

it obviously can perform in desert environments. I was down in the Helmand province, and it is a very capable plane.

Again it has to do with the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' capabilities. They are an expeditionary force. The vertical takeoff and landing ability of the V-22 is critical to what they do. As Mr. BARTLETT pointed out, it has longer range and greater capacity, and properly deployed and properly used, can actually make it cheaper than buying more helicopters that are necessary to accomplish that mission. It is a necessary program, certainly necessary for the Marine Corps. I would urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have before me an article from defense.aol.com from just a few months ago which was written by Richard Whittle, who wrote a whole book on the V-22. And as the editor says, this is as close to ground truth on the V-22 as one can get.

What he says is the marines and the Air Force Special Operations Command have been flying it in combat zones for 4 years, and they love it. He goes on to talk about problems in the early years, but the critics went to sleep in the middle of the story. In other words, they have not recognized the significant improvements that several people have talked about.

Since October 1, 2001, the military has lost 405 helicopters, 99 percent of them have not been V-22s; and yet this amendment comes only against the V-22 when it turns out the redesigned, retested Osprey safety record is the safest rotorcraft the Marine Corps flies based on mishaps per 100,000 flight hours.

When it comes to cost, since 2008 they are under budget and are actually going to save the taxpayers over \$200 million versus what was budgeted. This plane is working well. This amendment is behind the times.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

□ 1730

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise strongly to oppose the Quigley amendment in this particular matter.

I'm grateful for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the V-22, on behalf of the marines who are using it in the theater of battle where it has proven itself. Indeed, if this argument were taking place in 2009, there might be a case to be made, but it's being made in 2012, where, in fact, I've got the testi-

mony of the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Osprey has given the United States unprecedented agility and operational reach, unmatched by any other tactical aircraft. The Osprey is the cornerstone of the Marine ground task force. More significantly, with regard to cost savings, it has—procured under a multiyear procurement contract, it will actually save a proposed \$825 million over single-year contracts, providing required capability for the Marine Corps. In addition, if we tried to replace it, there would be 74 percent more cost associated.

Reliability, cost, dependability, proof. I urge my colleagues to support the retention of the V-22.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the fact remains, studies still show this a dangerous vehicle. Studies still show it is suboptimal. Studies still show it is wildly over cost.

I want to help marines. I want to save marine lives. That's why this amendment is appropriate. It is, in the end, still dangerous pork with wings.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, along with my colleague, Mr. FATTAH, to this amendment.

The V-22 Osprey program is a truly revolutionary system that is being used around the world today by both our United States Marine Corps and the Special Operations Command in support of our Nation's missions.

This amendment would eliminate the only cost-effective way to replace the fleet of aging medium-lift aircraft in our inventory. Canceling V-22 does not remove the requirement to replace legacy CH-46 and HH-53 airframes. It would only interrupt the carefully planned transition to a more capable and more cost-efficient alternative—at an additional expense to the American taxpayer.

I quote the United States Air Force Special Operations Command Commander, Lieutenant General Donald Wurster:

This aircraft is the single most significant transformation of Air Force Special Operations since the introduction of the helicopter. Nearly every mission we have faced in the last 20 years would have been done better and faster with the V-22.

Mr. Chairman, who are we, sitting here guarded and completely safe, to not listen to the brave men and women and their commander and not give them everything they need and request to keep them safe and give them the tools to do their job?

I urge you to support the President's budget request and vote "no" on the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2415. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Dock Street in Pittston, Pennsylvania, as the "Trooper Joshua D. Miller Post Office Building".

H.R. 3220. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 Evergreen Square SW in Pine City, Minnesota, as the "Master Sergeant Daniel L. Fedder Post Office".

H.R. 3413. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1449 West Avenue in Bronx, New York, as the "Private Isaac T. Cortes Post Office".

H.R. 4045. An act to modify the Department of Defense Program Guidance relating to the award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence administrative absence days to members of the reserve components to exempt any member whose qualified mobilization commenced before October 1, 2011, and continued on or after that date, from the changes to the program guidance that took effect on that date.

H.R. 4119. An act to reduce the trafficking of drugs and to prevent human smuggling across the Southwest Border by deterring the construction and use of border tunnels.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4849. Amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 112-485.

Mr. MARKEY. 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:

In title II, strike section 211 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 211. DELAY OF NEW LONG-RANGE PENETRATING BOMBER AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION ON FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement of a long-range penetrating bomber aircraft.

(b) REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby reduced by \$291,742,000, with the amount of the reduction to be derived from Line 042, Program Element 0604015F, Long Range Strike, as set forth in the table under section 4201.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of my amendment.

Here's what my amendment says: Why are we building a new nuclear bomber? It's 2012. The B-52s that we have—93 of them—are going to last until 2040. The B-2s we have are going to last until 2058. That's when they begin to retire.

Now, of all the things America doesn't need right now, it's a brand new nuclear bomber.

We're talking about cutting Medicare or Medicaid out here on the floor, there's not enough money to invest in research to find the cure for Alzheimer's, but we need a new nuclear bomber for \$18 billion? It makes no sense. It's insane. We don't even have any more targets to hit them with.

Every single nuclear submarine we have has 96 independently targetable nuclear warheads on board. That's 96 cities in the Soviet Union, the bombs in the Soviet Union would destroy, 96 cities in China destroyed by one submarine. We already have 93 B-52s. We have 20 B-2s. We have ICBMs ready to launch. And they want to build a new bomber, a nuclear bomber with nuclear bombs. By the time the new nuclear bomb arrives, there will be no place to hit. All the old bombers, all the nuclear submarines will have hit all the targets.

The boom we should be listening to is the baby boom. We need money for Medicare. We need money for Medicaid. We need money for Social Security. We need money to invest in finding the cure for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. That's the boom that's going to hit American families. That's the fear people have.

The fear that people have is not that they're going to be in a nuclear war. The fear that people have is that there's going to be a terrifying call that comes into their family that tells them that they now have another case of Alzheimer's in their family, that it has not been cured.

Each one of these bombers could double the size of the budget to find the cure for Alzheimer's. That's what we should be doing. That's the real terrorist that people are afraid of coming into their lives.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. McKEON. I just might note that the B-52s that have been around that their grandchildren are flying now that the original pilots flew, the B-2s, we have 20. I inquired the other day how many of them were ready to go on a mission—maybe eight. So I think that all of this talk about nuclear, the next bomber is the next generation bomber that will deliver all kinds of weapons, not just nuclear.

I yield, at this time, 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Delaying development of the new bomber for 10 years would put the average age of the bomber fleet over 50 years old by the time a new bomber was fielded, our oldest of which, the B-52, would be nearly 75 years old. It would create unacceptable levels of risk regarding power projection requirements and would affect our national security.

The Air Force has only 19 B-2 stealth bombers in the inventory, but they are 1980s technology, very maintenance intensive and very expensive to own and operate. The aircraft availability rate of the B-2 bomber fleet today being ready at a moment's notice for a mission is currently less than 40 percent.

A mainstay of the U.S. global military power is the ability to conduct long-range conventional or nuclear strike missions anywhere in the world and against any type of threat. Therefore, it is imperative to maintain a credible bomber fleet.

The Air Force plans to affordably, cost-effectively develop off-the-shelf technology—stuff that exists today—instead of inventing new technologies which in the past have led to cost overruns.

And I would say to the gentleman, don't just take my opinion. It's in the President's budget, so the administration obviously supports it. The Air Force says it's one of its top priorities.

We're in a day when oftentimes Congress wants things for the Pentagon that the Pentagon doesn't want. In this case, the Pentagon and the Air Force wants it. But let me quote what the Air Force said:

Delaying the long-range strike bomber program for 10 years would create unacceptable levels of risk in our ability to directly support future power projection requirements, significantly impacting national security. The long-range bomber will possess unique capabilities, including long-range, significant payload capacity, operational flexibility, and survivability in anti-access environments. It will replace existing bomber aircraft, some of which will be over six decades old when the long-range strike bomber reaches initial operational capability.

□ 1740

Mr. MARKEY. Could the Chair inform me as to how much time is remaining on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Again, the experts all say that if we delay this just 10 years, which is all I'm asking for, a 10-year delay, since the B-2s and the B-52s aren't beginning to retire until between 2040 and 2058. All that Mr. WELCH and Mr. CONYERS and I are saying is, if we delay it for 10 years, there's still plenty of time to build them if there's a need.

But to begin to build new things right now with this era of tremendous budget deficits, when we should just be trying to find a way to reduce our deficits, you know, balance this budget, it's just wasteful. It's wasteful. And I just want to balance the budget. And if we're wasting money on projects like this, then we have no chance of doing anything about this deficit reduction.

So, again, experience shows us that it only takes 16 years, not 30, to bring a new bomber from the drawing board to the runway.

There are millions of families out there who are trying to get by with a car that's a few years old and just keep it going. The Air Force has already spent over \$6 billion refurbishing all these planes. They plan on spending billions more on refurbishing them. There's no reason to believe they can't go out to the year 2060.

This is not the year for us to be spending this money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), my friend and colleague.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose amendment No. 11. It would delay research and development funding for the NextGen bomber. The bomber is critical to replacing an aging fleet. The new bomber is needed so we don't raid our readiness accounts.

