for the good of this Nation. We’re sitting here in the midst of a great debate upon a default crisis, a back-and-forth about how do we deal with the deficit. Well, one way we can deal with the deficit is to end this war; \$120 billion a year adds up to a third of a trillion dollars in just 3 years. We’re not suggesting we can get that. We know we’re going to have to maintain some sort of a presence there.

But surely we don’t need to spend \$120 billion in Afghanistan when in our own country we are denying our children an education for lack of money. We are denying our elderly the health care that they need, for example, terminating Medicare for lack of money. We are not feeding our children; “60 Minutes” recently did a heart-wrenching story on homeless children living in cars and hotels in America because their parents have lost their jobs.

We have an unemployment rate that demands our attention, demands our investment in America, rebuilding America’s bridges, roads, rebuilding our manufacturing sector, making it in America once again, rebuilding the real strength of this Nation, its economy, and the middle class so that they can have jobs that will allow them to stay in their homes, provide for their children, live the good American life.

We must end this war. We must first wind it down. Were this more than an appropriation bill, I would have gone to step two, which is 10,000 at the end of 2013 with a mission that is the original mission, that is, going after the terrorists, not nation-building. We must, as the President said, rebuild our Nation. And unlike the President, this amendment offers us the opportunity to use our money to rebuild this Nation.

By the way, for you deficit hawks, it’s all borrowed money. You’re borrowing money for Afghanistan, or you’re borrowing money to rebuild this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We oppose this amendment for the same reason we opposed the gentlewoman’s amendment from California on the last. It would be highly disruptive to our troops and, I think, put them at great risk for their personal safety. So we oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$919,034,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$675,360,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$1,436,353,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army", \$207,162,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy", \$44,530,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps", \$25,421,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force", \$26,815,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army", \$646,879,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force", \$9,435,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$39,175,755,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on ter-

rorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 149, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

Mr. WELCH (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, one of the central questions that Congress must address is whether to continue the policy and nation-building in Afghanistan. As previous speakers have indicated, it's expensive. It's also very questionable as to whether it's anything but a failure.

□ 2050

The cornerstone of the nation building program is the Commander's Emergency Response Program. That gives the commanders flexibility, at their own discretion, to authorize significant infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, the goal being to win hearts and minds of the Afghan citizens. When you lay it out by its intentions, it's a very reasonable tool to provide to our commanders. The problem is the evidence is in, and it has been a failure.

The \$400 million Commander's Emergency Response Program, CERP, is a central component of what I believe is a failed nation building strategy. And the fundamental question here is this: Does the Defense appropriations bill double down on the nation building approach which has been drawn into such question?

Now, of the CERP development dollars, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, SIGAR, about half of the CERP projects reviewed were unsustainable and fell into disrepair immediately following their transfer into Afghan hands. That failure of sustainment is real, and it is not subject to something that we can control here.

So the question that we have to ask on behalf of our military strategy is, is the money being used in a way that's effective? From the perspective of the Afghans, is it being used on projects that are sustainable? And the evidence, on the basis of our SIGAR report, is the answer is "no." And it's not surprising. You know, we've got to get a bit real

about this, whatever your position is on Afghanistan. If you have a government that has no infrastructure of civil service, that doesn't even have the capacity to do the sustainment, they don't have a civil service that can go out and maintain and repair the roads and other projects, is it realistic to expect that they will?

When you have a government that is corrupt, for whatever reason, but where the money that gets injected by the U.S. taxpayer into these projects, with the best of intentions, gets siphoned off into paying off people who have positions of authority, is that a wise use of our taxpayer dollar? Is it going to help our military ultimately be successful? So the question that we have a responsibility to answer is whether this tool of nation building makes sense.

One of the other questions that I think is fair to ask: Many of us have been to Afghanistan, and we've met with some of our USAID people, our State Department people who are out there, our military people of course, trying to implement these projects, Mr. Speaker. The amount of security that is required in order to allow people to do the simplest of projects in the middle of a shooting war is an enormous expense. And the question that comes to mind for me, and I think many Americans, is this: Does it make sense to do these infrastructure projects, these hearts and minds projects in the middle of a shooting war, or are those things that have to be done before or after? That's really the question.

So the intention of this program makes sense. The flexibility for our commanders they see as desirable. It is a tool that they can use. But we have had 10 years now of history. We have had a fully blown report by SIGAR that has said it just doesn't work. It just doesn't work.

So is it time for this Congress to call the question about the wisdom and the efficacy of this nation building tool, the CERP programs that fall into disrepair immediately upon their completion?

Our amendment calls the question, Mr. Speaker. And it would cut in half, which is about the amount that's documented to be wasted, the amount that is spent by U.S. taxpayers on these nation building activities in Afghanistan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under section 3(j) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, because the amendment does not merely propose to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill, but also proposes language other than the amounts.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on this point of order? The Chair will rule.

To be considered en bloc pursuant to section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5, an amendment must propose only to transfer appropriations from an object or objects in the bill to a spending reduction account. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont proposes other changes to the bill, namely changing the level of a limitation, it may not avail itself of section 3(j)(1) of House Resolution 5 to address the spending reduction account. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000) (increased by \$15,000,000)”.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment tonight that will save both blood and an immense amount of money. The amendment I am introducing along with Congressman BLUMENAUER designates already authorized funds in the amount of \$15 million to be used to insulate the shelters at forward operating bases in Afghanistan. Properly insulating military shelters can significantly reduce energy consumption, which in turn can decrease the number of vulnerable fuel convoys needed to support our troops.

These fuel convoys cost us dearly. They are an absolutely vital supply link to our troops in the field, but they are exposed to constant and devastating attack. Despite the Pentagon spending \$24 billion a year to protect fuel convoys in Afghanistan, more than 3,000 troops and civilian contractors have been killed or wounded while riding on convoy. What's more, fully two-thirds of the fuel used in Afghanistan goes to provide electricity for air-conditioning and heat at military installations. If we can reduce the energy required to heat and cool shelters in the field, then we can reduce the number of vulnerable fuel trucks needed to support the operations. Simply put, insulating the structures in the field will save lives of people who will not be on convoys to be attacked.

We will also save money. Properly insulated shelters use up to 92 percent less energy for their heating and cooling. With more than 200,000 gallons of diesel fuel used every day to power our forward operating bases in Afghanistan, insulating our field shelters has the potential to significantly reduce fuel consumption. A similar insulation effort in Iraq has led to almost \$1 billion a year in savings and has taken more than 11,000 fuel trucks off the road. This in turn has helped to prevent an estimated 458 casualties in Iraq.

A little arithmetic will show you that this \$15 million invested in insulating the shelters in the forward bases in Afghanistan should save several billion dollars in costs, as well as thousands of lives.

I want to thank Congressmen BLUMENAUER, HINCHEY, and WELCH for their support of this amendment. Together, the amendment provides a common-sense way to reduce fuel consumption across the war zone. This would save about two-thirds of the 200,000 gallons used a day. With the total cost of fuel sometimes exceeding \$400 a gallon in Afghanistan, including the transport costs, and thousands of casualties suffered by fuel convoys, a small investment of \$15 million in energy efficient insulation can go a long way in saving thousands of lives and upwards of billions of dollars in resources.

I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

□ 2100

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very, very similar to one that the House rejected earlier today.

The project that would be funded by this amendment, by the shifting of this money, is not an authorized program to begin with. But even if it were, the Army's O&M account in the OCO portion of the bill is funded at over \$39.1 billion.

And should this project remain in the final authorization bill and the Department concurs that it is a high enough priority, then there simply are ample funds to cover it with the \$39.1 billion.

So I see no reason for this amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GARDNER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, \$6,749,489,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$3,571,210,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$10,739,587,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$9,312,876,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading:

(1) Not to exceed \$12,500,000 for the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund, to be used in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(2) Not to exceed \$1,750,000,000, to remain available until expended, for payments to reimburse key cooperating nations for logistical, military, and other support, including access provided to United States military operations in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That such reimbursement payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, based on documentation determined by the Secretary of Defense to adequately account for the support provided, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the requirement to provide notification shall not apply with respect to a reimbursement for access based on an international agreement: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for the purpose of providing specialized training and procuring supplies and specialized equipment and providing such supplies and loaning such equipment on a non-reimbursable basis to coalition forces supporting United States military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and 15 days following notification to the appropriate congressional committees: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the use of funds provided in this paragraph.

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 128, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)”.

Page 129, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)”.

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000,000)”.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the money that we give Pakistan. It specifically deals with the reimbursement account that the United States pays for the war on terror to reimburse Pakistan for the spending that they do and the money that they request back from the United States, specifically takes \$1 billion out of the reimbursement account and applies it to the reimbursement or, excuse me, the Spending Reduction Act.

Since May 2, when Osama bin Laden was taken out and we learned more about the role that Pakistan is playing—or, shall I say, not playing—in the war on terror, they have become more and more an unfaithful ally. President Bush said, when the war on terror began, to the countries throughout the world, either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.

Pakistan has yet to prove which side they are really on, so much so that when Osama bin Laden was taken out by the American military, we did not trust Pakistan enough to even tell them that we were going to come into their country. Our distrust against that country has been proven over and over again since that date.

On May 16, the Wall Street Journal reported that over 40 percent of the money that Pakistan requests for reimbursement for military aid is denied by the Federal Government because those claims are unfounded by the Federal Government. In one case last year, the United States paid millions of dollars to refurbish four helicopters to help Pakistan's Army transport troops into battle against the Taliban, but it turned out that Pakistan diverted three of those aircraft to peacekeeping duties in Sudan operations for which Pakistan receives compensation from the United Nations.

