

was watching the news and I saw the President with the Prime Minister having a press conference in England and the President, in his comments, indicated that we are in a war and we're going to be all together to win this war in Libya.

As far as I know, the Congress of the United States has not declared war. We have not been really consulted about Libya. Yet we're spending probably a couple billion dollars over there right now. And with the President's remarks, you might wonder if we're going to have boots on the ground and be involved not only in the Middle East but now over in Libya. We don't have the money to do that nor has Congress been consulted.

Section 3 of the War Powers Act says: "The President in every possible instance shall consult with Congress before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities." He "shall."

He didn't. And we ought to be very concerned about that, whether we're Democrats or Republicans.

The power to go to war must be vested in the Congress of the United States. Not just the President but the Congress. He is not a king; he's a President. And we must make sure that Congress is involved in the decision-making process.

□ 1220

REPUBLICANS' ROAD TO RUIN BUDGET

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the "Road to Ruin" Republican budget will end Medicare. It will end a program that 46 million seniors and disabled individuals depend on for their health care. In fact, the end of Medicare will mean seniors are forced to pay more for prescription drugs, they will lose free wellness visits, and they will be forced to pay more out of pocket. In fact, the Republican plan will cause seniors to dip into their pockets twice as deeply as they do today by the year 2020 and three times more by 2030.

And what do we get with the end of Medicare? Where are these funds directed? To continue tax breaks for Big Oil, to continue loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas, and to provide tax breaks for the wealthiest amongst us—those who need them least.

Mr. Speaker, Americans oppose the efforts to end Medicare. I ask my colleagues to work with us to strengthen the program, not destroy it.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on this floor a number of my

Democratic colleagues took the floor to talk about the Republican plan to eliminate Medicare as we know it. Now, in response to that, some of my Republican friends stood up and said, well, where is the Democratic plan? I don't know whether they were sleeping through the 111th Congress or just failed to read the bill that they voted against and now want to repeal, but our Democratic principles were very much reflected in the Affordable Care Act that we passed in the last Congress. We found savings in Medicare, we extended the life of the program for at least 10 years, we are closing the doughnut hole, we are providing new services for seniors, all of that in addition to saving \$1 trillion in the second 10 years of the program.

So the Democrats have a plan for Medicare, and we passed it in the last Congress. The Republican response: repeal what we did and end Medicare as we know it—a very creative approach to solving one of the problems that faces this country and many of our seniors.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to echo the words of my colleague from Colorado, MIKE COFFMAN, in expressing our sympathies to the families of Corporal Kirton from Centennial, Colorado, who died this past week in combat. That is a loss to Colorado, that is a loss to the Nation, and we just express our sympathies.

I want to really turn to a big issue at hand, and that is over the last 10 years starting with Bill Clinton, we had a surplus, revenues exceeded expenses. But after the Bush tax cuts, which cost a trillion dollars or more, two wars which cost a trillion dollars or more and collapse of Wall Street a couple trillion dollars, that budget surplus was turned upside down. But instead of focusing on the tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires or tax cuts for the oil companies, the Republicans want to take money out of Medicare to try to get the budget right. Well, that's just going the wrong direction.

Under the Republican budget even \$100 a barrel, we are going to maintain those tax cuts for oil companies? Instead we're going to stop programs under Medicare? That's just wrong. Medicare is a program that has worked for this country for a long time, and I want to see it remain in place.

WITNESS BADGERED AT CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked yesterday at the exchange that occurred between our colleague

from North Carolina, PATRICK MCHENRY, and Elizabeth Warren, the woman who has been tasked by President Obama to establish the new Consumer Financial Protections Bureau.

You know, to have a woman of impeccable academic credentials, a woman who for years predicted what was going to happen, had a potential solution, and who has been adamant in her support for trying to unwind this mess, to have her being attacked, to have her at one point being accused of somehow doing too much to communicate with Attorneys General who are trying to get a fair shake for homeowners who have been cheated, speaks volumes—not just, sadly, about the Republican chair of the subcommittee, but about the Republican approach.

For heaven sakes, they shouldn't be blocking her nomination. They should be embracing it and working with us to make sure it never happens again.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1540, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 276 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 276

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1540) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 276 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. This resolution contains a waiver of all points of order, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman from California makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1230

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for the unfunded and unmet mandates, although there are many in this bill. I raise this point of order because we have one of the very few opportunities to actually talk about one of the provisions in the underlying bill. Thus far, this House has been denied the opportunity to properly debate this provision, and I believe we must illuminate what it actually does.

Section 1034 of this bill provides an unlimited opportunity for the administrative branch of government, the President, and the Secretary of Defense, to engage in war virtually anywhere, any place, anytime on this planet. That is an unbelievably broad op-

portunity that this House should never give to any President at any time.