This is about the bomber carrying nuclear weapons. It does a lot more than just carry nukes. It deters aggressors and even provides maritime surveillance, especially in the Asia-Pacific area. Congress opposed a similar amendment last year and, as cochair of the Long Range Strike Caucus, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment again this year.

Mr. MARKEY. Again, could you, Mr. Chair, tell me how much time I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Just look at this from the perspective of an ordinary family. They've already got three cars in the driveway. Everyone says to them, you can go another 100,000 on those three cars. And

yet the decision is made by some of the family members, we're going to buy a brand new, top-of-the-line car right now, even though the whole family is in debt. Everyone in the neighborhood would think that's crazy.

That's what we're doing here today. The majority is saying, let's build a brand new bomber, a gold-plated bomber that's been on the wish list of the Air Force for a generation, even though we have plenty of bombers, nuclear bombers in an era where there aren't any more nuclear sites that we can be bombing around the world, and we're just going to waste the money.

We should be balancing the budget. We have to tighten our belt. And I just urge the majority to reconsider this. We have to save the money. And there just are no targets, and there are plenty of bombers we have that can last out to 2060.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I ask unanimous consent to control the time of the gentleman from California, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a member of the committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I think this amendment is very curious when the Secretary of Defense came out with a new defense strategy last year, and they came out and said that the long-range strike fighter is one of their top priorities. And yet a Member of their own party is trying to do away with that.

As you know, gentlemen, over 50 percent of the cuts so far have come from our national defense. And there's only a few things we're supposed to be doing here in Congress, and one of them is provide for the common defense.

I have the honor of representing the B-2 bombers at Whiteman Air Force Base, and I couldn't be prouder of the good work that they are doing. But we have 19, right now, aircraft. If we approve this amendment, it would be over 50 years old by the time that we would be moving forward with looking at the future, and we'd have the B-2s at 75 years old.

I would use his analogy and say a family would not wait until the car is 50 years old, broken down in the garage and won't start before they go consider advancing and getting a new car.

We need to be proactive. We need to make sure that our defense industry remains strong. We need to be proactive. We need to oppose this amendment and continue to support our long-range strike fighters.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

We're \$15 trillion in debt—\$15 trillion. We've got all the bombers we need. They can last to 2060. We don't need a new nuclear bomber. Okay? We just don't need a new nuclear bomber.

We don't have the targets for them, we can't afford them, and we don't need them. How's that for a combination?

Let's just cut back on something on this defense budget. Does it have to be the entire wish list of every single defense contractor in the United States, regardless of whether or not it relates to the military needs of our country?

And by the way, 30 or 40 years from now, \$18 billion. We can postpone it 10 years, still have the brandnew planes ready to go in 2050 and 2060. We should be saving money for this generation right now, not just passing it on for the next generation.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was on this House floor commemorating the 70th anniversary of Ellsworth Air Force Base, which is in my great State of South Dakota.

Our bomber fleet, the average age is 40 years old. Old dogs can learn new tricks, and our bombers are certainly doing that. They've been updated as much as they possibly can be, but they do eventually still get older.

I will tell you that the B-1 bomber has performed admirably over the last three decades, and so has the B-2 and the B-52. But I will tell you, we must continue to upgrade and to maintain our bomber fleet. And I will tell you that prohibiting development of the new generation bomber for 10 years is shortsighted. It puts our national security at risk.

I am going to urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. I rise in strong opposition to the Markey amendment. I know my friend is trying to be humorous, but this is a very serious subject.

I was one of the leaders who worked to do the B-2 bomber. That took us between 15 and 20 years. Now, the reason we're starting is we've got to pull this technology together and try to do this for less money. And we need a long-range, modern, penetrating bomber with conventional weapons.

The nuclear weapon isn't the priority to me. It's the smart, conventional weapons that give us an enormous capability.

Let's vote "no" on the ill-conceived Markey amendment. And if he wants to look at something, tell him to look at land-based missiles.

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

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-485.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, 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 63, line 15, strike "\$1,261,000,000" and insert "\$857,695,000".

Page 64, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in this section for the ground-based midcourse defense system, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby reduced by \$403,305,000, with the amount of the reduction to be derived from Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment, Line 080, East Coast site planning and development, and EIS work program, as set forth in the table under section 4201. The amount of such reduction shall not be available for any purpose other than deficit reduction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chair, my amendment would reduce funding for the failed Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program by \$404 million. This missile defense program was designed to intercept limited intermediate and long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles before they reenter the Earth's atmosphere. Now, a fine idea. But the only problem is that while this failed missile defense program rarely hits anything, it continues to cost taxpayers billions of dollars.

If we're going to target wasteful spending, then a missile defense program that can't hit its targets is a good place to achieve taxpayer savings. This program has documented failure after failure.

In a time of large deficits and increasing debt, Congress should have to justify every penny that we spend of taxpayer money, and there isn't any justification for spending an additional \$400 million on a weapons program that simply doesn't work.

Since 1997, the system has failed more than half its tests, missing its target 9 in 17 times.

□ 1750

The scheduled March flight test was cancelled because they're still evaluating the previous failures.

Lieutenant General Patrick O'Reilly, the Director for the Missile Defense

Agency, testified that the flight test failures weren't because of lack of funds.

In fact, he said:

I don't think those failures would have been avoided if we would have had a larger or a lesser budget than we had.

This is not a problem that we can solve by throwing more taxpayer money and larger deficits after it. American taxpayers cannot afford a Congress that keeps spending money on programs that don't work.

Now, I'm sure the other side will discuss the issues of why there is strategic importance to a long-range missile threat and to preventing attacks from North Korea and Iran, neither of which currently possess the ability to launch a missile, but a missile defense system that doesn't actually defend against missiles is no defense at all.

My amendment would cut funding for this program by \$400 million just as the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, recommended. They took a close look at GMD and settled on a reasonable recommendation, which is that we would cut spending by \$403 million. It's what my amendment is.

To quote the GAO:

Until the failure review investigation is completed, mitigations are developed and proven in ground testing and then confirmed through flight testing, funding for GMD is premature.

I wholeheartedly agree with the GAO, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee of Strategic Forces, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. This is the first in a number of amendments that are going to come from the other side of the aisle which are targeted at weakening our national missile defense system.

This is at a time that we see rising and increased threats from both Iran and North Korea. We have Secretary Gates having said that North Korea's programs are becoming an absolute threat to the mainland United States.

It also comes, coincidentally, at a time when our President has had what is known as the "open mic incident" when he was in South Korea and was speaking with President Medvedev of Russia and indicated that he was hopeful for a time when he could get past this next election so that he could have greater flexibility on missile defense.

This secret deal that the President has with the Russians to weaken our missile defense is consistent with the amendments we are going to be seeing from the other side of the aisle. We know the deal is secret because, after the President returned back to the United States, we asked him to tell us what is this increased flexibility and

what is his intention in weakening our missile defense system. He won't tell us. So it remains a secret, but it is consistent with the amendments we are seeing on the other side of the aisle to weaken our national defense.

This amendment, disturbingly, tries to cut our Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, which currently is the only system that actually protects the mainland United States. It is part of the public portion of the President's plan that this be sustained. Again, we don't know what his secret deal is, but this system actually includes the CE-I interceptor, which is three for three in its successful intercepts. We know this is a system that works, and we know this is a system that's important.

We also know, if people on this floor are serious about trying to reduce the deficit, perhaps they should support the Ryan budget.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, a missile defense system that doesn't defend against missiles is no defense at all.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am going to have to be quick because, first of all, I want to address the issue about the so-called "open mic incident."

I do thank Mr. TURNER for accurately describing what happened, but he is wrong on one thing, which is that the President did, in fact, respond as to what he meant. He sent a letter to Mr. TURNER on April 13, explaining what he meant.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I don't have any time. I'm sorry. I don't have any time. I can't yield.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Would you read the letter.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I read the letter.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. What it says is basically what is obvious to everybody, which is that the President has a different opinion. The President believes that Russia can be a partner to reduce the missile threat and that he can possibly work with them to develop missile defense systems that they don't feel threatened by. It's no big secret. It's what the President has said.

Generally, the other side doesn't want to have anything to do with Russia—okay, fine—but they are a factor. The President wants to figure out some way in which we can work with someone who is no longer our enemy to reduce this threat. There is no great mystery here. That's what he is talking about.

I want to support Mr. POLIS' amendment as well and say that the problem is that we are going to need the ground-based missile system. It's funded in the President's budget to a certain amount of money, but because it

has been missing so often, there was a limited amount of money that you can spend testing this. It's not ready. They're spending money testing it. They just don't need this additional money.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. So we're not saying that we don't need missile defense. We're spending money on it. We're spending a lot of money on it, and we're going to develop that.

Then the point on Russia is very simple and straightforward in that the President would like to negotiate an understanding with Russia so that we are not in conflict with one another. There are many who don't want us to have that conversation, and I believe Mr. TURNER is in that camp. The President would like to have that conversation. That's all he meant, and he explained it in this letter.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

It can't be emphasized too often that our Ground-based Midcourse Defense is the only tested system that we have that defends the homeland of the United States against the most dangerous and powerful weapons mankind has ever known. I just somehow have a hard time cognitively grasping why a nuclear missile landing on our homeland doesn't alarm people a little bit more than it seems to.