Other claims include a \$26 million charge for barbed wire and pickets and \$70 million for radar maintenance, although there is no enemy air threat related to the war on terror.

And on May 22, 15 to 20 militants stormed three hangars at the naval aviation base in Karachi. It took the Pakistan military over 15 hours to end that siege.

Two U.S. P-3Cs were destroyed. The P-3C is an anti-submarine and marine surveillance aircraft. Some reports now indicate it was an inside job, as the terrorists had military uniforms and knew exactly where the planes were located.

Then on June 14, reports confirmed that Pakistan now has arrested CIA informants that helped us locate Osama bin Laden, where he had been living under the eyes of the Pakistan military for years.

As reported in The New York Times on June 14, ISI arrested 30 Pakistani informants who helped the United States capture bin Laden. One was a Pakistani Army major who officials said copied the license plates of cars visiting bin Laden's compound at Abbottabad.

Then further, in June, when CIA Director Leon Panetta went to Pakistan to inform them that there was a factory that was making bombs or IEDs that could be used against Americans, by the time the Pakistani troops showed up, the militants had disappeared.

Not to be outdone, we told them again about a second place where IEDs were being made, more bomb-making facilities only days later, and once again the terrorists picked up and dis-

appeared. Sounds like they had inside information.

And lastly, on June 29, Pakistan asked the United States to shut down a drone base that it had in Islamabad and ended U.S. operations at the Shamsi Air Base. Although the United States denies that occurred, Pakistan's defense minister said that it has ended those operations. And, of course, drones carry out strikes against the Taliban and al Qaeda militants on Pakistan's border with Afghanistan.

And lastly, Transparency International has rated 178 countries on corruption, and Pakistan, our so-called ally, is rated the 143rd most corrupt, beating out, of course, Bangladesh and Nigeria, who have less corruption in their governments.

So we are dealing with a corrupt government. We don't know where our money is going. It may end up in the hands of people who hate us. It's being wasted. The Pakistan military, the Pakistan Government is trying to play at least two sides: our side, their side. They may be on a third side, who knows. But a billion dollars that we send them for so-called reimbursement of the war on terror, we can stop that. They are an unfaithful ally.

Only 17 percent of the Pakistani citizens say they even like the United States. That puts 83 percent that do not like the United States. We don't need to pay the Pakistan people to hate us. They will do it on their own.

So we no longer need to fund them. We need to take a billion dollars out of this account and put it into the deficit reduction spending account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. The bill includes approximately \$2.4 billion to support the Pakistani military. Of this amount, 1.1 billion is for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund and approximately 1.3 billion is provided through Coalition Support Funds.

The Pakistani Counterinsurgency Fund provides for the training and equipping of Pakistani forces specifically to aid U.S. counterterrorism objectives. Coalition Support Funds are used to reimburse the Pakistani military for operations which generally support U.S. counterterrorism objectives.

In the wake of Osama bin Laden's killing by U.S. Special Forces, serious questions have arisen about Pakistan's reliability as a strategic partner. And I must say that I agree with much of what the gentleman from Texas has just said.

The relationship with Pakistan has always been difficult, but maintaining the relationship is essential. This relationship helped the U.S. make progress against terrorism, and the Pakistanis have allocated a significant part of their forces within their own borders to this mission.

A complete withdrawal of U.S. assistance would likely polarize Pakistan and exacerbate significant pro- and anti-American rifts with their military and their government generally. Aggravating this divide would be counterproductive to U.S. objectives in the region, and we must remember that they are also a nuclear power.

In addition to the counterterrorism activity, the fact of Pakistan's nuclear weapons capabilities provides ample reason for the U.S. to continue to try and engage Pakistan.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2110

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The ranking member, Mr. DICKS, has eloquently pointed out why we are opposing this amendment. But like Mr. DICKS and like Mr. POE, the author of the amendment, I couldn't agree more. If this language included the word Pakistan, I would probably have to have a different attitude on this amendment because I share those concerns and I share them strongly. However, I understand the importance of our coalition and the coalition support fund that we have agreed to and the importance of maintaining that agreement.

But I would say that someone at a higher level who deals diplomatically with other countries, including Pakistan, has dropped the ball somewhere. I agree with Mr. POE, but I just don't think that we can be in a position where we can renege on our agreements and arrangements with our coalition partners, because they are very important to us and to the missions that we face.

So as reluctant as I might be because I share Mr. POE's thoughts, I also will oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", \$217,500,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$74,148,000:

Provided, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS
RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", \$36,084,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", \$142,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", \$387,544,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL
GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", \$34,050,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, there is appropriated \$5,000,000,000 for the "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" for expenses directly relating to overseas contingency operations by United States military forces, to be available until expended: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress): *Provided further*, That of the funds made available in this section, the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, procurement accounts, and working capital fund accounts: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, that the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to such transfer: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as originally appropriated.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 131, line 25, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000,000)".

Ms. LEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE. I want to once again thank Mr. ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this bill. Let me also thank my colleagues who are joining Representative JONES and me on this bipartisan amendment: Representatives WOOLSEY, OLVER, HONDA, GRIJALVA and PAUL.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer the Lee-Jones amendment to redirect the \$5 billion of the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund into a deficit reduction account. This amendment does nothing to undermine the efforts that our servicemen and -women have performed with incredible courage and with extreme commitment in Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world. They have done everything asked of them. And as the daughter of a military veteran, I take any matters that affect our troops very, very seriously.

But supporting our troops does not mean giving a blank check to the Pentagon. I have consistently said that we cannot afford to give any more blank checks to the Defense Department.

This amendment is about eliminating a giant \$5 billion check with a blank memo to fight the global war on terror anywhere, at any time, without any accountability. The Department of Defense just has to notify Congress that these funds are being transferred.

This \$5 billion giveaway, which is what it is, it's like a slush fund, it's like a war slush fund, another giveaway to the Pentagon. It's a \$5 billion check to use as it pleases with little or no congressional oversight. There's no accountability in how these funds are spent. While we understand that the Pentagon needs flexibility to address terrorist threats to this Nation and around the world, we need not create a separate slush fund, mind you, to do it. The flexibility has been given elsewhere in this bill, including \$119 billion in flexibility in this appropriations bill, a tremendous amount, at a time when we are cutting aid to American families who need assistance with buying food or receiving health care and also during a time when there are many calling for cuts in Medicare.

We already have a process in place for the Pentagon to get additional funds, as needed, outside of this appropriations bill; and the Congress has consistently responded well to the needs of the military. But Congress does not need to create a \$5 billion war slush fund. The Pentagon can incorporate its work to fight terrorism globally into its budget while taking steps

to rein in waste, fraud, and abuse in an already bloated budget.

Sixty cents of every dollar of discretionary funds is already handed over to the Pentagon. There's no doubt that this war slush fund would give rise to opportunities for waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon, such as the more than \$300 billion in major weapons system cost overruns identified by GAO.

It's time to address the culture of unlimited spending and no accountability at the Pentagon. Being strong on defense does not mean we have to give a free pass for irresponsible spending.

During such austere times, does the Pentagon really need another slush fund? Why can't the Pentagon budget for its wars, budget for preventing terrorist attacks? It's time to hold the Defense Department accountable for its bloated budget and rein in waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon by ending this war slush fund before it ever gets started.

I think the American people would be shocked to know what's taking place in this budget, especially this \$5 billion in war funding that's just put aside for the Pentagon to use as it pleases.

And so I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" to end this slush fund, and let's begin to start reining in these blank checks for the Pentagon. We're asking people who are vulnerable, we're asking our senior citizens, we're asking low-income individuals, we're asking everyone in this country to pay for this deficit and this debt. And we know how we got there.

But we need to really start beginning to look at deficit reduction in a real way, and in a way that is balanced, as the President said. And I don't think allowing a \$5 billion slush fund really moves us in the correct direction. It really is, I think, a sad day to think that we would allow for the Pentagon to have a \$5 billion slush fund when we cut funding for women and children and people who are hungry, when we won't extend unemployment for people who have exhausted their 99 weeks of unemployment compensation.

I can remember asking the Speaker to allow us to vote for unemployment compensation that would provide for 14 additional weeks of unemployment, but we were told there's no money and that was somewhere between 16, you know, to 20 billion that should have been designated as an emergency. Now we're dealing with a \$5 billion slush fund. So I ask for an "aye" vote to use this money for deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't call this a slush fund. This is not an additional fund that was added by the subcommittee at the request of the Pentagon or the Department of Defense.

When the subcommittee analyzed the request at our hearings and in the subsequent material provided us to justify the budget of the Defense Department for the overseas contingency operations, we had a strong disagreement. We did not think that their figures were well thought out. So rather than appropriate that \$5 billion that they requested, we moved it to what we call this transfer fund. It is not any additional money; it is just taken out of one account and put into another account. This transfer fund is to give the Defense Department some flexibility when they do get their facts and figures together on what the actual costs are.

□ 2120

Now, the \$5 billion, again, is not a slush fund. They can't spend this money without reporting back to Congress. Any money spent from this transfer fund must be reported to Congress, and Congress has 15 days in which to respond to that request.