There are three very specific problems that the authorization for the use of military force has, and I want to make sure that we understand what those problems are.

This provision is particularly dangerous because it does undermine the Constitution. Only Congress has the authority to declare war. Yet this authorization to use military force passes to the President the opportunity to engage in war anywhere anytime, really, without any particular reservations.

This thing was snuck into the Defense Authorization Act. No debate in committee. And had I not somehow been going through the bill and thumbing through and finding page 133 of the legislation, it would never have been discussed in committee. But some time near 12 o'clock, or actually after 12 o'clock, I was able to present an amendment in the committee to strike this section of the bill. That amendment did not pass the committee, and hopefully it will be before the floor as we discuss the entire legislation.

So let me begin the discussion now.

We ought not expand the executive authority to go to war. First of all, this particular section, 1034, is harmful because of three reasons: one, it's unlimited—anywhere, any place, anytime; second, it is very unclear as to who we're going to go to war against; and, third, it's not necessary.

First, section 1034 is unlimited. There's no geographic limitation in section 1034. All that needs to be found by the President or the Secretary of Defense is there is a terrorist out there somehow associated with the Taliban or al Qaeda. And we know that al Qaeda is spread throughout the world, including the United States. So the entire globe is the subject of this authorization to use military force. And it's not just force against an individual terrorist or an individual terrorist organization. It's force against any nation that harbors, supports, or provides some sort of aid to a terrorist organization.

What kind of a nation would that be? Well, certainly we would consider Yemen, Somalia, maybe even Pakistan. And we did successfully go after Pakistan—not Pakistan, but after bin Laden who happened to be hiding in Pakistan. But the point here is unlimited authorization to go anywhere in the globe to go after terrorists of any color, any stripe, anywhere. I don't suppose we intend to declare war against ourselves, so maybe America is not included in this.

Secondly, there's no temporal limit to this, meaning this authorization goes on forever. It's not limited in time. It can go for 1 year, 2 years, 10 years, one century or a millennium. We must never allow any President to have that unlimited opportunity to wage war on behalf of this Nation.

Third, this resolution and this section is unclear. It's unclear in several

ways. What is an "associated force"? What's the "Taliban"? What is "al Qaeda"? We know al Qaeda as it existed in Afghanistan. We have a sense of what al Qaeda is in Pakistan. But now we have al Qaeda in the Saudi Arabia Peninsula, we probably have al Qaeda in Somalia and, certainly, according to the FBI, we have al Qaeda in the United States.

So this particular clause, associated forces, is one that we should never allow to go into law and allow any President over any time in the future to use it to undertake a war somewhere.

Finally, the provision is unnecessary. The administration is not asking for additional power. We have a case in point. The administration didn't need additional power to go into Pakistan to get bin Laden. The administration doesn't need additional power to go to Yemen to deal with al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, nor did the administration need power way back in the 1990s when President Clinton launched Tomahawk missiles into Afghanistan to go after bin Laden and al Qaeda in Afghanistan at that time.

The President, the administration, is not asking for this authority. They claim and the courts have provided them with sufficient authority to carry out the mission against terrorism as we know it today.

So in conclusion, I want to raise this issue to this House, to the Senate, and to the American public that in the Defense authorization there is an unlimited opportunity for any President now and in the future to wage war anywhere in the world against any nation that has a terrorist in that nation. That we should never do. We should aggressively maintain our authority under the Constitution to declare war and to authorize the use of military force.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The following discussion we have just had on the floor is certainly enlightening and interesting. There is much that I think is significant to what has been said by the gentleman from California.

However, Mr. Speaker, if you would forgive me, I need to talk directly to the point of order itself.

The question before the House is, should the House now consider House Resolution 276. While this resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee is not aware of any point of order. The waiver is prophylactic in its nature. Specifically, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, nor has the Congressional Budget Office identified any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote “yes” on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate having expired, the question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of 152 individual amendments to H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012.

I would like my colleagues to realize that the Rules Committee received 220 amendments for consideration of this bill; and of the 220 filed, 75 percent of them, or a total of 152, are made in order.

□ 1240

Even more remarkable, the vast majority of those that were not made in order were either withdrawn by the sponsor, were duplicative of other amendments filed, were redundant restatements of provisions already included in the base bill, or violated House rules. So this is an overwhelmingly fair and generous rule, and it continues the record of the Rules Committee in this Congress of making multiple amendments in order as long as they conform to the rules of the House.