Assuming the SM-3 Block 2B missile is able to provide protection for the homeland in that year—an assumption the GAO calls into question in fairly alarmed terms—this system will be the only system that we have that will be able to protect the homeland until at least 2020.

Mr. Chairman, we make a desperate mistake—for whatever the reason is, whether it's a secret deal with the Russians or whatever it is—in reducing the only system that protects the United States of America. It is folly.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. What the gentleman from Arizona failed to acknowledge is that the system simply doesn't work—missing its target more than half the time. You can't solve a problem by throwing more government money after it as the gentleman from Arizona is advocating.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Everyone here is alarmed, Mr. Chairman, about the possibility of a nuclear attack on the

United States. We also should be alarmed about sticking to the facts in the debate.

The fact is we are talking about a weapons system here that failed two tests in 2010 and that hasn't passed a test since 2008. The fact is that, in the meantime, we have a robust, successful, tested regional system that can protect the homeland, the country, and the fact is that the general who runs this program said:

In the program right now, we are addressing and are prepared to come back to flight testing, but we've had two failures, and no matter what budget we're dedicating, we have to get over those flight test failures.

Fix it first. Fund it later. Support the Polis amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I do have the honor of representing Colorado Springs in my congressional district, which has the Missile Defense Agency and some of these other important assets for our Nation's defense, and I totally oppose this amendment of my colleague's from northern Colorado.

We do have ground-based interceptors on the west coast. We have ground-based interceptors in Alaska. We need them also on the east coast. We need to start planning for that. The money that would be slashed by this amendment would go to starting the planning process, and it doesn't happen overnight. It's a multiyear process. We need to start the planning now so we can defend the heavy population centers on the east coast from intercontinental ballistic missile threats. There are rogue nations in this world that mean us harm. There is the possibility of an accidental launch by a number of countries. We have to have that type of defense. The Institute for Defense Analyses did a study that Congress called for. It said we need an east coast site. Should this amendment pass, that money will not be there to begin that process.

Unfortunately, Barack Obama has been slashing missile defense for 3 years now. This bad amendment would continue that same trend. The CE-I interceptor has worked three out of three times. That's a 100 percent record.

I also disagree with the gentleman from New Jersey, who just spoke, who said fix it first and then fund it. It's the other way around. You fund it so you can fix it.

They have it backwards, I'm afraid. A vote for this amendment is really nothing more than a vote against a strong missile defense for the United States. I urge a "no" vote.

□ 1800

Mr. POLIS. In closing, I was encouraged to hear my colleague from Colorado say: "You fund it so you can fix it." I hope that quotation can also be

used with regard to education and health care in this country, to ensure that everybody has access to a good education and the opportunities it can provide.

My amendment is a small step towards a sane defense budget. It would make a modest cut to a failed program that you simply cannot—by the military's own recognition—expect to fix by continuing to throw good money after bad.

I would urge the House to listen to the experts, listen to our military leaders, listen to independent auditors who are telling us not to throw good money after bad. Let's get the defense budget on the right track by spending money on our servicemembers and our programs that are proven to protect our country successfully. Let's not spend additional money on a missile defense system that simply doesn't work. It should be targeted for savings in this bill. It should be fixed. At that time, we can reconsider additional funding of this program. But there is ample funding with these reductions.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Polis amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. I want to encourage everyone to oppose this amendment which, again, is the first of a series of amendments on the other side of the aisle to weaken our National Missile Defense System. This is the only deployed system that we have that protects the mainland of the United States, and it is consistent with the President's secret deal.

The President has never answered our request as to what are the terms of his secret deal with the Russians where the President in a meeting with Medvedev said: "I have greater flexibility after I get past the election." Imagine the audacity of saying that when he's no longer subject to the electorate, that he's going to disclose a new missile defense deal or arrangement with the Russians. In fact, Putin himself acknowledges the agreement in a March 2, 2012, interview with a Russian newspaper. He indicates that "they made us a proposal just during the talks. They told us we would offer you this, we would offer you that, and they asked him to put it down on paper."

There are ongoing negotiations between this administration and the Russians. The President got caught in an open mic. There is a secret deal with the Russians that the President needs to answer to. This amendment would weaken our national defense and our missile defense system, as would the President's secret deal with the Russians. Vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chair, I oppose Representative POLIS's amendment to cut Ground-

Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) by \$403 Million.

Russia's most senior military leader recently threatened to pre-emptively attack U.S.-led NATO missile defense sites in Europe should America not kowtow to Russian demands.

In light of these threats, and others from North Korea and Iran, a strong missile defense system is vital to the safety and security of America and American troops deployed overseas.

And GMD works. For example, the CE1 interceptor, used by GMD, is three for three in successful testing.

Hence, GMD is critical to America's national security. GMD must be adequately funded.

I urge rejection of the Polis Amendment that puts American cities and American lives at risk.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to H. Res. 661, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 33, 36, 65, 66, 75, 85, 89, 93, 98, 100, 104, 124, 127, and 128, printed in House Report No. 112-485, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1069. REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS FROM CONGRESS ON STATUS OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing any letters from Congress (including a committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives, a member of Congress, an officer of Congress, or a congressional staff member) received by the Department of Defense that refers to or requests information on the status of a military construction project on the future-years defense program.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1084. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZED NUMBER OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION CIVIL SUPPORT TEAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1403(a) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 116 Stat. 2676; 10 U.S.C. 12310 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "23" and inserting "a minimum of 25"; and

(2) by striking "55 teams" each place it appears and inserting "57 teams".

(b) **FUNDING.**—

(1) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 301 for operation and maintenance, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4301, for Line 070, Force Readiness Operations Support is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000, to be derived from Line 036, Program Element 0603384BP, Chemical and Biological Defense Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO
OF GUAM

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. CODIFICATION OF NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 116. State Partnership Program

“(a) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—(1) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, including for the Air and Army National Guard, shall be available for the payment of costs to conduct activities under the State Partnership Program, whether inside the United States or outside the United States, for purposes as follows:

“(A) To support the objectives of the commander of the combatant command for the theater of operations in which such contacts and activities are conducted.

“(B) To support the objectives of the United States chief of mission of the partner nation with which contacts and activities are conducted.

“(C) To build international partnerships and defense and security capacity.

“(D) To strengthen cooperation between the departments and agencies of the United States Government and agencies of foreign governments to support building of defense and security capacity.

“(E) To facilitate intergovernmental collaboration between the United States Government and foreign governments in the areas of defense and security.

“(F) To facilitate and enhance the exchange of information between the United States Government and foreign governments on matters relating to defense and security.

“(2) Costs under paragraph (1) may include costs as follows:

“(A) Costs of pay and allowances of members of the National Guard.

“(B) Travel and necessary expenses of United States personnel outside of the Department of Defense in the State Partnership Program.

“(C) Travel and necessary expenses of foreign participants directly supporting activities under the State Partnership Program.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Funds shall not be available under subsection (a) for activities described in that subsection that are conducted in a foreign country unless jointly approved by the commander of the combatant command concerned and the chief of mission concerned.

“(2) Funds shall not be available under subsection (a) for the participation of a member of the National Guard in activities described in that subsection in a foreign country unless the member is on active duty in the armed forces at the time of such participation.

“(3) Funds shall not be available under subsection (a) for interagency activities in-

volving United States civilian personnel or foreign civilian personnel unless the participation of such personnel in such activities—

“(A) contributes to responsible management of defense resources;

“(B) fosters greater respect for and understanding of the principle of civilian control of the military;

“(C) contributes to cooperation between United States military and civilian governmental agencies and foreign military and civilian government agencies; or

“(D) improves international partnerships and capacity on matters relating to defense and security.

“(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—In the event of the participation of United States Government participants (other than personnel of the Department of Defense) in activities for which payment is made under subsection (a), the head of the department or agency concerned shall reimburse the Secretary of Defense for the costs associated with the participation of such personnel in such contacts and activities. Amounts reimbursed the Department of Defense under this subsection shall be deposited in the appropriation or account from which amounts for the payment concerned were derived. Any amounts so deposited shall be merged with amounts in such appropriation or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such appropriation or account.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘State Partnership Program’ means a program that establishes a defense and security relationship between the National Guard of a State or territory and the military and security forces, and related disaster management, emergency response, and security ministries, of a foreign country.

“(2) The term ‘activities’, for purposes of the State Partnership Program, means any military-to-military activities or interagency activities for a purpose set forth in subsection (a)(1).

“(3) The term ‘interagency activities’ means the following:

“(A) Contacts between members of the National Guard and foreign civilian personnel outside the ministry of defense of the foreign country concerned on matters within the core competencies of the National Guard.

“(B) Contacts between United States civilian personnel and members of the Armed Forces of a foreign country on matters within such core competencies.

“(4) The term ‘matter within the core competencies of the National Guard’ means matters with respect to the following:

“(A) Disaster response and mitigation.

“(B) Defense support to civil authorities.

“(C) Consequence management and installation protection.

“(D) Response to a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosives (CBRNE) event.

“(E) Border and port security and cooperation with civilian law enforcement.

“(F) Search and rescue.

“(G) Medicine.

“(H) Counterdrug and counternarcotics activities.

“(I) Public affairs.