This was done to try to make sure that we had what they needed, that the Defense Department had what they needed for the overseas contingency operations, but that they had to justify exactly how they were going to use the money. And to the contrary, rather than being the potential slush fund, this is definitely not a slush fund, and so I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, war is not predictable. We have men and women today engaged in combat. And I am a combat veteran with the United States Marine Corps. I served in the first gulf war, and I served in the Iraq war. I wish that war was predictable. I wish we knew what the enemy was going to do and when they were going to do it, but we don't know that. This is a dedicated fund to the global war on terror. It provides flexibility that is necessary for our commanders in the field at this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and would hope that it would be voted down.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States the "Afghanistan

Infrastructure Fund". For the "Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund", \$475,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such sums shall be available for infrastructure projects in Afghanistan, notwithstanding any other provision of law, which shall be undertaken by the Secretary of State, unless the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense jointly decide that a specific project will be undertaken by the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the infrastructure referred to in the preceding proviso is in support of the counterinsurgency strategy, requiring funding for facility and infrastructure projects, including, but not limited to, water, power, and transportation projects and related maintenance and sustainment costs: *Provided further*, That the authority to undertake such infrastructure projects is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That any projects funded by this appropriation shall be jointly formulated and concurred in by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred to the Department of State for purposes of undertaking projects, which funds shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That any unexpended funds transferred to the Secretary of State under this authority shall be returned to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund if the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, determines that the project cannot be implemented for any reason, or that the project no longer supports the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That any funds returned to the Secretary of Defense under the previous proviso shall be available for use under this appropriation and shall be treated in the same manner as funds not transferred to the Secretary of State: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein to the Secretary of State in accordance with section 635(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund, to remain available until expended, and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers to or from, or obligations from the Fund, notify the appropriate committees of Congress in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of the section the "appropriate committees of Congress" are the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the Defense appropriations bill is one of our primary funding bills to help protect our country against threats. However, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, correctly said that our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

With that said, finding dollars that can be diverted from lower priorities to apply to deficit reduction will indeed make America safer. This amendment will reduce funding for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund by \$200 million and return those funds to help reduce the deficit. That is \$200 million to help reduce the deficit.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund was established to provide funds for infrastructure projects, and some reports also indicate funds could be used for other purposes; but, predominantly, they are for infrastructure purposes. My amendment does not completely eliminate funding. It keeps over \$200 million in the infrastructure fund, but it reduces it so we can take a serious look at how we can achieve savings to reduce the deficit in funds spent overseas that are not being used properly and effectively.

With the death of Osama bin Laden, there is not a need for a large U.S. presence in Afghanistan. In fact, the killing of Osama bin Laden was the biggest deficit reduction action this country has known if we take advantage of that action and act on it to make it into a deficit reduction action. We need to rethink our goals and strategy in Afghanistan.

According to the World Bank, 97 percent of Afghanistan's gross domestic product is derived from military funding and foreign assistance—97 percent. If we build a vast infrastructure in Afghanistan, they will not be able to sustain it after we leave. The American people should not have to fund that infrastructure while sitting in traffic in our own Nation, in gridlock, seeing schools in disrepair, hospitals that can't provide services, and watching our own infrastructure crumble—infrastructure that can create and does create jobs carrying goods to market and providing jobs in America.

If House rules permitted, I would direct some of these funds toward building our own infrastructure. That's what we need to do. But that's not the case. The Afghan Government cannot spend all that we are giving to it, and our funding is only fueling corruption and profiteering.

Mr. POE mentioned Pakistan being third from the bottom ahead of Nigeria and another nation. Afghanistan is right there with them. They are fighting for the third to last place. Afghanistan is historically a corrupt nation, and what fosters corruption is money and the moneys that we give them; and 97 percent comes from us. It is going into the pockets of people who aren't

using it to build that infrastructure to help their own people. We are fostering corruption. Afghans could build their own infrastructure for far less than we are investing.

We need to pull back some of this funding to focus on our domestic priorities, but we need to be concerned about our deficit. Let's keep America safe and strong on all fronts.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join with me in a bipartisan effort, stretching from Florida to Tennessee, the width of the Southeastern Conference, and Conference U.S.A., I may say as well for central Florida. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the AIF, Infrastructure Fund for Afghanistan was created by this Congress in the FY 2011 House-passed authorization bill. It was again fully authorized in the FY 2012 House-passed authorization bill. We support the objectives of Operation Enduring Freedom, including the Afghan Security Forces Fund. This is a counterinsurgency tool that General Petraeus placed the highest priority on when he recommended that we create the AIF in place of the CERP, the Commanders Emergency Response Program. So we did that. We took money from the CERP, put the money into the AIF as part of General Petraeus's counterinsurgency program.

So we think this is not a good amendment, and we are opposed to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against my colleague from Tennessee's amendment.

General Petraeus testified before the House Armed Services Committee and stated that the current counterinsurgency strategy employed by U.S. forces and NATO in Afghanistan is seeing success.

I was there in mid-April; and having been there since 2005 through that time frame, the narrative there today is better than it has been since I started going over there in 2005. What we are doing there is working. The Afghan Infrastructure Fund is key to General Petraeus' counterinsurgency campaign as improvements to Afghanistan's infrastructure is necessary to obtain support from the local populace. General Petraeus' successful counterinsurgency strategy is dependent on the local populace and the intelligence they provide.

Visible development projects increases the Afghan Government's legit-

imacy in relation to the Taliban, especially since these projects are conducted in areas vulnerable to Taliban influence. Furthermore, economic development increases security in Afghanistan by providing jobs for former insurgents and building markets for alternative crops to opium, thus reducing corruption.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. The House Armed Services Committee has fully authorized this program. The House Appropriations Committee has gone through this bill with a fine-tooth comb. They believe that these funds will be properly used and properly supervised in the building of Afghan infrastructure as we continue to put in place the system we need so that when we leave, and we will leave, the Afghan people can sustain what we are doing.

One of the messages I got when I was there in April, unlike some of the previous efforts, we will build things to Afghan standards. That is not meant to be a pejorative; it is meant to face reality. When you build a road to U.S. standards, they cannot maintain that road to U.S. standards. But when you build a road to Afghan standards, they can in fact maintain that infrastructure. That is the new paradigm that they are working off of. Good enough for Afghanistan is not a pejorative; it is simply facing a reality that this country is different from the United States, and infrastructure projects there will be built to those Afghan standards.

I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2130

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 133, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$475,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$475,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Afghanistan policy that is funded in the fiscal year 2012 Defense appropriations bill. I join the efforts of my colleagues in a vari-

ety of amendments designed to accelerate the end of the war in Afghanistan.

For more than 9 years now, our troops have been executing the American mission in Afghanistan with bravery, dedication and extraordinary competence; but what started out as a "quick war" in 2001 to bring Osama bin Laden to justice and to dismantle al Qaeda in Afghanistan has turned into the longest war in United States history. The original mission has now been largely accomplished, and with bin Laden's death in Pakistan, this provides an opportunity to reexamine our ongoing mission in Afghanistan, which some estimates indicate is costing us in excess of \$8 billion per month.

We should no longer be sending billions of American taxpayer dollars to the Afghan people for their schools, their hospitals, their roads, bridges, and police at the expense of making those same investments in our own country, especially when the Afghanistan Government, under the leadership of President Karzai, has proven itself incredibly corrupt.

In fact, Transparency International ranked Afghanistan the third most corrupt country in the world; and The New York Times recently reported about a road construction project, just one example in Afghanistan, funded by American taxpayers. It's a 64-mile-long project and is expected to cost \$176 million to build, which comes to \$2.8 million a mile. Undisclosed amounts of money have gone to pay off local strongmen to buy security while the project is ongoing, and it was reported that the people collecting these bribes staged attacks on the construction crews in order to make the bribes necessary in the first place.

With this kind of corruption and many other examples, we simply cannot afford to finance the infrastructure projects associated with this war. Don't forget, Mr. Chairman, that on top of everything else we're not even paying for this war. It's actually being financed on the national credit card. These are difficult economic and budgetary times. It is time to reassess U.S. involvement in Afghanistan so that we can focus on rebuilding our own economy, putting Americans back to work, and making sure our Nation can compete in the 21st century.

That is why I'm offering this amendment today, which will strike \$475 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. Vital investments to our country's economic stability, the education of our children, the health of our seniors, and the employment of our workforce have time and again been put on the chopping block in this Congress. We're told that we can't afford to adequately repair our crumbling infrastructure here in America; we're told that Pell Grants and student loans are too expensive; and we're told that we need to change the safety nets for our Nation's seniors and most vulnerable populations—and in the same

breath, we're told we should continue to borrow billions and billions of dollars for nation-building in Afghanistan. What we really should be doing is nation-building right here at home. Instead of building roads and bridges and hospitals and schools halfway around the world in Afghanistan, we should be investing resources on the urgent needs of our own country.

Budgets are a reflection of our priorities.

Are we going to pay down our Nation's debt? Are we going to make the much needed investments in our own roads and bridges and ports? Are we going to protect our seniors? Are we going to ensure that access to college remains affordable? If we continue to spend billions and billions of dollars in Afghanistan, then we cannot have a balanced discussion of these priorities and these choices.

As we debate the merits of raising the debt ceiling and as we consider our domestic priorities, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which strikes \$475 million from nation-building in Afghanistan in order to keep those dollars right here at home—to invest in our future and to reduce our debt.

There was a recent report, Mr. Chairman, done by the Eisenhower Research Project at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies just this past week. This group's cost of war project has released new figures for a range of costs associated with U.S. military responses to September 11, including our activities in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. They project that the wars will cost Americans between \$3.2- and \$4 trillion and cost 225,000 lives.

It is time to end this spending. It is time to make these investments in infrastructure in our own country, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. This is pretty much the same debate we just had. The difference is that this particular amendment just eliminates the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund altogether, and the other amendment didn't do that.