One must commend Chairman DREIER for continuing this record of openness. Likewise, I wish to commend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), for bringing a bill to the floor under a continuing tradition of bipartisanship and mutual cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes the Congress has a reputation of being contentious and partisan, and that reputation is, unfortunately, occasionally deserved. However, as one who has been a member of the Armed Services Committee

and is currently on leave from that committee, I have been pleased to note that, when it comes to providing for the common defense of our country—a core constitutional responsibility—partisanship has usually been checked at the door with regard to the conduct and the product of the Armed Services Committee in their annual Defense authorization bill, as was this bill, having passed by a vote of 60-1 from committee. This rule builds on that bipartisan tradition when it comes to the Defense bill, and it makes more Democrat amendments in order than Republican amendments.

Yes, you're welcome.

Our Nation faces some daunting challenges: to provide adequate resources for our national defense going forward, to pay personnel and to provide promised benefits for our all-volunteer force. The modernization of our aircraft fleet is slipping further and further behind, and the average age of our fighter jets is 150 percent of their designed capacity. The age of our bombers is at a record high even as demands for their utilization is great in Afghanistan, in Iraq and increasingly in other places in the world. The infrastructure needs of our military continue to slip further and further behind—the cliché is that they're moved to the right—and a backlog of needed improvements to fill vital military missions grows even greater.

A strong national defense is directly related to a strong national economy and to a strong jobs outlook. National defense makes everything else that we enjoy in this country—our cherished way of life, our freedoms—possible.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 1540, does a remarkable job, given all of the fiscal restraints that have been involved, in continuing to provide for our common defense. For that purpose, I wish to inform my colleagues that this is a good bill, and we are adding to that a good and fair rule for the amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

All Members of this House are strongly committed to protecting our national security regardless of party, region or political point of view. It has been the tradition of the House Armed Services Committee, at the staff and member level, to work in a bipartisan way to carefully craft the annual Defense authorization bill.

I recognize Chairman BUCK MCKEON and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH for continuing that collegiality.

Given such a tradition, it comes as a surprise to see so many provisions in H.R. 1540 that attempt to repudiate and attack several of the President's national security policies: from warehousing low-level detainees for an indeterminate amount of time, to delaying the implementation of the repeal of Don't Ask-Don't Tell, to

hamstringing the implementation of the bipartisan-supported New START Treaty, to seeking a so-called “updated” authorization for the use of military force that no longer references the devastating 9/11 attacks against America but, instead, gives broad authority to the executive branch to pursue military operations anywhere and for any length of time.

Such changes have all the appearance of a partisan agenda.

Yesterday, I expressed my hope that the Rules Committee would make in order amendments so that a broad range of issues and recommendations might be considered and voted upon by this body. Over 200 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration, and 152 amendments were made in order; but each amendment only receives 10 minutes of debate time, evenly divided between supporters and opponents.

When the House is debating whether to significantly change and expand the authority under which the President—any President—may send our servicemen and -women into harm's way without consulting Congress and under the vague terminology of fighting global terrorism, is 10 minutes really enough time to give this grave matter the attention it deserves?

When military operations are underway in Libya, is 10 minutes really enough time to debate whether ground troops should not be deployed under any circumstances?

A number of amendments submitted to the Rules Committee focused on the future of our policy and military operations in Afghanistan. As most of my colleagues know, I believe we need to rethink our strategy in Afghanistan. It has demanded the lives of 1,573 of our servicemen and -women, and has gravely wounded tens of thousands of our troops. Suicide rates among our veterans from Afghanistan and Iraq have soared; and right now, there is no genuine path aimed at ending our military footprint in Afghanistan—no exit strategy.

The death of Osama bin Laden creates an opportunity for us to reexamine our policy in Afghanistan and to ask the President exactly how and when he will bring the last troops home to their families and to their communities.

This is a moment to bring fresh eyes to the question of what kind of defense priorities and budget best fit the needs of our Nation and our national security, especially in these difficult economic times. This is a matter that touches every single American and especially our uniformed men and women, their families and their communities.

How can we make any decision on budget priorities unless we know how much longer this war is going to last?

Already, it is the longest war in our Nation's history. It is bankrupting our Nation. Every day, every week, every month, we see billions and billions of

dollars charged to the national credit card, increasing the deficit, increasing the debt—with no end in sight.

We see corruption everywhere within the Karzai government in Afghanistan, and we see the basic needs of our own communities—roads, bridges, clean water systems, education, health care, and hunger programs—cut or eliminated for lack of funds.

Where does it all end? When does it all end? On a matter this important, shouldn't we be engaged in debate for more than 10 minutes?

I am pleased that the amendment I submitted with cosponsors WALTER JONES, LORETTA SANCHEZ, JUSTIN AMASH, JOHN LEWIS, RON PAUL, DAVID CICILLINE, and PETER WELCH was made in order. We have 5 minutes to describe why the President needs to clearly lay out to Congress, to the American people, to our military men and women, and to our military families exactly how and when we will complete the accelerated transition of our military operations to the Afghan authorities—5 minutes, Mr. Speaker—not to mention why the President needs to accelerate talks to achieve a political solution and reconciliation in Afghanistan and why we need to have a new National Intelligence Estimate, not just a report from the National Counterterrorism Center on the leadership, locations and capacity of al Qaeda.