“(J) Employer support and family support for reserve forces.

“(5) The term ‘United States civilian personnel’ means the following:

“(A) Personnel of the United States Government (including personnel of departments and agencies of the United States Government other than the Department of Defense) and personnel of State and local governments of the United States.

“(B) Members and employees of the legislative branch of the United States Government.

“(C) Non-governmental individuals.

“(6) The term ‘foreign civilian personnel’ means the following:

“(A) Civilian personnel of a foreign government at any level (including personnel of ministries other than ministries of defense).

“(B) Non-governmental individuals of a foreign country.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“116. State Partnership Program.”

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY.—Section 1210 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2517; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. ALTMIRE
OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 347. REPORT ON PROVIDING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES TO UNIFORMED PERSONNEL TRANSITING THROUGH FOREIGN AIRPORTS.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility of providing market-rate or below-market rate (or both) telecommunications service (either phone, VoIP, video chat, or a combination thereof), either directly or through a contract, to uniformed military personnel transiting through a foreign airport while in transit to or returning from deployment overseas. The Secretary also shall investigate allegations of certain telecom companies specifically targeting uniformed military personnel in transit overseas (who have no other option to contact their families) with above-market-rate fees, and shall include the results of that investigation in the report.

(b) SUBMISSION.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF
VERMONT

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. COORDINATION BETWEEN YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

The Office for Reintegration Programs shall assist each State to coordinate services under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program under section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 (10 U.S.C. 10101 note) with Small Business Development Centers (as defined in section 3(t) of the Small Business Act) in each State.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL
OF IOWA

At the end of subtitle I of title V of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF MULTIPLE DEPLOYMENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the effects of multiple deployments on the well-being of military personnel and any recommended changes to health evaluations prior to redeployments.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL
OF IOWA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 725. STUDY ON BREAST CANCER AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly conduct a study on the incidence of breast

cancer among members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and reserve components) and veterans. Such study shall include the following:

(1) A determination of the number of members and veterans diagnosed with breast cancer.

(2) A determination of demographic information regarding such members and veterans, including—

- (A) race;
- (B) ethnicity;
- (C) sex;
- (D) age;

(E) possible exposure to hazardous elements or chemical or biological agents (including any vaccines) and where such exposure occurred;

(F) the locations of duty stations that such member or veteran was assigned;

(G) the locations in which such member or veteran was deployed; and

(H) the geographic area of residence prior to deployment.

(3) An analysis of breast cancer treatments received by such members and veterans.

(4) Other information the Secretaries consider necessary.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study required under subsection (a).

(c) **FUNDING INCREASE AND OFFSETTING REDUCTION.**—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D—

(1) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 1406 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, is hereby increased by \$10,000,000, with the amount of the increase allocated to the Defense Health Program, as set forth in the table under section 4501, to carry out this section; and

(2) the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for Weapons Procurement, Navy, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4101 of division D, is hereby reduced by a total \$10,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be derived from—

(A) Line 004 (AMRAAM) in the amount of \$2,700,000;

(B) Line 006 (JSOW) in the amount of \$2,700,000; and

(C) Line 009 (Hellfire) in the amount of \$4,600,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 802. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONTRACTS FOR PURCHASE OF HELICOPTERS FOR AFGHAN SECURITY FORCES.

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITIVELY BID CONTRACTS.**—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall award any contract that will use United States funds for the procurement of helicopters for the Afghan Security Forces using competitive procedures.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH CERTAIN ENTITIES.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may not award a contract, directly or indirectly, to any entity controlled, directed, or influenced by—

(1) a country that has provided weapons to Syria at any time after the date of the enactment of the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-175); or

(2) any country that is currently a state sponsor of terrorism.

(c) **STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.**—In subsection (b), the term “state

sponsor of terrorism” means any country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism pursuant to section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The requirement in subsection (a) shall apply to contracts awarded after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of this section if the Secretary determines such a waiver is necessary in the national security interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 313, after line 20, insert the following:
SEC. 833. ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACT REPORT.

Not later than June 30, 2013, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the use of energy savings performance contracts by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, respectively, including each of the following:

(1) The amount of appropriated funds that have been obligated or expended and that are expected to be obligated or expended for energy savings performance contracts.

(2) The amount of such funds that have been used for comprehensive retrofits.

(3) The amount of such funds that have been used to leverage private sector capital, including the amount of such capital.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. . NATIONAL LANGUAGE SERVICE CORPS.

(a) **CHARTER FOR NATIONAL LANGUAGE SERVICE CORPS.**—The David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 813. NATIONAL LANGUAGE SERVICE CORPS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain within the Department of Defense a National Language Service Corps (in this section referred to as the ‘Corps’).

“(2) The purpose of the Corps is to provide a pool of personnel with foreign language skills who, as provided in regulations prescribed under this section, agree to provide foreign language services to the Department of Defense or another department or agency of the United States.

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD.—The Secretary shall provide for the National Security Education Board to oversee and coordinate the activities of the Corps to such extent and in such manner as determined by the Secretary under paragraph (9) of section 803(d).

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—To be eligible for membership in the Corps, a person must be a citizen of the United States authorized by law to be employed in the United States, have attained the age of 18 years, and possess such foreign language skills as the Secretary considers appropriate for membership in the Corps. Members of the Corps may include employees of the Federal Government and of State and local governments.

“(d) TRAINING.—The Secretary may provide members of the Corps such training as the Secretary prescribes for purposes of this section.

“(e) SERVICE.—Upon a determination that it is in the national interests of the United

States, the Secretary shall call upon members of the Corps to provide foreign language services to the Department of Defense or another department or agency of the United States.

“(f) FUNDING.—The Secretary may impose fees, in amounts up to full-cost recovery, for language services and technical assistance rendered by members of the Corps. Amounts of fees received under this section shall be credited to the account of the Department providing funds for any costs incurred by the Department in connection with the Corps. Amounts so credited to such account shall be merged with amounts in such account, and shall be available to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such account. Any amounts so credited shall remain available until expended.

“(g) USERRA APPLICABILITY.—For purposes of the applicability of chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, to a member of the Corps—

“(1) a period of active service in the Corps shall be deemed to be service in the uniformed services; and

“(2) the Corps shall be deemed to be a uniformed service.”.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD MATTERS.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—Subsection (b) of section 803 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1903) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (5);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(5) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(6) The Secretary of Energy.

“(7) The Director of National Intelligence.”.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) To the extent provided by the Secretary of Defense, oversee and coordinate the activities of the National Language Service Corps under section 813, including—

“(A) identifying and assessing on a periodic basis the needs of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for personnel with skills in various foreign languages;

“(B) establishing plans to address foreign language shortfalls and requirements of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government;

“(C) recommending effective ways to increase public awareness of the need for foreign languages skills and career paths in the Federal government that use those skills;

“(D) coordinating activities with Executive agencies and State and Local governments to develop interagency plans and agreements to address overall foreign language shortfalls and to utilize personnel to address the various types of crises that warrant foreign language skills; and

“(E) proposing to the Secretary regulations to carry out section 813.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle F of title X insert the following new section:

SEC. 1069. FEDERAL MORTUARY AFFAIRS ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Federal Mortuary Affairs Advisory Commission.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Commission shall be to advise the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and Congress on the best practices for casualty notification, family support, and mortuary affairs operations so as to ensure prompt notification and compassionate and responsive support for families

who have lost servicemembers, and for the honorable and dignified disposition of the remains of fallen servicemembers.

(c) **SCOPE.**—Within the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Commission shall examine, on an ongoing basis, all matters that encompass the notification of family members on the death of a servicemember in said family; all family support programs, policies, and procedures designed to assist affected families; and all aspects of mortuary affairs operations, including the final disposition of fallen servicemembers.

(d) **COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **MEMBERS.**—The Commission shall consist of 13 members, appointed as follows:

(A) One member appointed by the President of the United States.

(B) One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(C) One member appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(D) One member appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(E) One member appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(F) One member appointed by the Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

(G) One member appointed by the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

(H) One member appointed by the Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

(I) One member appointed by the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

(J) One member appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs.

(K) One member appointed by the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs.

(L) One member appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

(M) One member appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

(2) **TERM.**—Each member shall serve a term of three years.

(3) **MEETINGS AND QUORUM.**—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the chairman or a majority of its members. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(4) **CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.**—Upon convening for its first meeting, the Commission members shall elect by majority vote a chairman and vice chairman of the Commission.

(5) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—

(1) **POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION.**—Not more than 5 members of the Commission shall be from the same political party.

(2) **NONGOVERNMENTAL APPOINTEES.**—An individual appointed to the Commission may not be an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(3) **OTHER QUALIFICATIONS.**—At least four individuals appointed to the Commission should include family members who have direct experience dealing with the loss of a servicemember that involved interactions with the Dover Port Mortuary. At least three individuals should have extensive private or public sector experience in mortuary science, operations, procedures, and decorum.

(f) **DURATION.**—The Commission shall have a 5 year duration, beginning after the last member of the Commission is appointed

(g) **MEETINGS AND REPORTS.**—The Commission shall hold regular public meetings, notification of which shall appear in the Federal Register and on the Commission's website. Not less than annually, the Commission shall provide a written report to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and Congress on—

(1) recommendations for improving casualty notification, family support, and remains disposition; and

(2) progress, or lack thereof, by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in acting upon prior recommendations of the Commission. Said report shall also be posted on the Commission's website for public inspection.

