

Turner (OH)
Upton
Viscosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster

West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone

Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Baca
Barton (TX)
Berman
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Cardoza
Carson (IN)

Cooper
Costello
Donnelly (IN)
Filner
Gallegly
Heinrich
Mack

McIntyre
Napolitano
Noem
Paul
Paulsen
Slaughter
Stutzman

□ 1451

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 249, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 249 today. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 10th, 2012, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 249 in order to attend my grandson's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on final passage of

H.R. 5326, Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, and 249. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote Nos. 246 and 248. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote Nos. 244, 245, 247 and 249.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4004

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 4004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOUTHERLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Among next week's suspensions will be H.R. 365, the National Blue Alert Act, sponsored by Congressman MICHAEL GRIMM, which will coincide with National Police Week and will help deter the threat of violence against our Nation's law enforcement officers.

In addition, the House will consider two important bills under a rule. The

first is H.R. 4970, the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization, sponsored by Congresswoman SANDY ADAMS, herself a former sheriff. Our second rule bill, which will take up the remainder of the week, is H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act, sponsored by Chairman BUCK McKEON. This bipartisan bill provides for the funding of our armed services prior to Memorial Day, as is the House's appropriate custom.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

On the Violence Against Women Act, a very important piece of legislation which we have reauthorized in the past in a bipartisan fashion, it is under a rule. Does the gentleman know whether it will be an open rule or whether there will be, perhaps, a modified open rule with amendments being printed? Will the gentleman tell us? I have a lot of folks on my side of the aisle who are very interested in dealing with certain portions of that bill, and they'd be interested to know whether or not they will be able to offer amendments.

Mr. CANTOR. I will just tell the gentleman, as he knows, the Rules Committee is the one to decide the process by which bills come to the floor and the rules for those bills; and the Rules Committee will be meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. I would tell the majority leader, for the purposes of his planning and anticipation, as he may well know, the bill that has been reported out of the Judiciary Committee is controversial. There was a bill that passed through the other Chamber, which passed overwhelmingly—more than 2-1—and it is not like this bill.

□ 1500

There are Members that would like to incorporate the Senate's provisions in the House bill, and I know we would appreciate it if we would be given that opportunity to offer that on the floor as an alternative. If the gentleman would take that into consideration, perhaps talk to Mr. DREIER about making such amendments in order, we would very much appreciate that. Of course we would also appreciate, perhaps, if you wanted to take up the Senate bill as a substitute. We think we would have overwhelming votes for that on this side of the aisle. In light of the fact that you and I have been working in such a bipartisan fashion lately, perhaps that would be a good way to continue that process.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. It has certainly been an improved sense of cooperation, and I appreciate that on the gentleman's part in trying to deliver results and trying to make sure we get America back to work.

I would say to the gentleman, as he rightly noted, that this bill has traditionally been reauthorized. The approach that we tried to focus on was to do what it is that the gentleman and I have been trying to do the last couple

of weeks, and that is to separate out things that divide us and try to unite us around the central focus of a particular piece of legislation.

VAWA is a program that calls for the commitment of taxpayer dollars to fund the appropriate services for abused women. This is a bill that is much needed, and it is one that I think deserves our bipartisan support. We tried to stay away from issues that divide us, and we tried to listen to the GAO in terms of its recommendations under this program to make sure that taxpayer dollars are spent at their most efficient levels so that we can get more out of the dollars being spent. That is the spirit with which we will bring this bill to the floor.

Again, I know it's an important bill. We all care deeply about making sure that abused women receive the necessary services that they need.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations, and clearly he and I agree on the importance of this piece of legislation.

Certainly we're concerned about violence perpetrated against all women who happen to be in this country and subject to violent acts by others. So we want to make sure that we can, in fact, protect all women who are subject to abuse. Hopefully we can pursue that objective.

Mr. Leader, the appropriation bill we just passed was somewhat more controversial than I had hoped it would have been, in part because of the riders that were adopted to that bill, which were strongly opposed by many on this side of the aisle, and in part because we do not believe it complied with the agreement that we reached with reference to funding levels.

There are now 11 more appropriation bills to go. Can the gentleman tell me the next appropriation bill that he expects to have on the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman that we are looking to accommodate the needs of the committee as they move forward and with their bills and their agenda. It is our intention to continue with the kind of debate that we had on the CJS bill this week.

As you know, it's been some time since this House was able to see an appropriations process work in a very open fashion like we had this week. We intend to continue to do that with the bills. It's the Speaker's commitment that this be an open process and that Members have a right to air their views, and that those issues and amendments can come to a vote.