Five minutes.

This Defense bill would give the executive branch carte blanche to fight global terrorism anywhere and by any means, but we don't even have an up-to-date NIE on al Qaeda.

That's not debate, Mr. Speaker. Quite frankly, it's an insult, not to mention that, if we add up the time of all the amendments, at best, the debate on the future of U.S. military operations in Afghanistan might begin as early as 10 or 11 o'clock tonight—but, most likely, even later. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to rush this bill through just because Members were told they could fly out of town at 3 o'clock tomorrow. We could stay on Friday or we could continue the debate on the amendments next week.

War. The very lives of our uniformed men and women. Libya. Unchecked power granted to the executive versus the constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war or to authorize the specific use of our military might around the world. These are matters that deserve much greater attention than what is granted under this rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern-Jones-Sanchez-Amash-Lewis-Paul-Cicilline-Welch amendment on Afghanistan when it comes up for debate late this evening; and I ask my colleagues to reject this rule, which denies this House the ability to debate these grave matters in the manner they deserve and require.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I rise in support of the rule and H.R. 1540.

As a U.S. marine, I understand the importance of strong national defense, especially during this time of war. That's why I'm glad this bill provides our troops with the resources they need and enables them to carry out the missions we ask of them.

□ 1250

As a freshman member of the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to thank Chairman McKEON for his leadership throughout this process. He has been very open in working with me and other colleagues on the committee in developing ways to restructure the Quadrennial Defense Review process. This process informs the annual defense spending bill, of course. So I am proud of the bill we are debating today. I am encouraged by our recognition that a restructured QDR process will allow us to better identify DOD priorities. And that is the key to efficiently spending taxpayer dollars.

In sum, this bill responsibly addresses military issues facing us today, and it is being offered with an eye to improving the defense funding process in the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the majority and the minority for working together for a robust process that we had, but I am concerned about two deficiencies in the process, one the gentlelady from Guam will speak to momentarily. I think it's really a travesty that she is not able to present an idea this House has considered many times as part of this bill. And I hope that would be reconsidered.

Secondly, we have all said forever that we agree that there is a problem that has to be fixed for people who served our country in uniform. And here is what happens. You have a person who is very seriously injured in the line of duty in the military, and they retire and they would get disability pay for their injury. Let's say they have been deafened by a bomb going off near them, and they are very, very ill or disabled, and they qualify for disability pay. They also qualify for a regular military pension.

I think most of us on this floor would say, most people in the country would say they should get both. If you are injured in the line of duty and you are severely disabled as a result, you should get both your disability pay and your regular pension. And for years people on both sides have said they want to do this. The problem has been it does in fact cost money. And there are a couple of other variations here. The widows and widowers of these servicemembers have the same problem with re-

spect to their benefits. And then there is another problem where people who serve in the Reserve get credit toward earlier retirement, but they have to make it fit around the Federal fiscal year or they don't get it.

So we have people over in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been deprived of earlier retirement. They have been shot at the same as everybody else, but because they got shot at after October 1, it doesn't count. It's just a bizarre rule that ought to be fixed.

Now, we had an amendment in the Rules Committee that fixed, to a great extent, these three problems. And it had a way to pay for it which is controversial. It would take some of the Internet gaming that's going on and say, A, it's legal, and B, that the money from it should go to help these service personnel who were injured in the line of duty. Some people like this idea, some people don't. But I think it should have been brought to this floor so we could have a debate about it.

If you talk to any one of our Members, Mr. Speaker, I think he or she would tell you they are all for fixing this problem, but it has to be paid for. So we had a solution that fixed a large part of the problem and was paid for, would not result in an increase in the deficit, but it didn't find its way to the floor. I know the technicalities of it. But I really think the House should be given a chance to work its will on this question.

It's as simple as this: The guy who lost his hearing because a mortar shell went off next to him, should he have to choose between his disability pay and his regular retirement instead of getting both? I think he should get both. And I think the House should be able to work its will on that question. I would urge us to consider during this debate process making that possible.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts raised an issue just a minute ago that he said we should be discussing regarding the War Powers Act. And I certainly agree with him. I would just like to inform him that right now the Foreign Affairs Committee is holding hearings on a number of pieces of legislation that will deal with and refine the War Powers Act, and hopefully correct some of the loopholes that are in it so that Congress is included in the loop.