(h) **INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, Commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this title. Each department, bureau, agency, board, Commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman, the chairman of any subcommission created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(2) **RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.**—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(i) **ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) **OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—In addition to the assistance prescribed in paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(j) **STAFF OF COMMISSION.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.**—The chairman, in consultation with vice chairman, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The executive director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, and 90 of that title.

(B) **MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(3) **DETAILEES.**—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission

without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(4) **CONSULTANT SERVICES.**—The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(k) **COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—

(1) **COMPENSATION.**—Each member of the Commission may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

In the table of contents in section 2(b), insert after the item relating to section 1068 the following new item:

Sec. 1069. Federal mortuary affairs advisory commission.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

At the end of subtitle D of title XII of division A of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT TO CONGRESS A PLAN FOR A FOREIGN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT USING FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days prior to the commencement of a covered infrastructure project, the head of the Federal department or agency with primary responsibility for carrying out the project shall submit to Congress a plan to carry out and sustain the project.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The plan shall include a description of the following:

(1) The total amount of funds to be obligated and expended under the project, including the total amount of funds to be contributed from other sources.

(2) How the project will be maintained after its completion, who will be responsible for maintaining the project, and who will contribute funds for maintaining the project.

(3) How the project will be protected after its completion.

(c) **COVERED INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT.**—In this section, the term “covered infrastructure project” or “project” means a project to improve the infrastructure of a foreign country under which the United States contributes not less than \$1,000,000 from funds made available for overseas contingency operations.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to covered infrastructure projects commenced on or after 60 days after such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE OF ARIZONA

At the end of subtitle B of title XV, add the following new section:

SEC. 1523. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS IN OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND.

Amounts appropriated to the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations

contained in this title and available for use or transfer to cover expenses directly relating to overseas contingency operations by the United States Armed Forces may be used only for an item or activity specified in the overseas contingency operations portion of the budget submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

In section 1531, relating to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, add at the end the following new subsection:

(c) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS IN JIEDDF.—Funds in the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund shall be available, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, for the purpose of monitoring, disrupting, and interdicting the movement of explosive device precursors from a country that borders Afghanistan to a location within Afghanistan. For a country in which the actions and activities described in the preceding sentence are carried out, such funds may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, also be used to train and equip the security forces of that country that support missions to monitor, disrupt, and interdict the movement of explosive device precursors into Afghanistan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chair, I rise to commend the Armed Services Committee on their good work in a number of areas in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, but I have a concern with the report language from section 815 that I would like to bring to the chairman of the committee's attention.

I certainly approve of utilizing competition to both improve contract performance and cost effectiveness of weapons systems. However, I want to bring to attention the fact that the C-17 and its F117 engines have been a model of modern sustainment. Today, time-on-wing for F117 engines has doubled since the start of this sustainment program while making multiple design and hardware upgrades.

Today, the F117 engines are sustained through an award-winning performance based on logistics contracts that minimize life-cycle costs with fixed fees based on flight cycles. This contract type requires comprehensive understanding and investment by the service provider, along with the engineering design expertise to develop and implement improvements in response to the actual mission.

I support the use of every practical means of providing for the efficient defense of this country in the protection of our warfighters. That includes the appropriate use of competition and any other contracting method that incentivizes positive outcomes for cost effectiveness and performance. In fact,

the Air Force has taken steps to ensure these outcomes are achieved on the C-17 sustainment contract. As we push the Air Force and other services to extend the practices further, we must always keep reliability and readiness of the weapons system in mind.

I look forward to working with the chairman to address these issues in conference, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his remarks and his strong support for the readiness of our Armed Forces. There's no doubt that our C-17 fleet is doing a remarkable job around the globe, and I assure the gentleman that this committee strongly shares in your desire to ensure that the C-17 continues to perform magnificently for many years to come.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc for a couple of reasons I think are very important to all of us. As we know, the amendment that I'm concerned with and talking about has to do with the issue of multiple deployments and to add to the Armed Forces Breast Cancer Research Act of 2012 to the underlying legislation.

Amendment No. 85 requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the effects that multiple deployments have on the well-being of our military personnel. I, along with some of you, have some appreciation for multiple deployments. We used to call them tours, but we understand that the deployments and the impact on our troops in uniform and our families is severe. We need to know more about it.

The other is I had a former staffer that went to a 5-year reunion, a female staffer. She's an Iraq war veteran, and she returned to tell me that six of the 70 women in her battalion, ages 25 to 35, had been diagnosed with breast cancer and others had noncancerous masses. This startled me, as did a study that indicates breast cancer is more prevalent in military women than civilian.

The women are not the only ones that need this study. At last count, at least 78 men who served at Camp Lejeune between 1950 and 1985 have been diagnosed with breast cancer. These marines and their families deserve more information. Last Congress, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America and the VFW supported conducting this study.

More troops are returning from duty only to face a new battle—breast cancer. So I urge my colleagues to get them answers. Support this en bloc amendment and the other good features of it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for including in this en bloc amendment an amendment that I and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) offered to ensure that we budget honestly.

We have something called the Overseas Contingency Operations Account, or OCO, and this we fear is sometimes used to put in items that we don't want to become part of the budget, that are above the budget, or outside of the budget. This amendment will ensure that those items in this account are war related and not simply items to get around budget constraints in the budget that we've established for defense.

I thank the gentleman for putting this in. This is an important amendment. We've got to ensure that we budget honestly, and then make sure in the future we know what our budget is, and we know what accounts are doing. This is a good step in that direction.

□ 2700

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I wanted to take this moment while we have a little extra time on this one to talk about Afghanistan and to express our opinions since we weren't able to get our amendment ruled in order.

It's important for all the Members on the floor to understand that the base bill has language on Afghanistan, and the base bill calls for us keeping 68,000 troops in Afghanistan until the end of 2014 and then makes unspecified requests to make sure that we have sufficient troops to accomplish a series of missions after 2014. It very aggressively calls for a large troop presence in Afghanistan for an extended period of time.

I, and many Members on this side of the aisle as well as some on the other, oppose that. We do not think that keeping that many troops in Afghanistan for that long is in the best interest of our national security or our country, and the bulk of the country agrees with us on that. Unfortunately, we weren't offered the opportunity to offer our amendment that offers what I think is a better approach.

I am also going to reluctantly oppose Representative LEE's amendment, the only alternative we were given, which is to pull us out as fast as we safely and responsibly can. Representative LEE's amendment does not allow us to maintain any sort of counterterrorism mission, which I do think is critically important. The amendment we wanted to offer was to put us on a more aggressive, quicker drawdown pace to speed up the transition to the Afghan forces for security while enabling us, with a relatively small number of troops, to maintain that counterterrorism issue.

We have trained over 350 Afghan national security forces. They have taken over responsibility for an increasing number of provinces and districts

throughout the country and for an increasing number of security responsibilities. It is time to make that transition.

My objection to the base bill is it doesn't give us the opportunity to make that transition because it mistakenly believes that the key to Afghan stability is keeping as many U.S. troops in Afghanistan for as long as possible. Having that large of a foreign military force—as we have seen, there's been a huge increase in attacks by Afghan forces on U.S. forces. We had the Koran burning incident. We had the horrible incident of a soldier going off and allegedly killing 16 or 17 civilians in Afghanistan.

Our presence at this point, in and of itself, is destabilizing. And what we want is a responsible drawdown of that force. We don't want to do it hastily in a way that jeopardizes the mission or jeopardizes Afghanistan. That was the purpose of the amendment that I, along with Congressman McGOVERN and others, authored. And it is unfortunate that for reasons I cannot understand, the majority refused to allow us the opportunity to debate that.

Now, as I said earlier, I speculated that part of the reason is because they know that the American people agree with us. It's a debate they don't want to take. And I respect that. A number of my colleagues have joked with me over the years, The toughest part of this job is voting; that's when people actually see where you stand.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

There have been many times where I wished I didn't have to do that, but it comes with the job and particularly on something as important as Afghanistan.

I don't think anyone would dispute that the most important thing about this bill, the Armed Services Committee bill, this year is what's going on in Afghanistan. The single most important issue, and we're denied the opportunity to have a vote on what I think is a much better plan, rather, leaving in place in the base bill a call for having 68,000 troops in Afghanistan until the end of 2014.

It is very simple: the majority is in favor of a larger troop presence for a longer period of time. We are in favor of a smaller troop presence for a shorter period of time. I believe it's the better policy. I regret that we will not have the opportunity to vote on it; but as we go into conference, I will strenuously argue this point. It is a major flaw, I believe, in an otherwise very strong bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm not as good as my friend in characterizing or talking about something,

so I would just like to read from the bill what it actually says:

The United States military should not maintain an indefinite combat mission and should transition to a counterterrorism and advise and assist mission at the earliest practicable date, consistent with conditions on the ground. In order to reduce this uncertainty and to promote further stability and security in Afghanistan, the President should fully consider the international security assistance force commander's assessment regarding the need for the United States to maintain a significant combat presence through 2013. And finally, maintain a force of at least 68,000 troops through December 31, 2014, unless fewer forces can achieve the United States objective.