This account, this Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, was created by Congress in the fiscal 11 authorization bill and again in the fiscal 12 authorization bill—which we just passed a few weeks ago—at the request of General Petraeus, who made this one of the most important parts of his counterinsurgency strategy. Now, if you don't believe that General Petraeus knows what he's talking about, then maybe you should vote for this amendment; but those of us who have watched General Petraeus skillfully function as the leader in Iraq and there again at Cen-

tral Command and there again in Afghanistan, we believe that this is not a good amendment and that it should be defeated, the same as the other amendment that we just defeated, so I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. This amendment is very similar to the one we just debated except as to the amounts, and it does strike the entire infrastructure account. I would like to make a couple of points that I didn't make earlier with respect to the previous amendment.

None of the conversation that I was ever aware of prior to bin Laden's death remotely said that the war was over or that the fight was over if we killed bin Laden. Had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle been making that argument from start one, then it might have some validity to it; but quite frankly, that was just a marker in this long fight against Islamic jihadists and these terrorists.

The other issue of invoking past costs, or sunk costs, is informative as to how we got to this point in time and as to looking at where we go from here to when we have all American troops out of there; but how we make the intelligent decisions and intelligent investments in Afghanistan between now and then is the bigger question. Whatever it costs to fight in Afghanistan, whatever it has cost to fight in Iraq over the past 8 years or whatever, I understand those are big numbers; but we are looking forward as to how we push the Afghan security system to a point where they can take care of themselves and, in fact, begin to run their country as they should.

Most of my good colleagues' arguments were better suited for the conversation we had in April with reference to the overall budget. That budget passed. This amount that we are now going to spend on the Department of Defense fits under the discretionary spending cap that we put in place by the majority vote of this House back in April. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations had done their work, allocated their amount of moneys across a lot of priorities, said "no" to a lot of things, and said "yes" to this issue. So I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. 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 135, line 11, insert before the period at the end the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$236,000,000 to the Secretary of Transportation for the National Infrastructure Investments program".

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading requirement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment would shift \$236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund and would return that money back to the taxpayers of the United States—the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments program.

□ 2140

Look, I understand that we're trying to fight terrorism by spending all this money in Afghanistan, but the best way to protect the American people from terrorist attacks is to repair our roads and bridges, secure our ports, help fund secure rapid transit systems so we don't have to spend as much money buying foreign oil—and you know that some of that money that goes to these foreign countries when we buy oil ends up in the hands of terrorists. Let's redirect a share of the money that is going to rebuild roads in Afghanistan to build and invest in transit in America. Not only is this good for Americans, we're going to pave over all these potholes that are damaging our cars. And with rapid transit programs, we're going to help provide people who can't afford a car—or in my area, in metro Detroit, people can't afford auto insurance even though they have good driving records because they're red-lined. At least if we transfer some of that money to transit, they will have a way to go to work and to other events for leisure.

But the bottom line is this: If we invest this money in the United States as opposed to spending it all in Afghanistan, we're going to create jobs here in the United States. That is the best way

to secure our country—to make sure we put as many people as possible here back to work.

I urge your support on this amendment.

This amendment would shift \$236 million from the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, AIF, to the Department of Transportation's National Infrastructure Investments Program.

The Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund provides funding for infrastructure projects such as water, power and transportation and related maintenance and sustainment cost.

My amendment would cut the amount dedicated to this fund in half. While we can agree that this funding is helpful to the Afghan people, I believe that we need to invest in nation-building at home at least as much as we invest abroad.

My amendment would restore about half of the funding historically given to the National Infrastructure Investments Program, which is zeroed out in this bill.

The National Infrastructure Investments Program awards grants to state, local, and transit agencies on a competitive basis for highway, bridge, port and rail projects that stand to make a significant national or regional impact.

The Department of Transportation estimates that, for every \$1 billion invested in Federal highways, more than \$6.2 billion in economic activity is generated. Spending tax dollars in Afghanistan fails to create the same economic multiplier.

The U.S. has invested approximately \$51 billion in reconstruction and development for Afghanistan since 2002.

Our nation faces an "infrastructure deficit" as well as a fiscal deficit: federal investment in infrastructure has declined as a share of GDP over the past fifty years while the cost of building new infrastructure has risen.

A report from the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that the nation needs \$2.2 trillion dollars of infrastructure expenditure over the next 5 years, but less than half that amount has been budgeted.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's infrastructure needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for the highway, bridge, and port projects that create jobs and further commerce here at home. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to address the point of order?

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I understand the honorable Representative's point of order here.

You know, if there is anything that is not in order, it's the nature of these rules. There are people out here in this country who are taxpayers, they don't want to see their money spent or borrowed in Afghanistan rebuilding their roads when we have all these potholes right here. We should be able to, in this Congress—

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's comments must be confined to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not debating the point of order, and so I insist on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction to transfer funds. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Afghanistan Security Forces Fund", \$12,800,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Afghanistan, including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this heading is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That up to \$15,000,000 of these funds may be available for coalition police trainer life support costs: *Provided further*, That contributions of funds for the purposes provided herein from any person, foreign government, or international organization may be credited to this Fund and used for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing upon the receipt and upon the obligation of any contribution, delineating the sources and amounts of the funds received and the specific use of such contributions: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to obligating from this appropriation account, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such obligation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of any proposed new projects or transfer of funds between budget sub-activity groups in excess of \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursu-

ant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000,000)".

Mr. COHEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I do realize the result of this amendment probably. There is another Latin phrase besides "nunc pro tunc," which is "morituri te salutant," which is basically "we who are about to die salute you."

I understand the votes today, and I see them, but I find it hard to fathom, with the American public—and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are indeed concerned about the deficit, not going at the place where you can really get to the deficit, which is in spending in the defense budget. That's Moby-Dick. You don't throw your harpoons at a minnow; you throw your harpoon at the whale. This is the whale. And Captain Ahab had a good point; you go out there and you see the big one, you go for it.

This would reduce the funds we are giving to the Afghanistan security forces by \$4 billion. It wouldn't take all of it. It would keep two-thirds—they would still have two-thirds. It would reduce it by \$4 billion and return those funds to help the deficit. The \$12.8 billion that is currently allocated to this fund is nearly equivalent to the entire GDP of Afghanistan. Their GDP is \$14 billion to \$16 billion. Let's understand this, Mr. Chairman: We are giving the Afghanistan people their entire GDP, and we're borrowing it from China and other places. This makes no sense. We need to go after the big whale.

Six times the total annual revenue of the Afghan Government—which is approximately \$1.5 billion—is what we're giving them. I understand these funds are to be used to provide assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan, including training and providing equipment, supplies, and services. Well, I have seen soldiers killed over there, my constituents that were killed by Afghanistan soldiers that we trained. We don't know which ones are Taliban and which ones are going to turn on us, and we're training them and giving them weapons.

Roughly \$6 billion of the \$12.8 billion is for salaries and benefits. In light of the President's announcement of withdrawing troops from Afghanistan, we need to make reductions all around, and that includes reduction for these security forces. This country could not, should not fund the structure that the Afghanistan Government cannot fund and at a time when we need to take a look at our deficit.

Now I have heard General Petraeus' name over there. I'm a fan of General Petraeus too, but he's sometimes wrong. He's sometimes wrong. And I think he was for us supporting the President in Libya. And some of the folks over there that are so supportive of General Petraeus weren't so supportive of General Petraeus then. So they understand he's not always right, and he's not right on these funds either. These troops are not going to be trained in a way that they're going to be able to sustain the forces. They're not going to use the weapons, they're not going to be able to supply them. It's going to be a waste.

General Mike Mullen talked about our debt being our biggest security threat, and accordingly we need to re-adjust our priorities and find realistic ways to reduce our deficit. This is a way we can do it and save \$4 billion—still give them \$8.8 billion. It's plenty. I'd like to see it all cut, but I realize that's not realistic. But we are pulling out. We're not going to be able to train those troops to where they're going to be able to maintain the funds to pay those troops in the future. Most of it is salaries, and when we're gone they're not going to have the salaries.

I've been to Afghanistan, you've been to Afghanistan. It is beyond Third World—it's Fourth World, and we're giving them the last of our dollars. If you really, really, really care about reducing the deficit, you've got to go for the whale, you've got to go for the defense budget. And just giving this money to Afghanistan is I think a dereliction of duty.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as we speak, our marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen are fighting for freedom in some of the toughest places imaginable. A vote for this resolution is a vote to pull the support out from under our troops and to leave a legacy of failure in Afghanistan. I urge against supporting this amendment.

Although I applaud the bravery and skill of the personnel who brought Osama bin Laden to justice, it is important to remember that this is not justification to abandon our efforts to increase the security in Afghanistan. The men and women of our military are working tirelessly to increase the proficiency of Afghan security forces, but to transition lead responsibility for

security to them is irresponsible at this time. The Afghan security forces did not suddenly become more proficient because of the death of Osama bin Laden. I am strongly supportive of transitioning responsibility to the Afghan security forces, but only when they are fully prepared to assume that responsibility.

□ 2150

I agree that nation-building should not be a principal tool for achieving America's national security objectives. Such campaigns are too expensive in both blood and treasure, particularly given the circumstances our Nation currently faces. However, this is not an excuse to negate the sacrifices our troops have made or the progress they have won in Afghanistan.

I believe that establishing an arbitrary time line for withdrawal will actually hobble any efforts for a political reconciliation with the Taliban. If they are certain that our forces are leaving before the currently planned transition time line of 2014, they lose all incentive to work with us and the Afghan Government on a political solution.