I say to the gentleman that we look forward to working with him and looking to the committee to bring forward the bill that they think is ready next to be brought to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As I said, one concern we had on our side of the aisle was the riders, many of which we thought were inappropriate. They were adopted, but we did not favor them. The second was, of course,

the level of funding. The Appropriations Committee clearly articulated very early in this process they thought the monies available to them under the Ryan constrictions on 302(a) were too low to meet some of the commitments that they had.

First of all, pursuant to what he says the Speaker wants to do and he wants to do, and I think we ought to do—we didn't always get that done lamentably—does the gentleman believe that we're going to have the time to bring each one of the appropriation bills to the floor between now and the August break so that the Senate might consider them and we might consider them individually, as opposed to in some omnibus piece of legislation?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, all I would say to the gentleman is it is certainly the intention and the commitment we have to bring these bills forward for an open and fair debate.

I know the gentleman has expressed now twice the fact that his side didn't like some of the votes that occurred on the specific provisions of some bills. This is a democratic process, as he knows. Twenty-three Members on his side of the bill ended up supporting the CJS bill. Again, this is the House's will at work, and we hope to be able to work with him in this very new environment in which we're operating on appropriations bills.

The commitment that we have is still that we want to bring these bills forward under a very challenging fiscal time in our country and do so without earmarks. This does represent a new construct within which we are operating. Again, we look forward to the gentleman's participation towards that end in a successful way.

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

I want to make it clear that clearly I understand it is the democratic process that riders are offered and the House does its will. There it is. The gentleman is absolutely correct, that's the process.

But I want to emphasize that we still have great concerns about the agreement that we reached not being carried out pursuant to what we believed the agreement was in terms of funding levels and 302(a) allocations; that is, the general allocation to the Appropriation Committee. I know the gentleman knows that we have that concern. I know the gentleman has also made the observation that that was a cap and not an agreed number. I will tell my friend again—I think I said this a couple of weeks ago—that undermines our willingness to make agreements if what we make an agreement on is the most that you'll do, but then come in at levels substantially below that which we think we agreed to, and in fact is in the law.

I want to make it clear that was my major concern and continues to be my major concern. I understand, as all of us do on this floor, that the majority

will rule on the amendments, and what amendments are adopted are adopted. There were a lot of them on the floor, as you know better than I, because there were a lot from your side, and that's appropriate.

Let me ask you about the transportation conference, Mr. Leader. We are very concerned about this. We think this is a jobs bill. We think it's an important bill. This bill, as you know, was adopted overwhelmingly by some 74 Senators. Half of the Republican Conference in the Senate is voting for the transportation bill. We're in conference now. We've been in conference for some time. Can the gentleman tell me what he thinks the status of the conference is and when we might adopt this bill? Obviously, we have it extended until the end of June, but we must act before then. Can the gentleman tell me the status of the conference?

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman rightly suggests, we are in conference with the Senate. Deliberations are ongoing. We are very mindful, as he indicates, of the expiration of the existing authorization of the program at the end of June, knowing that is our deadline.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say as we close this colloquy—which some people will say was one of our more tame colloquies—perhaps that's appropriate. On a week that we did have an opportunity to come together, I want to thank the gentleman. I want to again say that Neil Bradley did an excellent job working with John Hughes and my staff and the Financial Services staff of Mr. FRANK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER's staff, and the Senate.

□ 1510

I think we've done what we ought to do more of. And we passed a bill which, as you know, my party supported unanimously because we believe it does, in fact, make us more competitive in the international marketplace and will help keep and grow jobs. So I want to thank the gentleman for his work on that and, again, thank Mr. Bradley and Mr. Hughes for their work on that. And hopefully the Senate will act on that with dispatch.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will join the gentleman in thanking both of our staffs. They did tremendous work, as well as Mr. MILLER on the Financial Services Committee and the staff there, Mr. BACHUS' staff. Your office can be instrumental, I think, in helping move the Senate along. But everyone from the chief of staff on down in your office—and we want to thank you as well for your team's commitment to working, again, in a very difficult equation where there were a lot of differences that we tried to work through but, in the end, didn't want to unilaterally disarm American business in the name of competitiveness in our country.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to apologize to

your chief of staff for not mentioning him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

— **HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 15, 2012, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

— **RURAL POST OFFICES**

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this week the postal service announced a new strategy to keep rural post offices open. My district in Arkansas could have lost as many as 100 post offices.

This new plan from the postal service is not perfect. The retail window at many post offices will have limited operating hours. However, access to the retail lobby and post office boxes will remain unchanged. More importantly, towns will keep their ZIP codes, and community identities will be preserved.

In November of 2011, I introduced H.R. 3370, Protecting Our Rural Post Offices Act, which prohibits the postal service from closing rural post offices that do not have an alternative office within 8 miles. Now that the postal service has announced plans to keep all post offices open, Congress can enact reforms that will ensure rural Americans no longer have to worry about access to mail services.