So I would just like to inform him of that, because although I would like to see this in this particular legislation that we are talking about and discuss this in some detail, I think the hearings that are going on right now will go into in depth the problems that we face with that bill. The one thing that I would say is that I think we all agree, Democrats and Republicans alike, that this body and the other body ought to be involved in the decisionmaking

process before we go into any conflict. And this issue of Libya is a perfect example of where the executive branch has run away from the Congress without consulting with us. And that's something that should never happen in the future, especially when we are risking American lives and American money.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, although I do continue to believe that on these great issues that we need more than 5 minutes to be able to present our case. Our entire policy in Afghanistan, we are given 5 minutes to debate the issue. I don't think that that's right.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For more than 9 years now our American troops have been executing the mission in Afghanistan with extraordinary dedication and competence. They have done all we have asked of them. But what started out as a quick war on October 7, 2001, to wipe out al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and other terrorists has turned into a campaign that seemingly has no end in sight, ripping our Nation's most precious treasures, our brave men and women, from their families and their communities, and costing us more than \$8 billion a month.

The cost of this war, again, \$8 billion a month, approximately \$2 billion a week, is totally unsustainable, especially at a time when we are being asked to make extreme cuts here at home; money, by the way, that we are putting on the American credit card.

Mr. Speaker, my Rhode Island constituents understand that it's time to transfer responsibility for Afghanistan to the Afghan people and bring our brave men and women home. We should no longer send billions of American taxpayer dollars to the Afghan people for their schools and hospitals, roads, bridges, and police, at the expense of making those same investments in our own country, especially when the Karzai government has shown itself incapable of governing effectively or honestly.

For example, a yearlong investigation by a Senate panel has found evidence that the mostly Afghan force of private security guards that our military depends on to protect supply convoys and bases in Afghanistan are rife with criminals, drug users, and insurgents. More alarming, the report alleges that some local warlords, who have emerged as key labor brokers for private security firms, are also Taliban agents.

It's time to rethink our strategy in Afghanistan so that we can focus on rebuilding our economy and making sure Americans can compete in the 21st century. We need to invest in job creation and reducing our debt, instead of sending billions of dollars to a corrupt gov-

ernment abroad. That's why I am proud to support and to be a cosponsor of the McGovern amendment, which requires the President to provide Congress with an exit plan from Afghanistan with a timeframe and a completion date.

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. A clear exit plan will stabilize Afghanistan by ending an unpopular presence there and improve our country's flexibility to respond to more immediate and pressing national security challenges, improving our fiscal and economic situation at home. This is about setting the right priorities for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support the McGovern amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act, and I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for bringing this important bill to fruition. The legislation we have demonstrates support for our troops. It is a good bill that will provide them with the tools and support they need as they protect our freedoms and our liberties.

In funding our military for 2012, we ensure our troops who are deployed in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere in the world have the equipment and resources they need to succeed in their missions. There is no higher priority than advocating on their behalf, and they deserve nothing less than the best.

□ 1300

We need to send a clear message to the men and women fighting for our Nation that this Congress is committed to keeping our national defense a priority.

We are a Nation at war with men and women fighting in harm's way at this very minute. We need not forget that we face threats throughout the world with enemies bent on destroying our way of life. We have a constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

I support our troops, and I am proud to stand with them as they protect our freedoms.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I hope that someday my Republican counterparts will be clear about why my amendment was not made in order, and I also hope that they will provide greater explanation as to why we were promised an open rule this year but have anything but that today.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my friend, Mr. BISHOP, voted for this amendment in the last Congress, and I want to thank him, but I can't imagine how he could have had such a change of heart in such a short time.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This rule does not afford the people of Guam with an opportunity to make their case about the matter of Guam war claims before this House. All I want, and all we want, is a vote, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I do not understand why my Republican colleagues are so concerned about allowing my amendment for a vote on the floor, as is regular order.

Guam war claims have passed this House five times—I have to repeat that, five times—and each time with overwhelming bipartisan support. The resolution of Guam war claims is so critical to maintaining support for the military buildup on Guam. The people of Guam are going to bear the brunt of the significant impacts because of this realignment of military forces, and it is only right to bring war claims to a conclusion. This is what I hear from my constituents every day.

We reached a compromise with the Senate on this matter last year, having both Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member MCCAIN supporting the provision. However, because of the time we had last Congress, it was struck from the bill due to the objection by a small minority of Senators, and we were forced to agree to the defense bill by unanimous consent here in the House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. BORDALLO. Let history note that I did not object to the unanimous consent request last year based on the commitments of my friends across the aisle. In fact, Chairman MCKEON committed to including war claims in this year's defense bill, and I do appreciate his support.