What this amendment, in fact, does, though, is cuts off funding for the development of Afghan security forces. Our entire exit strategy is based on developing Afghan security forces so that they are strong enough to allow us to pull our forces out to complete a transition whereby they assume operational control by 2014.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Half of the money we give them is for salaries. When we pull out, we don't pay the salaries. Their budget is only like 15 percent of everything we give them. They can't pay the salaries. They can't borrow from China. So what's going to happen then?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. We have three security objectives in Afghanistan. The first is to make sure the Taliban don't take over the entire country. The second is to keep al Qaeda out of the country. And the third is to have a permissive environment from which we can strike targets in Pakistan at will, as we did with Osama bin Laden.

Cutting the legs under the current strategy of giving them the capability of standing up their own security forces completely undermines where we are right now and undermines the President's goals of being able to do that transfer of operational control by 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Colorado for having made a very, very

eloquent statement that really is factual and gets right to the point. But the reason I rise also is earlier in the day, just in case there are Members here tonight that weren't there early today, I did suggest that I might say this again and again and again during this debate. This subcommittee that recommends this bill in a very non-political way, in a very careful way, reviewed and analyzed all of the requests that we had from the administration in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012 appropriations for national defense.

The original recommendation, we reduced by \$9 billion, and I think that is larger than the gentleman's whale, but it is a substantial cut and it was made without any regard to politics. We were extremely careful not to affect the war fighter. We were extremely careful not to affect our Nation's readiness. This is not a good amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. 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 135, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 146, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It reduces the Afghan Security Forces account by about 1 part in 500, one five-hundredth, in order to increase the Defense Health Program account by \$20 million to save soldiers' lives. It will give the Pentagon a much-needed infusion of funds to address a serious gap in our military's suicide prevention.

I learned about this gap through the tragedy of a young constituent from New Jersey who fell through the cracks. He took his own life in September of 2008. But it is not just one soldier. We have a broad problem here. In each of the past 2 years, more American soldiers have died at their own hands than have been killed in war fighting.

Coleman Bean of East Brunswick, New Jersey, attended East Brunswick public schools, he enlisted in the Army

in 2001, and he attended Airborne school at Fort Benning. His first assignment with the 173rd Airborne was in Italy. In 2003, he and the rest of the 173rd conducted a combat jump into Iraq.

Like many of his buddies, he saw the horrors of war firsthand, and, like some, he sought treatment from the VA for his diagnosed post-traumatic stress disorder when he returned home in 2004. He was honorably discharged from active duty in 2005, and, like other Army members, Coleman Bean still had 4 years of reserve duty commitment through what is known as the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) program. He was recalled to duty in Iraq in 2007 through the IRR and was assigned to serve in northern Iraq. When he returned to New Jersey the following year, he was still suffering from the symptoms of PTSD but managed to conceal his condition from even those closest to him. No one reached out to him. Tragically, he took his own life in September 2008. Ironically, tragically, a few weeks after Coleman took his life, the VA called to say that his appointment was ready.

Two Federal agencies charged with helping prevent suicides among our returning soldiers utterly failed this soldier and his family. Indeed, earlier this year, the Ninth Circuit Court, siding with two veterans groups that sued the Department of Veterans Affairs for failing to provide timely care for veterans at risk of suicide, noted that an average of 18 veterans per day take their own lives. We must stop this epidemic. This amendment will help. We can't allow another family to lose a son or a daughter, a father or a mother, a husband or a wife because of buck-passing.

When I investigated Coleman Bean's tragedy, the VA confirmed that they don't offer dedicated suicide prevention programs for members of the IRR. They consider that a DOD responsibility. The DOD officials at TRICARE said that treating IRR members is the VA's problem. Simply stated, if you are a member of the Individual Ready Reserve suffering from PTSD, you're on your own.

The same problem applies to other categories of reservists, such as the Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), and the members of the Inactive National Guard (ING). According to the Defense Department, there are at least 123,000 IRR, IMA, and ING members who have done at least one tour in Iraq or Afghanistan.

My amendment would give the Secretary of Defense the funding needed to expand the suicide prevention outreach program to ensure that members of these reserve units who have served a tour in Iraq or Afghanistan will receive a call from a properly trained counselor not less than once every 90 days so long as the servicemember remains in the IRR, the IMA or the ING. In these calls, the trained counselor would be required to determine the

emotional, psychological, mental, medical and career needs and concerns of the reservist. Covered reservists identified as being at risk would be immediately referred to the nearest military treatment facility.

I have discussed this program with the Pentagon. The Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Dr. Stanley, assures me that the Department has more than adequate legal authority to carry this out. What he needs is funding, and my amendment would provide that funding.

When we get the word out about these counseling services, we save lives. This amendment is budget neutral, it is vitally needed, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

□ 2200

Mr. DICKS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DICKS. I rise in support of the amendment, and urge that we accept it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. 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. HOLT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. 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 136, line 23, insert before the period at the end the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer \$2,000,000,000 to the Secretary of Homeland Security to increase funds available for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605)”.

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

(Mr. CLARKE of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This amendment redirects \$2 billion from Afghanistan Security Forces to the State Homeland Security Grants Program (SHSP).

My amendment makes sure that the Afghanistan Security Forces aren't funded at the expense of our country's Homeland Security efforts.

The State Homeland Security Grants Program ensures that states have strategies in place to protect, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.

State Homeland Security Grants Program was cut dramatically in the FY '12 Homeland Security Appropriations bill and was under-

funded in the FY '11 bill. This amendment would restore grant funding to the FY '10 level to make sure our first responders have the resources they need to keep our communities safe.

My amendment does not jeopardize the training and equipping of the Afghanistan Security Forces. Even with my amendment, the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund is funded above the FY '10 level of \$9.1 billion.

This is an important issue, and we need to make sure we are taking care of our country's homeland security needs. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we have adequate funding for protecting ourselves from terrorism and catastrophic events. I think that as we reassess our mission in Afghanistan we should be able to fund these kinds of important programs and still devote significant savings to the deficit.

However, I understand that the House rules do not allow transfers such as are proposed in this amendment, so I will withdraw the amendment in the hopes we can work on this issue in the future.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does another Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I would like to speak on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is pending.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I would like to speak on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. This bill, this amendment which transfers money from the Afghanistan Security Forces to Homeland Security, it better supports existing law, better supports this defense budget because it better protects the American people, less money by funding police and fire as opposed to blowing all that money in Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again the gentleman is discussing the amendment and not the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will hear Members on the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, just to clarify.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. In order to explain my position on the point of

order, I had to explain the merits of this amendment. This Defense budget is about protecting the American people. I'm saying redirect the money to Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule. For the reasons stated in the previous ruling, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I made this announcement earlier in the day that I would allow the Member to have the 5 minutes to speak on the amendment even though it was subject to a point of order, if that courtesy was not abused. In recent points of order, that courtesy has been abused.

I will continue to show that courtesy to Members who do not abuse their 5 minutes and who do not abuse the point of order.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. As a new Member in this body, I have the utmost respect for this institution and to the chair. And to the extent that I appeared to be out of bounds, I do apologize.

It's the fact that this country is in crisis. We have a huge debt. We have so many people that need jobs. And since the budget resolution was passed, April 15, Osama bin Laden was captured and killed, and that provided us with an opportunity to reassess our mission in Afghanistan.

I want us to take a little share of our money that we're spending in Afghanistan and return it here to protect the American people, and also take the remainder of the savings to pay down our debt.

And I do understand what the rules provide. It is just, Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe these rules are old and out of date. We need to, in this House, respond more quickly and nimbly and more effectively on behalf of the American people.

And my closing point is this. We've spent over \$50 billion in economic aid to Afghanistan. Let's take a share of that money, redirect it back home, create jobs here by repairing our roads and bridges. I understand that we don't want to have safe havens for terrorists around the world like Afghanistan. The best way to protect the American people is invest in homeland security, help fund our police and firefighters. They don't have the equipment that they need. The communication and radios with which they can talk to each other, they can share information.

And also, too, I believe it's the duty of this Congress to find a way to pro-

vide more equipment in funding for police and fire because this Congress in the past had failed to effectively address the foreclosure crisis which really dropped property values so our local units of government don't have the revenue to hire more police and fire.

So saying that, I want to say to the chairman that I respect your position; I respect this institution. I'm here trying to fight for my people I represent in metro Detroit and return American tax dollars back to Americans to create jobs here and to protect Americans here at home.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the "Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund", \$1,100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance to Pakistan's security forces; including program management and the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and funds; and facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction to build the counterinsurgency capability of Pakistan's military and Frontier Corps: *Provided further*, That the authority to provide assistance under this provision is in addition to any other authority to provide assistance to foreign nations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; defense working capital funds; and to the Department of State, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other authority available to the Department of Defense to transfer funds: *Provided further*, That funds so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation account, notify the Committees on Appropriations in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 137, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000,000)".

Page 161, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000,000)".

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief.

I had my argument on the other \$1 billion that I asked to be deducted from the reimbursement account to be sent to the spending reduction account.

This is a separate fund that also gives money to Pakistan, over a billion dollars. I'm asking that a billion dollars of that fund that goes into counterinsurgency also be sent to the spending reduction account.

There are several reasons for that, but the main one is the Pakistan Government is correct: we don't know where the money is going. We found out that after we took out Osama bin Laden, in that compound we found documents that revealed discussions of promises of no al Qaeda attacks in Pakistan in exchange for sheltering Osama bin Laden.

That's the type of things that we wonder about whether Pakistan is on our side or on the side of our enemies. We don't know whose side they're on. So I'd ask the adoption of our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move to strike the final word.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California for any comments he may have.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the goals of this amendment which are to demand accountability from a nation that until recently has been one of our good friends.

Pakistan has faced serious problems throughout its history, and the United States has played a leading role in helping stabilize that troubled nation. We have spent billions and billion of dollars in military support and billions and billions more in economic assistance. We have worked as close as we can with Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies in order to stabilize the border region near Afghanistan where al Qaeda and the Taliban are trying to overthrow both Afghanistan and the Pakistan governments.