So many of the challenges we face in Washington are not Democrat versus Republican; rather, urban versus rural interests. In small communities across Arkansas and across the country, the post office represents the town identity and lets the world know the community exists. If post offices were to completely close and small communities no longer had their own ZIP codes, cities' identities would be lost. For my part, I will continue efforts to ensure rural Arkansas communities keep access to postal services.

— **HONORING OUR NATION'S MOTHERS**

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to the Nation's mothers and to be able to wish them a wonderful and happy Mother's Day.

This morning I had the privilege of going to the women's war memorial at

Arlington Cemetery to lay a wreath for our fallen women who fell in battle and in service to their Nation; many of them were mothers. I stand today to say to them, even in the loss of life, we thank you. We honor you.

I honor my mother, who lost her life in 2010, Ivaleta Jackson, along with my aunt, Valerie Bennett, along with my living aunt, Vickie Bennett, and as well Audrey Bennett and some of the mothers of my community: Ruby Mosley, Dany Simmons, Sylvia Gonzalez, Ester Campos. So many mothers who have served their communities. The late Beulah Shepard. So many of them.

But I want to say to the Nation's mothers that we have an obligation to ensure that your children are protected and that the lives of women are protected and that we recognize and respect all of the service, all of you that are stay-at-home mothers who take care of the children at home; those who work; those who work and have children. To those who do so many things, I am so honored to be able to say, you are, in fact, America's sheroes. We honor you this weekend. But, actually, as we're taught, we honor you every day of the year.

God bless you. God bless the United States of America.

— **VOTER PHOTO ID LAWS**

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when people fraudulently vote, they infringe on the rights of lawful voters. One solution is to require valid photo IDs. The Supreme Court has upheld photo IDs to vote, but some object.

Attorney General Eric Holder is investigating Texas' photo voter ID laws even though such IDs will be free to those who need them. A person needs an ID to open a bank account, to use a credit card, to check into a hotel, to drive, to buy a lottery ticket, to buy alcohol, cash a check, board a plane, or even visit a public school. When Eric Holder spoke in Austin recently, it was reported that people had to present a valid photo ID to enter the building he was speaking in. Isn't that ironic.

A local D.C. paper printed an editorial claiming photo ID laws disenfranchised voters. But to enter the paper's facilities, a person must present a photo ID. Ironic again. It would seem the only ones who would be disenfranchised by voter photo ID laws would be unlawful voters.

And that's just the way it is.

— **HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TRAVIS MILLS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's always my privilege and honor to ad-

dress you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Today, I come before you with a humble heart and an appreciation for a young American whom I believe this Congress needs to honor. I will be reading into the RECORD a poem in honor of an American hero, Staff Sergeant Travis Mills, Bravo Troop 4, 73rd Cav, 82nd Airborne, United States Army, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor this remarkable young man, Staff Sergeant Travis Mills. On April 10, 2012, while out on patrol with his troops in Mialand province, Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Mills almost lost his life during an IED explosion.

He is known for leading his men in combat. Where they go, he goes. After the explosion, while being airlifted on the bird, an extraordinary moment was noted by the medic onboard. While bravely wounded, he did not shed even a tear, and he asked how his men were doing, who were also wounded. He then smiled at them, gave them a wink to reassure them—this is a man who lost four limbs, Mr. Speaker. It was impressive, to say the least.

Staff Sergeant Travis Mills lost three of those limbs initially and later a fourth limb. In two short weeks, already his progress and courage was an inspiration, to say the least. And now he embarks upon his recovery. It's clear that nothing is going to slow his recovery down.

□ 1520

I will now read a poem, penned by Albert Caswell, titled: "They'll Not Take That From You."

And what can these, our brief lives so make?
All out upon our life's wait?

All within these, our short lives await . . .

So then which steps must we all so take?

All in our times worth, not to forsake . . .

All in which we so create . . .

For the path is straight my friend . . .

And our journey is but a long and hard one,
so then!

For its all in our hearts depends . . .

If its up in Heaven we wish to wake . . .

Travis, no they'll not take that from you!

They may take your strong arms and legs
. . .

They may even make you cry out in pain, as
do they!

Until, it's for death you beg!

But there are a few most magnificent things,
Travis,

so they . . .

That, they'll not so take from you . . .

All because of what you so gave!

The word of hero,

now comes before, and after, your fine name
this day!

And Heaven for you Travis one day, awaits!
As from you, this they'll not so take!

They'll not take that from you!

For it's that most splendid word, of "Honor"
. . .

That which so courses all through your magnificent veins!

For you were one of those most gallant ones
of all . . .

Who, like all of those other fine souls before
you,

who so stood tall!

Who so selflessly marched off to war,