This is the policy that has been established by the Commander in Chief in consultation with the generals and the field commanders. Now, I met with General Allen, the commander in Afghanistan, about a month ago. I asked him how many troops he needed, and he said he was in the process of evaluating. He didn't have a number yet. When he got that number, he would send it back through the chain of command to the Commander in Chief.

At that time, if he finds after his assessment that he may be able to withdraw troops sooner or may be able to accomplish his mission with less than 68,000, I would imagine the Commander in Chief will want to change his policy. And this allows for that because if the Commander in Chief, in consultation with the commander in the field, says that we can do it with fewer forces to achieve the objective, that's exactly what the bill says.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I would just say that no part of the President's plan calls for having at least 68,000 troops through December 31, 2014. If you had struck that out of the bill, that would change things. But having that number in there makes an enormous difference.

And with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of this amendment. It includes my amendment, prohibiting the Defense Department from purchasing helicopters, directly or indirectly, for the Afghan security forces from any entity controlled, directed, or influenced by Russia, any other state that provides weapons to Syria, or other state sponsors of terrorism. It also requires that any such future contract be competitively bid.

The U.N. estimates more than 9,000 people in Syria have been killed by the Assad regime since violence began there. And the Russian state arms dealer Rosoboroneexport continues to provide that regime with the means to perpetrate widespread and systematic attacks on its civilians, including signing a deal with Damascus in January to supply Syria with 36 combat jets.

Incredibly, the Defense Department is purchasing 21 Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan security forces through a

no-bid contract with that Russian company, even though it supplies arms to Syria and it was, for years, on the U.S. sanctions list for providing illegal nuclear assistance to Iran.

If U.S. taxpayer dollars are going to be spent providing helicopters to the Afghans, those dollars should be spent on American systems that create jobs here at home.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the chairman.

I rise today in support of my amendment. We know that the DOD faces a difficult challenge in balancing cuts with our national security strategy. However, the proposed elimination of two National Guard WMD civil support teams poses tremendous risk.

These teams are highly trained units that provide rapid support to civil authorities. Of special concern is the proposed elimination of the 24th WMD-CST located in New York City. This team has been instrumental in contingency preparations for high-profile activities like massive sporting and political events to national holidays. They have also responded to numerous crises situations.

My amendment, which I offered with my colleagues Representatives TONKO, BILIRAKIS and CASTOR, simply changes the authorized numbers of teams from 55 to 57, bringing this in line with the current number of active teams.

Making sure New York City, a top terrorist target, has the assets needed should we have another terrorist attack, is vital. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, in March, "NBC News" ran a story about a soldier who was charged \$41 for a three-second voicemail he left his wife from a pay phone in an airplane in Germany.

□ 1820

This is simply outrageous.

For servicemembers in transit to and from deployment, a quick phone call from an airport pay phone is often their only link to loved ones at home. Because public phones in foreign airports may not accept prepaid calling cards, servicemembers have to accept whatever cost the pay phone service charges in that particular airport. It is important that we help provide that crucial link for our servicemembers during this time of transit.

My amendment would direct the DOD to submit a report on the feasibility of providing telecom services to servicemembers in transit to overseas deployment and to investigate allegations of overcharging servicemembers. The brave men and women of our Armed Forces deserve better than \$41 3-second call.

I encourage all Members to support my amendment.

Mr. McKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that illustrates an old saying: Adding insult to injury. The insult is the terms under which we are debating this vast commitment of taxpayer dollars to the most important issue we have—defense.

People will be debating at 11 o'clock tonight, in 5 minutes on a side, very significant issues. We had a few minutes to debate the question of Afghanistan. My colleague, Ms. LEE, and some Republicans will join to try to bring this budget number down to where it should be—\$8 billion at least, back to the number of the agreement. And they will have 5 minutes in which to do it. That's outrageous.

Also, it's important to note if this bill goes through, it is a statement that efforts to improve the quality of life at home will be sacrificed to foreign adventures that are ill-fated in many cases.

I read a letter from the chairman of the committee to the Secretary of Defense. He said, Mr. Secretary, if we increase spending here, it won't come out of other national security accounts. Of course not. It will come out of Medicare. It will come out of Medicaid. It will come out of efforts to protect the environment. It will come out of police on our streets.

There is an excess of money here. Afghanistan is a good example. A commitment of 68,000 troops. The gentleman from California complained about what the gentleman from Washington said. It sounded the same to me. They put down 68,000 troops, dictating to the Commander in Chief—or trying to—what it should be.

There is an effort going on in Afghanistan which has gone far beyond what was justified by our national security. There is a commitment to spend more than is necessary on nuclear weapons when the military hasn't asked for them. There are weapons systems here the Pentagon didn't want. And where does it come from? It comes from everything we try to do to improve the quality of life at home.

This is an attack on our ability to provide the funding that America needs for a decent set of conditions here.

No one is opposing adequate national defense. This continues a pattern of overspending. I remember, again, what Rupert Murdoch's Wall Street Journal said, hailing the Republican budget, which this is carrying out. It protects defense so they can cut Medicare and Medicaid and other domestic programs.

It's too bad we don't have a decent amount of time to expose the extent to which that is going on.

Mr. McKEON. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

I don't quite know where to start. We have just cut in this budget and in the previous Deficit Reduction Act \$487 billion and another \$500 billion, \$600 billion that kicks in with sequestration next January, so that over the next 10 years we'll be cutting \$100 billion dollars a year out of defense at a time when we are fighting a war.

In my lifetime, I have seen this cut back after every war so that we won't be prepared, I guess, for the next one. And what happens when we get in the next conflict, being not prepared and having run our military down, is we end up losing a lot of people. And I do not want to see that happen if there is any possible way that we can overcome it.

I was in a meeting in the Pentagon a couple of months ago when the Secretary was laying out this budget. A senior military officer, one of the highest ranking in our country, was sitting across the table from me, and he looked at me at the end of the meeting, and said, In my 37 years in the military, and doing this, I have never seen a time more serious, more dangerous than right now.

We're facing a possible nuclear weapon in Iran. Much of the terrorism that we see around the world is nurtured and paid for and embraced and sent forth from Iran. We have the problem, we know, in North Korea. We have the problem of China that is decreasing their defense spending and pushing us further back in helping us defend Taiwan and other commitments that we have in the area. We had the Arab Spring that nobody had thought about or planned on. And where is the next hotspot going to be? We do not know. But I guarantee you that when you run down your defenses, that is when somebody will take advantage.

President Reagan said we should have peace through strength. General Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, we hear a lot the quotes about beware of the military industrial complex. He also said our military, our strength, our people in the military, are the ones that keep us safe, and we should be so strong that no one ever should dare attack us for fear of being annihilated. It's when we run down those forces, as we have.

I remember I was at the Reagan Library recently and they showed a video of when President Reagan ran in 1980. You might recall that we had hostages in Iran that had been causing lots of problems for President Carter. And we tried to send the military on a mission, and they couldn't even fly across the desert with the equipment they had at that time. We had a hollowed-out military.

We do not want to go there at this point. Half of the savings that we have taken in deficit reduction have come out of the military. We have done this on the backs of our troops, when they account for less than 19 percent of the overall spending. If we had no discretionary spending, we would be running a deficit of a half-trillion dollars a year. That is no military spending, no education spending, no spending on our parks.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition of Mr. GALLEGLY'S AMENDMENT #15 to H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Navy have a long track record of working together on other conservation through the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. The Navy activities have not lead to the harassment of otters off the coast of California, so the provisions to continue Naval exemptions from the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) should be preserved in H.R. 4043.

This amendment takes the necessary step of extending the Navy's exemption allowing ongoing military operations. However, I do not believe that we should be using our Nation's military readiness as a cover for establishing regulations that only benefits a special interest group. I have serious concerns with the broad exemptions for fishermen included in this amendment. Fishermen working south of Point Conception, California would be given incidental take exemptions from the ESA and MMPA indefinitely. This would remove any ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service or any other agency to address problems that may arise with otter recovery as a result of interaction with fisheries. ESA and MMPA exemptions for specific industries undermine the principles of management based on sound science under these statutes and set a dangerous precedent of Congressional micro-management for political reasons.

The Navy has agreed to continue the management of the sea otters on these installations, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Schregardus, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Navy on Environment, testifying before the Fisheries and Oceans Subcommittee, specified that the further provisions have no relevancy to military readiness operations in the region. None of the witnesses present at the hearing could identify how the management actions specified in subsection (g) had any impact on military readiness. Additionally, we have heard testimony from scientists that indicate the concerns for the ongoing viability of the California shellfish industry do not rest on the shoulders of sea otters. Commercial over-harvest and withering disease are the primary culprits to the decline of endangered abalone species. The presence of sea otters and related improvement to the nearshore kelp forest ecosystems can actually benefit abalone.

Southern sea otters are recovering from the devastating fur trade in the 18th and 19th centuries, which almost eliminated them completely. The nearly 2,800 otters that live in the region today have grown from just over 40 individuals that remained on the California coast in the 1930s.

While the population is growing, the recovery of this species is extremely slow. It is very important that our legislative actions do not reverse past conservation successes that have developed as a result of collaboration between the Navy, the Fish and Wildlife Service and other scientists and stakeholders.