But the Republican leadership would not allow him to honor his commitment to me. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and a true disservice to the people of Guam.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment, No. 99, to be included for consideration in this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah yield for such request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have a great deal of sympathy for the gentlelady from Guam, and on the Resources Committee where that bill still is, I will work with you on that, but I do object to unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me again express my disappointment with the lack of time that we are being allowed to debate some very, very important issues that impact everybody, every single person in our country: issues of war; issues of granting the executive branch this new broad authority to be able to go to war any time they want without even consulting the United States Congress, giving them these unilateral powers which I believe

is not what our Founding Fathers ever anticipated; issues involving Libya; and I could go on and on and on, not to mention some of the issues that were not allowed to be brought up at all, and Ms. BORDALLO just mentioned one of them. I don't understand why that was not made in order.

But in this House of Representatives, since the new majority took over, we debate trivial issues passionately and important ones not at all. You know, we spent hours debating whether we should defund National Public Radio. But on the issue of Afghanistan, what our policy should be in Afghanistan, we have over 100,000 troops in Afghanistan, we are borrowing over \$8.2 billion a month—a month, a month—to pay for Afghanistan, that is all going on our credit card. That is going, adding to our deficit, to our debt. Our kids and grandkids are going to pay for the fact that we are not paying for it now. Those issues deserve more than a few minutes of debate.

Again, I have an amendment on Afghanistan to encourage the President to rethink our policy and to develop an exit strategy, and I and all the other Members who are cosponsoring my bill, my amendment, are given 5 minutes—5 minutes—to talk about this issue. Surely we could spend at least another 5 minutes on top of that—I mean, hopefully even longer—being able to discuss this important issue.

I regret that, because I think we need to be debating and discussing what we are doing in Afghanistan. I think it is important. I think the American people want us to figure a way out, and yet we give them 5 minutes to be able to debate this issue. I think that is regrettable.

[From <http://www.thenation.com>, May 10, 2011]

END THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN, AND BEGIN NATION-BUILDING HERE AT HOME

(By Rep. Jim McGovern and Rep. Walter Jones)

This week we joined with over a dozen of our colleagues—Republican and Democrat—to introduce new legislation to require the Obama Administration to present an exit strategy for U.S. forces from Afghanistan.

Specifically, our bill (the “Afghanistan Exit and Accountability Act”) would: require the President to transmit to Congress a plan with timeframe and completion date on the transition of U.S. military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan; require the President to report quarterly (i.e. every 90 days) on the status of that transition, and the human and financial costs of remaining in Afghanistan, including increased deficit and public debt; and; included in those quarterly reports, the President must disclose to Congress the savings in 5-year, 10-year and 20-year time periods were the U.S. to accelerate redeployment and conclude the transition of all U.S. military and security operations to Afghanistan within 180 days (i.e. 6 months).

The operation that resulted in the killing of Osama bin Laden demonstrated that the men and women of our armed forces and intelligence community are incredible people. The world is now a better, safer place.

The question then becomes: now what? Now that bin Laden is dead and Al Qaeda is

scattered around the globe, does it really make sense to keep using over 100,000 U.S. troops to occupy Afghanistan and prop up a corrupt government? We don't think so.

Remember—we didn't find bin Laden on the front lines of Afghanistan. He was comfortably holed up in a mansion in Pakistan. We must continue to target Al Qaeda wherever in the world they are. But continuing to be bogged down in Afghanistan makes that mission harder, not easier.

In December, Afghan President Hamid Karzai made it clear that he would rather align himself with the Taliban than with the United States. So why on earth are we sacrificing so much in terms of dead and wounded soldiers and billions of dollars to support him?

We believe that bin Laden's death creates an opportunity to re-examine our policy and to require the Administration to tell us exactly how and when we will end our massive troop presence in Afghanistan.

Our bill requires the President to give Congress a concrete strategy and timeframe for bringing our servicemen and women home to their families and communities, and it requires quarterly reports on the human and financial costs of continuing the war—and how much we would save if we withdrew our forces within a reasonable time frame.

That's not too much to ask.

To make it worse, we're not even paying for the war. It's on the national credit card. The war in Afghanistan adds \$100 billion a year—\$2 billion each week, \$8 billion each month—to our debt.

We're told that we can't afford vital domestic funding, but we should continue to borrow billions and billions of dollars for nation-building in Afghanistan. Instead, we should be doing some more nation-building right here at home. Why don't we take some of those billions to build roads and bridges and schools right here in the United States?

In the end, of course, only President Obama can bring an end to the war. But Congress must play a role, as well. For too long, Congress has ducked its proper oversight responsibilities when it comes to the war in Afghanistan. We've avoided meaningful debate and discussion and have chosen to simply “go along to get along.”

The President told us that we will see a substantial drawdown of troops in July. He needs to keep that promise. And he needs to tell us when all of our troops will be coming home, and how much staying in Afghanistan will continue to cost the American people—in sacrificed lives, wounded bodies and minds, and U.S. tax dollars—until this war is finally over.