It is therefore hard to express the anger and frustration of all Americans when we discovered that Osama bin Laden, the man who had engineered the death of thousands on American soil, was living in comfort just a short drive from Islamabad. And we have asked in vain how this could occur. Rather than help us get to the bottom of how this international criminal could live for years within blocks of their military school, we received protests from Pakistani officials that our brave Special Forces captured and killed bin Laden under their noses.

□ 2210

But, Mr. Chairman, what has really outraged me and many of my colleagues is that the Pakistanis have had

the audacity to arrest and detain the informants who helped us bring this ultimate terrorist to justice. It is almost too much to take, and it is time that we made it clear to the Pakistanis that our friendship is at the breaking point. For this reason, I am convinced that we must carefully scrutinize every dollar that we are spending in Pakistan in this bill, and especially in the Foreign Operations bill.

And, Mr. Chairman, while I want to support Chairman YOUNG and the work of Mr. DICKS, as well as the rest of my colleagues on this committee, I do want to serve notice that as we go forward and I am able to gather more information, I could very well be presenting a very similar amendment in the Foreign Operations bill. It is high time that we get the answers that we seek here and know really which friends are truly our friends.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I continue to be opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the Pakistanis are a troubled ally. They are an unstable Islamic country with extremist tendencies and a country that has nuclear weapons. The funding that we are talking about right now is that which is for training them in counterinsurgency operations.

We have troops in combat at this time in Afghanistan. The Taliban, the Afghan Taliban who are fighting our forces in the field oftentimes have sanctuary in Pakistan. We are trying to stand up a Pakistani military that is not simply exclusively engaged or exclusively focused on a conventional war with India but is able to launch counterinsurgency operations, particularly in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas. I think this funding is critical so long as we have troops in the field in Afghanistan that we seek to maintain, or certainly increase the capability of the Pakistani military counterinsurgency operations.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and would urge my 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 Texas (Mr. POE).

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Army", \$387,900,000, to remain

available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Army", \$118,412,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army", \$37,117,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Army", \$208,381,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Army", \$1,398,195,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", \$492,060,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Weapons Procurement, Navy", \$41,070,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", \$317,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Navy", \$249,514,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$1,183,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", \$440,265,000, to re-

main available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", \$46,920,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", \$139,510,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Air Force", \$3,213,010,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$406,668,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, \$1,500,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2014, of which \$490,000,000 shall be available only for the Army National Guard: *Provided*, That the Chiefs of National Guard and Reserve components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective National Guard or Reserve component: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund, \$3,195,170,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to procure, sustain, transport, and field Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall transfer such funds only to appropriations made available in this or any other Act for operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That such funds transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, not fewer than 10 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees

in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \$8,513,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", \$53,884,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", \$182,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$192,361,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Defense Working Capital Funds", \$435,013,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Defense Health Program", \$1,228,288,000, which shall be for operation and maintenance: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities", \$469,458,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund", \$2,577,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device

Defeat Organization to investigate, develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds provided herein to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; and defense working capital funds to accomplish the purpose provided herein: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall, not fewer than 15 days prior to making transfers from this appropriation, notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Inspector General", \$11,055,000: *Provided*, That each amount in this paragraph is designated as being for the global war on terrorism pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34 (112th Congress).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this title are in addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for 2012.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 9002. Upon the determination of the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer up to \$3,000,000,000 between the appropriations or funds made available to the Department of Defense in this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Congress promptly of each transfer made pursuant to the authority in this section: *Provided further*, That the authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense and is subject to the same terms and conditions as the authority provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012.

SEC. 9003. Supervision and administration costs associated with a construction project funded with appropriations available for operation and maintenance, "Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund" or the "Afghanistan Security Forces Fund" provided in this Act and executed in direct support of overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan, may be obligated at the time a construction contract is awarded: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs include all in-house Government costs.

SEC. 9004. From funds made available in this title, the Secretary of Defense may purchase for use by military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the U. S. Central Command area of responsibility: (a) passenger motor vehicles up to a limit of \$75,000 per vehicle and (b) heavy and light armored vehicles for the physical security of personnel or for force protection purposes up to a limit of \$250,000 per vehicle, notwithstanding price or other limitations applicable to the purchase of passenger carrying vehicles.

SEC. 9005. Not to exceed \$400,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this title under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Army" may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to fund the Com-

mander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Afghanistan to respond to urgent, small scale, humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility: *Provided*, That each project (including any ancillary or related elements in connection with such project) executed under this authority shall not exceed \$20,000,000: *Provided further*, That not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds during that quarter that were made available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein: *Provided further*, That, not later than 30 days after the end of each month, the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees monthly commitment, obligation, and expenditure data for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan: *Provided further*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section or under any other provision of law for the purposes described herein for a project with a total anticipated cost for completion of \$5,000,000 or more, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing each of the following:

(1) The location, nature and purpose of the proposed project, including how the project is intended to advance the military campaign plan for the country in which it is to be carried out.

(2) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, and completion date for the proposed project, including any other CERP funding that has been or is anticipated to be contributed to the completion of the project.

(3) A plan for the sustainment of the proposed project, including the agreement with either the host nation, a non-Department of Defense agency of the United States Government or a third party contributor to finance the sustainment of the activities and maintenance of any equipment or facilities to be provided through the proposed project.

SEC. 9006. Funds available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide supplies, services, transportation, including airlift and sealift, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting military and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees regarding support provided under this section.

SEC. 9007. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended by the United States Government for a purpose as follows:

(1) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) To exercise United States control over any oil resource of Iraq.

(3) To establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

SEC. 9008. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) Sections 1002 and 1003 of the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-148).

SEC. 9009. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 45 days after the end of each fiscal quarter a report on the proposed use of all funds appropriated by this or any prior Act under each of the headings Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund, and Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund on a project-by-project basis, for which the obligation of funds is anticipated during the 3-month period from such date, including estimates for the accounts referred to in this section of the costs required to complete each such project.

(b) The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(1) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) were obligated prior to the submission of the report, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(2) The use of all funds on a project-by-project basis for which funds were appropriated under the headings referred to in subsection (a) in prior appropriations Acts, or for which funds were made available by transfer, reprogramming, or allocation from other headings in prior appropriations Acts, including estimates for the accounts referred to in subsection (a) of the costs to complete each project.

(3) An estimated total cost to train and equip the Afghanistan and Pakistan security forces, disaggregated by major program and sub-elements by force, arrayed by fiscal year.

SEC. 9010. (a) FUNDING FOR OUTREACH AND REINTEGRATION SERVICES UNDER YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM.—Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by title IX, up to \$20,000,000 may be available for outreach and reintegration services under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program under section 582(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 125; 10 U.S.C. 10101 note).

(b) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—The amount made available by subsection (a) for the services described in that subsection is in addition to any other amounts available in this Act for such services.

SEC. 9011. Funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment unit cost of not more than \$250,000: *Provided*, That, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary to meet the operational requirements of a Commander of a Combatant Command engaged in contingency operations overseas, such funds may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$500,000.

SEC. 9012. (a) The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan may, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, carry out projects in fiscal year 2012 to assist the commander of the United States Central Com-

mand in developing a link between United States military operations in Afghanistan under Operation Enduring Freedom and the economic elements of United States national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through strategic business and economic opportunities.

(b) The projects carried out under paragraph (a) may include projects that facilitate private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, and energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan.

(c) The Secretary may use up to \$150,000,000 of the funds available for overseas contingency operations in “Operation and Maintenance, Army” for additional activities to carry out projects under paragraph (a).

SEC. 9013. From funds made available in this title to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, up to \$524,000,000 may be used by the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to support the United States Government transition activities in Iraq by undertaking facilities renovation and construction associated with establishing Office of Security Cooperation locations, at no more than ten sites, in Iraq: *Provided*, That not less than 15 days before making funds available pursuant to the authority provided in this section, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notice containing a detailed justification and timeline for each proposed site and the source of funds.

SEC. 9014. (a) Not more than 85 percent of the funds provided in this title for operation and maintenance may be available for obligation or expenditure until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report under subsection (b).

(b) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on contractor employees in the United States Central Command, including—

(1) the number of employees of a contractor awarded a contract by the Department of Defense (including subcontractor employees) who are employed at the time of the report in the area of operations of the United States Central Command, including a list of the number of such employees in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(2) for each fiscal year quarter beginning on the date of the report and ending on September 30, 2012—

(A) the number of such employees planned by the Secretary to be employed during each such period in each of Iraq, Afghanistan, and all other areas of operations of the United States Central Command; and

(B) an explanation of how the number of such employees listed under subparagraph (A) relates to the planned number of military personnel in such locations.

SEC. 9015. Of the amounts appropriated or transferred to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the ‘Fund’) for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2011—

(1) not more than 25 percent of such amounts may be obligated or expended until such time as the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State—

(A) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the Fund and the metrics used to determine progress with respect to the Fund; and

(B) notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the intent of the Secretary to

obligate or expend amounts that are in excess of such 25 percent and a period of 30 days has elapsed following such notification.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts described in the matter preceding paragraph (1) shall be available for reprogramming.

(3) Such report shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) A discussion of United States strategic objectives in Pakistan.

(B) A listing of the terrorist or extremist organizations in Pakistan opposing United States goals in the region and against which the United States encourages Pakistan to take action.

(C) A discussion of the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units that hamper the ability of the Government of Pakistan to take action against the organizations listed in subparagraph (B).