I urge adoption of only the naval provisions in this amendment, which would address the national security needs of the nation without compromising the recovery of the southern sea otter.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for accepting this amendment. When the long-running problems at the Dover Port Mortuary were revealed to the public last year, all of us were appalled and ashamed at how the remains of fallen warriors had been mishandled. It took a number of people, including a constituent of mine who is the widow of a deceased Iraq veteran, as well as several brave whistleblowers—public servants in the truest sense—to bring these problems to light. What we now know is that multiple Air Force IG inspections missed the mishandling of bodies, improper cremations and other serious problems that plagued the Dover Port Mortuary for years. Clearly, a higher, more sustained level of oversight of Dover and of our overall process for military mortuary affairs is called for.

My amendment would provide that higher level of oversight by creating a Federal Mortuary Affairs Advisory Commission. The amendment requires the appointment of family members with direct experience in dealing with Dover, as well as the appointment of outside specialists in mortuary affairs. We owe it to our fallen warriors and their families to make this painful process as dignified and respectful as possible. Creating this Commission will help us do that, which is why I ask for my colleagues to support it.

Without world class linguists we would not have found Bin Laden. It was an important reminder about the need to improve foreign language education and ensure our national security and defense officials have the skilled linguists they need to get the job done.

Since it was created as a pilot program in 2005, The National Language Service Corps (NLSC) has helped meet the growing need for linguists and my amendment will ensure that this program becomes permanent.

The NLSC is a corps of on-call language-certified experts who are available to supplement Federal agencies' language capacity. It is designed to provide a surge capability for meeting short-, mid-, and long-term requirements through the identification of a reserve workforce with expertise and skills in over 120 languages that are either currently or potentially critical to the Federal government. The NLSC currently has over 1800 members who are proficient in a critical foreign language. My amendment will help our government have the linguists needed at a moment's notice. I appreciate the committees understanding of the importance of American having a strong foreign language capacity for our defense and non-defense needs.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The en bloc amendment were agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ROHR-ABACHER of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 335, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—84

Adams
Amash
Baldwin
Benish
Billakis
Black
Bono Mack
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Cohen
Cravaack
Culberson
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Denham
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jordan
Keating
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Landry
LoBiondo
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
McClintock
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Nugent
Pallone
Paul

Petri
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Ribble
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Schilling
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stearns
Stutzman
Tiberi
Upton
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—335

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus

Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman

Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boren
Boswell

Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Gibbs
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall

Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal

Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rivera
Rohy
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch

West	Wittman	Yarmuth
Whitfield	Wolf	Young (AK)
Wilson (FL)	Womack	Young (FL)
Wilson (SC)	Woolsey	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Amodei	Filner	Slaughter
Biggert	Holden	Wasserman
Cardoza	Kelly	Schultz
Costello	Pascrell	
Cuellar	Sanchez, Loretta	

□ 1851

Messrs. FLEMING, JOHNSON of Georgia, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, KINGSTON, and BERG changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. BONO MACK, Messrs. RIBBLE, BENISHEK, RIGELL, LYNCH, FARENTHOLD, BILIRAKIS, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. ROKITA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 263, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of Florida was allowed to speak out of order.)

20TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S SHOOT-OUT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a couple of days ago we had the 20th Annual Congressional Sportsmen's Shoot-Out. I'm pleased to say, for the majority side of the aisle, that we actually were able to return the trophy back to our side. To my good friend, MIKE ROSS, I want to say, nice try.

We had a great day raising money for the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, a foundation that helps fund educational opportunities for young people to learn about hunting and fishing and conservation. This is one of the great bipartisan things that we do as a group.

And with that, Mike, I would also like to say we will miss your enthusiasm, as you leave this body, for hunting and the outdoors.

I yield to my good friend, MIKE ROSS from Arkansas.

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Let me just say that the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus is one of the largest bipartisan caucuses within the Congress. I think the work we do together is very important, and at a time when there's so much that divides us, this is something that so many of us are able to come together and be united on. I want to thank everyone that participates and helps make it one of the largest, if not the largest, bipartisan caucuses in the Congress.

To my friend from Florida, now that he gave me a little kind jab, let me just make the point that the Democrats have won the annual skeet, trap, and sporting clays competition for the last 3 years, and we were feeling bad about it, and so we decided that this year we would make sure that all of our shot-

guns had a full choke and one arm tied behind our back to try to make it more fair. And, obviously, maybe we shouldn't have tied our arm behind our back.

We congratulate you on your victory this year, and we look forward to next year as well for those that are returning.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the top gun of the day, DUNCAN HUNTER.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will resume.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 113, noes 303, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—113

Amash	Gutierrez	Pallone
Baldwin	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Paul
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Petri
Benishek	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Himes	Polis
Bonamici	Hinchee	Quigley
Boswell	Hirono	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Honda	Richardson
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	(TX)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cassidy	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Jones	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Keating	Schrader
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Clay	Lee (CA)	Sires
Cleaver	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Cohen	Loeb	Stark
Conyers	Loeb	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Maloney	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tonko
DeFazio	Matsui	Towns
DeGette	McClintock	Tsongas
DeLauro	McDermott	Velázquez
Doyle	McGovern	Visclosky
Duncan (TN)	Meeke	Walsh (IL)
Edwards	Michaud	Waters
Ellison	Miller, George	Watt
Eshoo	Moore	Waxman
Farr	Moran	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Yarmuth
Fudge	Napolitano	
Grijalva	Neal	
	Oliver	

NOES—303

Ackerman	Austria	Barton (TX)
Adams	Baca	Bass (NH)
Aderholt	Bachmann	Berg
Akin	Bachus	Berkley
Alexander	Barletta	Berman
Altmire	Barrow	Bilbray
Andrews	Bartlett	Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Bishop (NY)	Grimm	Paulsen
Bishop (UT)	Guinta	Pearce
Black	Guthrie	Pelosi
Blackburn	Hall	Perlmutter
Bonner	Hanna	Peters
Bono Mack	Harper	Peterson
Boren	Harris	Pitts
Boustany	Hartzler	Platts
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Brooks	Hayworth	Pompeo
Broun (GA)	Heck	Posey
Brown (FL)	Heinrich	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Hensarling	Price (NC)
Bucshon	Herger	Quayle
Buerkle	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Burgess	Hinojosa	Rehberg
Burton (IN)	Hochul	Reichert
Butterfield	Hoyer	Renacci
Calvert	Huelskamp	Reyes
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Canseco	Hultgren	Richmond
Cantor	Hunter	Rigell
Capito	Hurt	Rivera
Carnahan	Israel	Roby
Carney	Issa	Roe (TN)
Carter	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Chandler	Jordan	Rooney
Clyburn	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Kildee	Roskam
Coffman (CO)	Kind	Ross (AR)
Cole	King (IA)	Ross (FL)
Conaway	King (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Connolly (VA)	Kingston	Royce
Cooper	Kinzie (IL)	Runyan
Costa	Kissell	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kline	Ryan (OH)
Cravaack	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	Lamborn	Sarbanes
Crenshaw	Lance	Scalise
Critz	Landry	Schiff
Cuellar	Langevin	Schilling
Culberson	Lankford	Schmidt
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Schock
Davis (KY)	Latham	Schwartz
Denham	LaTourette	Schweikert
Dent	Latta	Scott (SC)
DesJarlais	Levin	Scott, Austin
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott, David
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dicks	Long	Sessions
Dingell	Lowey	Sewell
Doggett	Lucas	Sherman
Dold	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Donnelly (IN)	Lujan	Shuler
Dreier	Lummis	Shuster
Duffy	Lungren, Daniel	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	E.	Smith (NE)
Ellmers	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Mack	Smith (TX)
Engel	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Farenthold	Marchant	Southerland
Fincher	Marino	Stearns
Fitzpatrick	Matheson	Stivers
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Fleming	McCaul	Terry
Flores	McCollum	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McCotter	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHenry	Tiberi
Fox	McIntyre	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Turner (NY)
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Turner (OH)
Gallegly	McMorris	Upton
Garamendi	Rodgers	Van Hollen
Gardner	McNerney	Walberg
Garrett	Meehan	Walden
Gerlach	Mica	Walz (MN)
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Webster
Gibson	Miller (MI)	West
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (NC)	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Gonzalez	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gosar	Myrick	Wolf
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Womack
Granger	Noem	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Young (AK)
Green, Al	Nunnelee	Young (FL)
Green, Gene	Olson	Young (IN)
Griffin (AR)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	Cardoza	Filner
Biggert	Costello	Holden

Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta Wasserman
Lewis (CA) Slaughter Schultz
Pascarell Sullivan Wilson (FL)
Pence

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1859

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 264, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 264
I inadvertently voted “yea.” My intention was
to vote “nay.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CON-
NOLLY) 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 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 412, noes 1,
not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—412