That's what our bill would require. We are hopeful that with enough public pressure, we can provide some wind at the back of the President to help him do the right thing.

This war is the longest in our history. There's no end in sight. It's time to stop digging.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just one moment to clarify the record with respect to amendment No. 61 by Mr. CONYERS in the Rules Committee report. Printed in report 112-88, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina was inadvertently added as a cosponsor to the Conyers amendment No. 61. I want to clarify for the record that Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina is not a cosponsor of that particular amendment.

I appreciate the discussion we have had so far. I would like to remind my colleagues here that if every amend-

ment made in order in this rule were to have its maximum amount of time, we would have already approved a maximum of over—well, we have a minimum of 26 hours of debate on this particular issue.

I am appreciative of the concerns of Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts. I also want him to realize there are multiple amendments that were made in order dealing with this and similar subjects. And I am very appreciative that Mr. MCGOVERN, as a veteran of the House, understanding the rules of the House, has been wise enough to use this debate time also for speaking about that particular amendment, which will vastly extend the amount of time he has to cover that issue. That is wise of him; that is good of him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would again remind my colleagues that on the issue of what our future should be in Afghanistan, those of us who want us to rethink our policy and develop an exit strategy are given 5 minutes—5 minutes. We could debate whether we should fund National Public Radio or not for hours, and all the other items on the Republican social agenda for hours and hours and hours, but when it comes to the issue of war, we are told you get 5 minutes. I don't think that's adequate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. First let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

I would just say to the gentleman, you are absolutely correct, and I oppose this rule because this is such an important issue that affects our national security, but also the economic security of this country.

This is an issue that warrants much more deliberation and debate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when the authorization to use force to go to war in Afghanistan came before us on that terrible day of 9/14, there may have been 1 hour of debate, if that long. And so I think at this moment, as we are turning the corner, hopefully, we should have a full debate on the direction, the timeframe which Mr. MCGOVERN has in his resolution, and also a plan to begin to end the war in Afghanistan.

□ 1310

We must have a political solution and reconciliation in Afghanistan because most military experts have told us there's no military solution in Afghanistan. We know and we hear that if it's going well, we need more money and more troops; and if it's going poorly, we need more money and more troops. So we need here in the House to have this debate. What should we do and how should we do it?

So this amendment, this proposal by Mr. MCGOVERN, warrants much more than a 5-minute debate because it's such an important issue to the country. Over 70-some percent now of the

American people believe it's time to wind down. Many of us believe that beginning in July we should put forth a proposal for a significant and sizeable reduction as the President indicated he would do in the past. Many believe that we should not fund any more combat operations in Afghanistan and that, in fact, we should only use our funding for force protection and to bring our young men and women home.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentle-lady an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN.

What the McGovern-Jones amendment seeks to do is begin that debate, to get us on course and to allow this House of Representatives to discuss what in the world should come next.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, I thank you for your hard work, and just say that I think that it's about time now that we have a rule on such an important issue that allows for this body to engage in debate. Our troops deserve that, the American people deserve that, and certainly we need to begin to reflect public opinion on this because the public gets it. They know that \$100 billion a year is no drop in the bucket in terms of our resources. We have a deficit, we have an economic crisis throughout the country, and we certainly need to find some balance between our national security interests and our economic security interest. Beginning to develop a plan to get out of Afghanistan warrants a full-fledged discussion.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. Earlier this year, we learned of wrongful home foreclosures on active duty military families in violation of the law. And so I submitted a very straightforward amendment that would have directed the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the Treasury and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to prepare a comprehensive strategy to protect members of the Armed Forces and their families from unfair, deceptive and abusive financial services practices and to enhance the financial readiness of such families, families who are sacrificing so much today.

The amendment would have no effect on direct spending, and it was germane. Yet, despite the majority's high claims of openness and transparency and the fact that 152 amendments were made in order, this one was not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. DELAURO. One can only conclude that the majority has chosen its dislike, or its detest, for the Consumer

Financial Protection Bureau over protecting military families. Elizabeth Warren is right: attacks against the bureau are now happening in the back alley. Yesterday, that back alley was the majority side of the Rules Committee, and the victims—the victims—were the brave men and women in uniform and their families.

Oppose this rule.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by making a couple of points here. First, I would urge everybody, Democrats and Republicans, to support the McGovern-Jones amendment on Afghanistan. I think there is bipartisan concern and bipartisan anxiety about our policy. I think there are Republicans, as well as Democrats, who believe that it's time to rethink this strategy and to come up with an exit strategy to bring our troops home, to bring them back to their families and to bring them back to their communities.