(D) A discussion of how assistance provided utilizing the Fund will address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

(E) A discussion of other efforts undertaken by other United States Government departments and agencies to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C) or complementary activities of the Department of Defense and how those efforts are coordinated with the activities undertaken to utilize the Fund.

(F) Metrics that will be used to track progress in achieving the United States strategic objectives in Pakistan, to track progress of the Government of Pakistan in combating the organizations listed in subparagraph (B), and to address the gaps in capabilities listed in subparagraph (C).

SEC. 9016. (a) Not to exceed \$176,575,000 from amounts made available to the Department of Defense in this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2012 may be obligated for information operations or military information support operations: *Provided*, That such amount is to be derived from the amounts provided in title IX of this Act for the following accounts in this title as follows:

“Operations and Maintenance, Army”, \$104,675,000;

“Operations and Maintenance, Navy”, \$1,200,000;

“Operations and Maintenance, Air Force”, \$20,400,000; and

“Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide”, \$50,300,000.

(b) Such amounts are to be allocated only in accordance with the direction and for the purposes specified in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 9017. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following account in the specified amount:

“Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund”, 2011/2013, \$595,000,000.

□ 2220

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 161, line 4, 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 10001. 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$124,800,000.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It cuts \$124.8 million from the overall bill. For my colleagues who say they are committed to deficit reduction, this is your chance to prove it.

This amendment reduces government spending while protecting the Pentagon's national security mission by reducing the funding for military bands to the authorized level. Currently this bill and the Pentagon's budget includes a total of \$324.8 million for 154 military bands and more than 5,000 full-time professional military musicians.

This amendment would reduce the total funding for military bands to \$200 million. The limit set for spending on military bands included a voice vote in the 2012 defense authorization bill, H.R. 1540.

Let me be clear: This amendment brings the defense appropriations bill in line with the spending on military bands established in the defense authorization bill. Again, the House is already on record voting to limit spending on military bands to \$200 million.

Earlier, in debate on this bill, Representative CARTER of Texas had an amendment that struck the language that I had inserted in the defense appropriations bill that would limit the military bands to \$200 million. This amendment was agreed to on voice vote.

I do not believe that the majority of Republicans and Democrats in this House want to be on record adding, adding over \$124 million in spending for military bands.

This amendment gives all of my colleagues the opportunity to reduce the cost to government by cutting \$124 million from this bill, while allowing the Pentagon to continue to spend \$200 million for choirs, jazz bands, ensembles, and other musical missions.

There is no doubt that bands are important. We all enjoy listening to military bands and cherish the traditions of military music. But at a time of fiscal crisis, \$200 million must be enough for ceremonial music, concerts, choir performance, and country music jam sessions.

Maybe you believe that spending \$325 million in 2012 is in our national security interests, a national priority that cannot even be cut or reduced.

Well, I couldn't disagree more. There are really Members in this House who in good conscience vote to cut nutrition for programs for poor, hungry women and infants, but vote to protect a military bands budgets? Is this House really capable of gutting investments on women's health care, but allow \$5 million increases in funding for military bands?

Republicans are forcing cuts in law enforcement, firefighters, homeless veterans, but they take a stand opposing limiting funding for military bands to \$200 million as a national security priority. Is this Congress really going to raise the debt ceiling so it can pay \$325 million for military bands next year with money borrowed from China? These are truly misplaced priorities.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress faces record deficits, and it's time for both smart investments and tough choices. In this \$650 billion defense appropriations bill, this amendment proposes an extremely modest test of this House's willingness to cut spending for non-essential military functions.

Last year the Army Materiel commander had a \$4.4 million state of the art building especially constructed for the Army Materiel Command Band. While schools, health care centers and food banks are getting cut, \$4.4 million is an example that seems to indicate to me that no one told the Pentagon that this is a fiscal crisis.

The Pentagon does not need any more band aid.

Mr. CARTER argued against reducing spending on military bands, saying the language didn't save 1 cent, and he was correct. This amendment saves U.S. taxpayers \$124.8 million, and that makes a lot of sense to the Minnesotans I represent. And it should make a lot of sense to my tea party Republican colleagues who march to their own drummers.

This amendment gives all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, a chance to show our constituents a deficit reduction. I urge my colleagues to support this reduction to unnecessary defense spending.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment would essentially cap funding for military bands at \$200 million and reverse a decision of the body earlier this evening.

The band's main mission is music, with a secondary wartime mission for security. Band members train for security, and given the shortage of guards, security is often the band members' go-to-war mission. Every soldier is taught their basic combat skills and can secure the perimeter.

The Department of Defense strongly believes that military bands are vital to recruiting, retaining, and community relations, and that they provide patriotic, inspirational music to instill in soldiers, sailors, and airmen the will to fight and win, and foster the support of our citizens and promote national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and urge others to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments left, and this one will deal with the subject of NASCAR.

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. _____. Not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay motorsports drivers, racing teams, or racing cars in the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), the National Hot Rod Association (NHRA), the Indy Racing League Indy Car Series, or the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) Super Bike Racing or otherwise conduct recruiting outreach through motor sports under the authority of section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-129).

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

□ 2230

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the Department of Defense to limit what they spend on motorsports sponsorships for NASCAR, the National Hot Rod Association, the Indy Car Series, or AMA Super Bike Racing to no more than \$20 million in fiscal year 2012. With our Nation in a fiscal crisis, I can't imagine anyone wanting to spend more than \$20 million for taxpayer-funded racing teams.

As Members of Congress, we must make choices with what to do with America's taxpayer money. Congress needs to set priorities that will reduce the deficit and grow our economy.

This year, the Department of Defense will spend at least \$63 million in taxpayer funds to sponsor motorsports for so-called recruitment purposes. In the last decade, hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars have been spent to sponsor motorsports racing.

And what do the American people get for their investment? Those millions of tax dollars buy decals—big stickers—on race cars. They pay for multimillion dollar race contracts for millionaire race car drivers and racing team owners. For example, the National Guard is currently spending \$20 million in taxpayers' funds to sponsor one race car driver, \$20 million, one race car driver.

At a time when our Nation is fighting two wars and facing a fiscal crisis, why are we borrowing money from China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia to pay for sponsorships and millionaire car drivers? How does that advance national security?

Now, many of my colleagues insist that these sponsorships are critical to the survival of an all-volunteer military. I disagree. But I respect their passion despite the fact there is no evidence to demonstrate that this motorsports program is effective in recruiting. And that is why my amendment maintains a significant and sufficient investment in motorsports sponsorships, \$20 million, to allow the Pentagon to demonstrate to us and to the taxpayers it does work.

Now as Members of Congress, we must do a better job of exercising our oversight over the Pentagon's recruiting budget. Right now, 75 percent of Americans ages 17 to 24 years old are not qualified—let me repeat—75 percent of young Americans ages 17–24 years old are not qualified to serve in the Armed Forces.

Motorsports sponsorships are not the answer to making America's youth more physically fit or more academically prepared to serve. And according to a 2010 report by a retired military leader entitled "Too Fat to Fight," the U.S. military faces serious long-term recruiting challenges.

Let me quote the report directly. When weight problems are combined with educational deficits, criminal records, and other disqualifiers such as asthma or drug abuse, 75 percent of Americans 17–24 years old are unable to join the military for one or more of those reasons. The military will have to have more fit young men and women if they are going to find enough recruits with the excellent qualifications needed for a modern military.

But we're not talking about \$63 million to sponsor academic decathlons, soccer leagues, or baseball teams.

With these alarming trends facing America's young people, the Pentagon needs to be leading a national effort to ensure young people around this country from coast to coast are educationally prepared, physically fit, morally sound, and dedicated to serving our country. Those young men and women aren't just found at racetracks. Yet that is where our branches of military are spending disproportionate amounts of recruiting budgets on an increasingly small number of recruiting targets.

Here is an example of a motorsport's recruiting power. In 2010, the National

Guard spent \$645,000 to sponsor one single NASCAR race, the Air Guard 400. According to the Air National Guard, that \$650,000 sponsorship generated 439 recruits. Only six of those leads were qualified leads or recruited eligible.

How many enlistments for \$650,000? Zero. Zero enlistments, zero contracts signed. Other branches of the Armed Forces have found these sponsorships to be a waste. The Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Navy have all canceled their motorsports sponsorships years ago, shifting their valuable recruitment dollars to more effective programs.

I respect the patriotism and passion of motorsports fans. I do. And I encourage the U.S. military to continue its longstanding relationship with motorsports like NASCAR. This amendment does nothing to the additional \$3 million the Army spends on outreach to NASCAR racing events or the millions spent on military recruitment at races. But we are wasting taxpayers' dollars on race cars and millionaire drivers with little or nothing to show from it.

I've heard from supporters of racing sponsorships talk about the passion points and media impressions these sponsorship dollars produce among television viewers. Really? Americans don't know that there is an Army or an Air Force, or the American people don't know that we are at war in Iraq and Afghanistan? They don't need a racing car to tell them that we have a volunteer military and our country is at war.

Already this year, the Republican Congress has voted to cut nutrition programs for poor, hungry women and infants. And this majority is cutting investments in energy efficiency at a time of high gas prices.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to limit the sponsorship of motor racing to \$20 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I compliment the gentlelady for her determination. She has really worked this amendment hard on more than one occasion. The House has already spoken on this issue. When we considered earlier H.R. 1, this amendment was defeated by more than 100 votes, 448–281.

But this is a recruiting tool. I don't think any of us want to go back to a draft. I think we like the fact that we have an all-volunteer service. But if you feel an all-volunteer service means you have got to recruit, then you use more than just NASCAR or sporting events or advertising in newspapers to gain recruits so that we can have an all-volunteer military, as opposed to a conscripted, drafted military.

The Army National Guard estimated that it engaged more than 83,000 prospects in the year 2010. The Air Force reports that their NASCAR sponsorship is the second-highest source of acces-

sions of all event sports sponsorships. The Army expects that they will, this year, engage 28,700 prospects and gain access to 182 schools through its sponsorship of NASCAR.

Now, the gentlelady, as I said, is persistent. She uses the occasion to mention the fact that the Marine Corps does not use sporting, does not use NASCAR for recruiting. Which is true. But that is not a reason why we should discontinue the program. The Navy and the Marine Corps do not sponsor motorsports, NASCAR. But they both use the sponsorship of sporting events as part of their recruiting programs. The Navy is a sponsor of the X Games, while the Marine Corps sponsors a variety of events, including the Ultimate Fighting Championship.

The fact of the matter is we spend a lot of money for recruiting, and the recruiting for our programs that are successful ought to be continued and should not be denied for whatever the reason that someone objects to using the money for sponsoring race car vehicles.

The National car took seventh place, by the way, in Daytona this past weekend. And not only do we get the sponsorship, the excitement of the crowds and many of whom go to the recruiting stations, but we get newspaper coverage for free, we get television coverage for free, coverage that we don't have to pay for because of these events that we do sponsor.

So, as we did in the Appropriations Committee, and as we did on H.R. 1 earlier in this year, I just hope that we will, once again, defeat this amendment, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2240

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 provided to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan or used to carry out section 9012.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (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 gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, Section 9012 of this Defense appropriations bill contains language authorizing the Pentagon, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, to operate a task force for business and stability operations in Afghanistan.

The bill provides \$150 million to the Secretary of Defense to operate this business task force. Our brave military men and women have been in Afghanistan for 10 long years confronting the Taliban, killing terrorists, and helping secure a better future for the Afghan people.

When in the course of this long war did it become the Department of Defense's role to facilitate business opportunities for Afghan and foreign companies?

Is it really within the Pentagon's expertise or mission to excel at business development, farming, or mineral exploration?

This bill gives the Department of Defense authorization to carry out "projects that include private investment, industrial development, banking and financial system development, agricultural diversification and revitalization, energy development in and with respect to Afghanistan."

Afghanistan is an active war zone.

American servicemembers are under attack and our Department of Defense should be solely focused on their security. The Pentagon's focus should not be on starting up businesses or facilitating business development tours for corporate CEOs. Economic development is an important part of America's overall strategy in Afghanistan, but that is the role of civilian agencies like USAID, the Department of State, or the Department of Commerce.

Congress needs to invest in America's civilian capacity to carry out this function. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in this House does not believe international development activities are a component of national security. If they did, they would not cut vital foreign assistance capacity and programs.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Pentagon is supporting the development of the Afghan carpet industry while U.S. soldiers are under attack. Afghan carpets should not be a strategic priority for the Department of Defense.

Every House Member needs to ask why the Department of Defense is helping Kate Spade, an exclusive New York handbag designer, to source raw materials in Afghanistan? Since when did the Pentagon invest taxpayer dollars in promoting women's fashion?

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense described his role in heading up the task force in *The Washington Post*: "We do capitalism. We're about helping companies make money."

Colleagues, helping companies make money is not the role of the Depart-

ment of Defense. This is the worst example of mission creep. It is up to Congress to perform its oversight duty and rein in the Pentagon.

Getting people to work in Afghanistan is important. Afghans who are working on farms, in factories, in functioning government ministries, and in the police and military are likely not shooting at our troops. But this report that accompanied the Defense authorization bill that passed in May said it best, and I quote from the Defense authorization bill: "The function of private sector business development falls outside of the core competency of the Department of Defense."

The House Armed Services Committee's report went on to further state: "The mission of TFBSO should eventually fall under the jurisdiction of a different agency, likely USAID or possibly the Department of Commerce."

The Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan and its \$150 million budget should not be funded and not authorized in the Defense authorization bill. This function and this money belongs in the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

This task force is another example of the militarization of foreign assistance that diverts the Pentagon from its core mission of security and war fighting. It also dangerously blurs the line between military-affiliated personnel in a war zone and civilian personnel carrying out development activities.

America needs the Department of Defense to take care of its top priority: ensuring the national security of our country. We all know there will be fewer and fewer military personnel in Afghanistan in the coming months. Troops stationed in Afghanistan will be in increasing danger. We must allow those troops to focus on their security mission.

If the Secretary of Defense truly believes business development and the work of the task force is vital to national security, then the Pentagon can contract with professionals at USAID to carry out this function.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and get the business development and cooperative investment support out of the Pentagon.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, the Americans and our allies pretty much stabilized Afghanistan and neutralized the Taliban. But then before the job was completed, we all walked away. The Taliban resurged, came back, and created the situation that we face today and yesteryear and the year before. Let's not let that happen again.

Now this Task Force for Business and Stability is part of that operation to

try to maintain stability once we clear out and neutralize the Taliban once again. The mission of the task force is to assist the commander of U.S. Central Command in developing a link between U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and economic elements of U.S. national power in order to reduce violence, enhance stability, and to restore economic normalcy in Afghanistan through business and economic opportunities such as agricultural diversification and energy development.

The Secretary may use up to \$150 million of available operations for overseas contingency operations. This amendment would prohibit that. This amendment would not permit us to do the things that we need to do after winning on the battlefield. After eliminating the combat areas, we have got to maintain an Afghanistan that is not any longer under the jurisdiction and the influence of the Taliban.

As I said, we did that once before at great cost. We neutralized the Taliban. We basically stabilized Afghanistan, and then we walked away. We didn't do the things that this Business and Stability Operations Task Force would do.

So let's do them this time so we don't have to go back and refight the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan. It is not a good amendment. It is not a good amendment, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I agree with the gentleman on this particular amendment. I think we should vote it down.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. 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 close the defense commissary store at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, over 19,000 people in New Jersey depend on the goods and services provided by the commissary at Fort Monmouth. The looming closure of Fort Monmouth has cast a cloud over the future of this facility, causing considerable consternation among the active duty, Guard and Reserve, and military retirees who count on the commissary to help them save money and live their quality lives that we have promised them.

In February 2011, the Secretary of the Army recognized the importance of this facility and recommended to the Pentagon leadership that the facility remain open. Department regulations give the Pentagon the ability to decide whether to keep the commissary open after a base closes.

□ 2250

I should point out that the active personnel at Naval Weapons Station Earle, which does not have a commissary, depend on this commissary as well. We in New Jersey, in the New Jersey delegation, strongly agree with Secretary McHugh's recommendation, which is currently under consideration in the Pentagon.

The amendment I am offering, but will withdraw pursuant to a discussion, a colloquy with my colleagues, would bar the use of fiscal 12 funds to close the commissary.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member.

Mr. DICKS. I can completely understand the gentleman's concern here. I want the gentleman to know that I am prepared to work with him on this to see if we can talk to the powers that be over in the Pentagon. Hopefully, they can accept Secretary McHugh's recommendation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

Let me say that I agree with Mr. DICKS. We are more than happy to work with you in order to work out this problem.

Mr. HOLT. I thank both gentlemen. This means a great deal to the people of New Jersey, to whom we owe a great deal for their military work.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,

Washington, DC, February 25, 2011.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: Thank you for your August 17, 2010 letter concerning the closure of the commissary and post exchange on Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

As we have discussed, the post exchange stores at Fort Monmouth must close in preparation for the closure of Fort Monmouth. However, I have directed the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy and Environment to send an official request to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [USD(P&R)] to keep the Fort Monmouth commissary open for a transitional 2-year period following installation closure.

If USD(P&R) approves this request, the continued operation of the commissary for this 2-year period will be conditional on a volume of sales that supports operational costs. Defense Commissary Agency's (DeCA) projections indicate annual sales of \$9.2M in the year following closure. DeCA will continue to review sales and cost data and will advise the Army if sales decline significantly.

Thank you for your inquiry into this matter and for your continued support of our Soldiers and their Families.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MCHUGH.

With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. GARDNER, 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. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 7, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2260. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cooperative Inspection Programs: Interstate Shipment of Meat and Poultry Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2008-0039] (RIN: 0538-AD37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2261. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diethylene Glycol Monoethyl Ether (DEGEE); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0474; FRL-8877-1] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2262. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C9 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons, C10-11 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons, and C11-12 Rich Aromatic Hydrocarbons; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0517; FRL-8876-2] received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2263. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2264. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Bangladesh, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2265. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report for calendar year 2010 on the country of origin and the sellers or uranium

and uranium enrichment services purchased by owners and operators of U.S. civilian nuclear power reactors, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 1015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2266. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Information Required in Prior Notice of Imported Food [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0179] (RIN: 0910-AG65) received June 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2267. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Administrative Simplification: Adoption of Operating Rules for Eligibility for a Health Care Claim Status Transactions [CMS-0032-1FC] (RIN: 0938-AQ12) received June 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2268. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards No. 108; Lamp, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment [Docket No. NHTSA-2004-18794] (RIN: 2127-AK85) received June 17, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2269. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Plating and Polishing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0084; FRL-9320-6] (RIN: 2060-AM37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2270. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition and Spark Ignition Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0295, FRL-9319-5] (RIN: 2060-AP67) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2271. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0076; FRL-9320-2] (RIN: 2060-AH37) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2272. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2011 [NRC-2011-0016] (RIN: 3150-AI93) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2273. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning Planning [NRC-2008-0030] (RIN: 3150-AI55) received June 15, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2274. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-16, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.