We need to make our voices heard. The President has said in July he is going to make an announcement about the drawdown of American troops. We're hearing from some sources that it may be only a token drawdown. We need a real drawdown, a significant drawdown, because if not, we are going to be engaged in a war that has no end.

We are borrowing money like there's no tomorrow to pay for this war; \$8.2 billion a month we're borrowing. We're not even paying for it. For those who support this war, I would say that if you support it, then pay for it. And I will tell you that most of the people across this country believe it's time to leave. We're supporting a corrupt government. The Karzai government is corrupt. There's no question about it. By every measure, they are wasting our money. And this is not a man, quite frankly, who our American servicemen and -women should have to die for.

We are nation-building in Afghanistan when we should be doing nation-building here in the United States. My district is not unique in its need for more investments in roads and bridges. We need more investments in job creation to put people back to work. People want to invest here in the United States because national security also means whether or not people have a job, whether or not people can earn a living.

I would urge, again, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help me and help Mr. JONES and the others who co-sponsored this amendment, put a little wind behind the President's back in July so that he makes a meaningful announcement so that we can see the light at the end of the tunnel so that there is an exit strategy.

Mr. Speaker, let me also urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to

make in order H.R. 1979 by Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, to expand eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans disability compensation to include chapter 61 disability retirees, to increase the monthly amount of special survivor indemnity allowance for widows and widowers of deceased members of the Armed Forces and to enhance the ability of members of the Reserve components who serve on active duty or perform active service in support of a contingency operation or in other emergency situations to receive credit for such service in determining eligibility for early receipt of nonregular service retired pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can help our veterans, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 6 shall be in order in lieu of amendment number 5 in House Report 112-88.

SEC. 6. The text referred to in section 5 is as follows: Page 113, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 317. HEALTH ASSESSMENT REPORTS REQUIRED WHEN WASTE IS DISPOSED OF IN OPEN-AIR BURN PITS.

"Section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2250; 10 U.S.C. 2701 note) is amended—

"(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

"(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) **HEALTH ASSESSMENT REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after notice is due under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a health assessment report on each open-air burn pit at a location where at least 100 personnel have been employed for 90 consecutive days or more. Each such report shall include each of the following:

"(1) An epidemiological description of the short-term and long-term health risks posed to personnel in the area where the burn pit is located because of exposure to the open-air burn pit.

"(2) A copy of the methodology used to determine the health risks described in paragraph (1).

"(3) A copy of the assessment of the operational risks and health risks when making the determination pursuant to subsection (a) that no alternative disposal method is feasible for the open-air burn pit.'".

□ 1320

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

An amendment to H. Res. 276 offered by Mr. McGovern of Massachusetts:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, an amendment consisting of the text of H.R. 1979 (added as a new title at the end of the bill) shall be in order as though printed as amendment number 153 in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Andrews of New Jersey or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RESIGNATION AS CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: During the past eleven years, it has been my distinct honor to serve as Chaplain of the House of Representatives. It has been a true blessing for me to come to know you, Members of Congress through the years, and so many dedicated Staff personnel who have come to the Capital to serve this nation with their daily labor and sincerity of heart.

In my duties as Chaplain I have tried to be present to all and listen to their needs. Hopefully I have offered them guidance when sought, counsel when requested and strength in difficult times. I have learned compassion for them and their families. My greatest joy has been to lead people in the Chamber and across the nation in prayer.

It is now time for me to retire. I hope you will accept my resignation as Chaplain to be effective on Saturday April 30, 2011.

I trust you will convey to all the Members of the House my continued esteem for their efforts to shape laws and policies for the common good of the American people and for a better and peaceful world. I thank you and all for the kindness, patience and friendship extended to me. Certainly I do remember all of you in my daily prayer until the end of my days.

With gratitude to you and Almighty God,

REVEREND DANIEL P. COUGHLIN,
Chaplain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation of Father Daniel P. Coughlin as Chaplain, effective April 30, 2011, is accepted.

There was no objection.

BEST WISHES TO REVEREND DANIEL COUGHLIN AND WELCOMING REVEREND PATRICK CONROY

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with all of my colleagues in extending best wishes to Father Coughlin for his very, very important service over the past 11 years to this institution and to welcome and congratulate the new Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Father Pat Conroy of Snohomish, Washington, a very distinguished alumnus of Claremont McKenna College in southern California, a man who has had spectacular service and even greater days ahead with the work that he is going to be doing with every Member of this institution.

ELECTING CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 278

Resolved, That Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING MANDATORY FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 269 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1216.

□ 1324

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1216) to amend the Public Health Service Act to convert funding for graduate medical education in qualified teaching health centers from direct appropriations to an authorization of appropriations, with Mr. CAMPBELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 24, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) had been postponed.