Ackerman	Brooks	Costa
Adams	Broun (GA)	Courtney
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Crawford
Akin	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Alexander	Bucshon	Critz
Altmire	Buerkle	Crowley
Amash	Burgess	Cuellar
Andrews	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Austria	Butterfield	Cummings
Baca	Calvert	Davis (CA)
Bachmann	Camp	Davis (IL)
Bachus	Campbell	Davis (KY)
Baldwin	Canseco	DeFazio
Barletta	Cantor	DeGette
Barrow	Capito	DeLauro
Bartlett	Capps	Denham
Barton (TX)	Capuano	Dent
Bass (CA)	Carnahan	DesJarlais
Bass (NH)	Carney	Deutch
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Benishkek	Carter	Dicks
Berg	Cassidy	Dingell
Berkley	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Berman	Chabot	Dold
Billray	Chaffetz	Donnelly (IN)
Bilirakis	Chandler	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Dreier
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Clarke (MI)	Duncan (SC)
Black	Clarke (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Clay	Edwards
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Ellison
Bonamici	Clyburn	Ellmers
Bonner	Coble	Emerson
Bono Mack	Coffman (CO)	Engel
Boren	Cohen	Eshoo
Boswell	Cole	Farenthold
Boustany	Conaway	Farr
Brady (PA)	Connolly (VA)	Fattah
Brady (TX)	Conyers	Fincher
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Fitzpatrick

Flake	Lee (CA)	Rivera
Fleischmann	Levin	Roby
Fleming	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
Flores	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Forbes	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Fox	Loeb	Rohrabacher
Frank (MA)	Loftgren, Zoe	Rokita
Franks (AZ)	Long	Rooney
Frelinghuysen	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Fudge	Lucas	Roskam
Gallely	Luetkemeyer	Ross (AR)
Garamendi	Lujan	Ross (FL)
Gardner	Lummis	Rothman (NJ)
Garrett	Lungren, Daniel	Roybal-Allard
Gerlach	E.	Royce
Gibbs	Lynch	Runyan
Gibson	Mack	Ruppersberger
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney	Rush
Gohmert	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Gonzalez	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Marino	Sánchez, Linda
Gosar	Markey	T.
Gowdy	Matheson	Sarbanes
Granger	Matsui	Scalise
Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Green, Al	McCauley	Schmidt
Green, Gene	McClintock	Schrader
Griffin (AR)	McCollum	Schwartz
Griffith (VA)	McCotter	Schweikert
Grijalva	McDermott	Scott (SC)
Guinta	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Guthrie	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Scott, David
Hahn	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hanabusa	McKinley	Serrano
Hanna	McMorris	Sessions
Harper	Rodgers	Sewell
Harris	McNerney	Sherman
Hartzler	Meehan	Shimkus
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Shuler
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shuster
Hayworth	Michaud	Simpson
Heck	Miller (FL)	Sires
Heinrich	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Smith (WA)
Higgins	Moran	Southerland
Himes	Mulvaney	Speier
Hinchee	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)	Stearns
Hirono	Myrick	Stivers
Hochul	Nadler	Stutzman
Holt	Napolitano	Sullivan
Honda	Neal	Sutton
Hoyer	Neugebauer	Terry
Huelskamp	Noem	Thompson (CA)
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Thompson (MS)
Hultgren	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Nunnelee	Thornberry
Hurt	Olson	Tiberi
Israel	Olver	Tierney
Issa	Owens	Tipton
Jackson (IL)	Palazzo	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Towns
(TX)	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas
Jenkins	Paul	Turner (NY)
Johnson (GA)	Paulsen	Turner (OH)
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Upton
Johnson (OH)	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Johnson, Sam	Peters	Visclosky
Jones	Peterson	Walden
Jordan	Petri	Walsh (IL)
Kaptur	Pingree (ME)	Walsh (MN)
Keating	Pitts	Walters
Kelly	Platts	Watt
Kildee	Poe (TX)	Waxman
Kind	Polis	Webster
King (IA)	Pompeo	Welch
King (NY)	Posey	West
Kingston	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Kinzing (IL)	Price (NC)	Whitfield
Kissell	Quayle	Wilson (FL)
Kline	Quigley	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Rahall	Wittman
Lamborn	Rangel	Wolf
Lance	Reed	Womack
Landry	Rehberg	Woodall
Langevin	Reichert	Woolsey
Lankford	Renacci	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Yoder
Larson (CT)	Ribble	Young (AK)
Latham	Richardson	Young (FL)
LaTourette	Richmond	Young (IN)
Latta	Rigell	

NOES—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—18

Amodei	Hall	Schock
Biggert	Holden	Slaughter
Cardoza	Miller, George	Walberg
Costello	Pascarell	Wasserman
Cravaack	Pence	Schultz
Filner	Sánchez, Loretta	
Grimm	Schilling	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1903

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 265, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes 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 249, noes 171,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—249

Adams	Carter	Garamendi
Aderholt	Cassidy	Gardner
Akin	Chabot	Garrett
Alexander	Chaffetz	Gerlach
Altmire	Chandler	Gibbs
Austria	Coble	Gibson
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Cole	Gohmert
Barletta	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barrow	Cooper	Gosar
Bartlett	Costa	Gowdy
Barton (TX)	Cravaack	Granger
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Benishkek	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Berg	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Berkley	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Billray	Davis (KY)	Grimm
Bilirakis	Denham	Guinta
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hall
Black	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Blackburn	Donnelly (IN)	Harper
Bonner	Dreier	Harris
Bono Mack	Duffy	Hartzler
Boren	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hayworth
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Heck
Brooks	Emerson	Hensarling
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Flake	Huizenga (MI)
Buerkle	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Burgess	Fleming	Hunter
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Hurt
Calvert	Fortenberry	Issa
Camp	Fox	Jenkins
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Canseco	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gallegly	Jordan
Capito		

Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)

Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt

Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—171

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
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
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr

Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney

Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1908

Ms. HOCHUL and Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 266, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) 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 211, noes 209, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—211

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor

Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly

Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling

Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—209

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo

Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum

McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires

Smith (NJ) Towns
Smith (WA) Tsongas
Speier Turner (OH)
Stark Van Hollen
Sutton Velazquez
Thompson (CA) Visclosky
Thompson (MS) Walsh (IL)
Tierney Walz (MN)
Tonko Waters

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei Filner Sanchez, Loretta
Biggert Holden Slaughter
Cardoza Pascrell Wasserman
Costello Pence Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1912

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 267, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.
MARKEY) 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 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 112, noes 308,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—112

Amash Fudge Neal
Baldwin Gibson Oliver
Bass (CA) Griffith (VA) Pallone
Becerra Grijalva Paul
Berkley Gutierrez Pelosi
Berman Hahn Perlmutter
Bishop (NY) Higgins Peters
Blumenauer Hinchey Petri
Bonamici Hinojosa Pingree (ME)
Boswell Hirono Polis
Braley (IA) Holt Quigley
Campbell Honda Rahall
Capps Jackson (IL) Rangel
Capuano Jackson Lee
Carson (IN) (TX) Richmond
Chu Johnson (GA) Rohrabacher
Clarke (MI) Keating Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (NY) Kind Rush
Clay Kucinich Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver Lee (CA) T.
Cohen Lewis (GA) Sarbanes
Conyers Loeb sack Schakowsky
Crowley Lofgren, Zoe Schwartz
Cummings Lynch Sensenbrenner
Davis (IL) Maloney Serrano
DeFazio Markey Smith (NJ)
DeGette Matsui Engel
Deutch McCollum Stark
Doggett McDermott Thompson (CA)
Doyle McGovern Tierney
Edwards Michaud Tonko
Ellison Miller, George Towns
Eshoo Moore Tsongas
Farr Mulvaney Van Hollen
Fattah Nadler Velázquez
Frank (MA) Napolitano Walz (MN)

Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alkin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Cicilline
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

NOES—308

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hochul
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luettkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (MS)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Watt
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei Filner Sanchez, Loretta
Biggert Holden Slaughter
Cardoza Pascrell Wasserman
Costello Pence Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1916

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed
his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 268, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes 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 165, noes 252,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

AYES—165

Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul

Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ribble
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)

Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Amodei
Biggert
Cardoza
Costello
Filner

Holden
Landry
LaTourette
Pascarell
Pence

Roybal-Allard
Sanchez, Loretta
Slaughter
Wasserman
Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1919

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 269, I was
away from the Capitol due to prior commit-
ments to my constituents. Had I been present,
I would have voted "yea."

Mr. McKEON. 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.
WEST) having assumed the chair, Mr.
HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair
of the Committee of the Whole House
on the state of the Union, reported that
that Committee, having had under con-
sideration the bill (H.R. 4310) to au-
thorize appropriations for fiscal year
2013 for military activities of the De-
partment of Defense, to prescribe mili-
tary personnel strengths for fiscal year
2013, and for other purposes, had come
to no resolution thereon.

MOTIONS TO INSTRUCT CON- FEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, I have a
motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Barrow moves that the managers on
the part of the House at the conference on
the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on
the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348
be instructed to insist on title II of the
House bill, regarding approval of the Key-
stone XL Pipeline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to
clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman
from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) and the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON)
each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would
like to inquire whether whoever is
claiming time to speak on this motion
on the Republican side of the aisle is,
in fact, opposed to the motion.

Mr. UPTON. I would like to claim
time on the Republican side in support
of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to clause 7(b)(2) of rule XXII, the

gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW),
the gentleman from Michigan (Mr.
UPTON), and the gentleman from Cali-
fornia (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control
20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Georgia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a
motion to instruct the conferees on the
Surface Transportation Extension Act
of 2012 to insist on title II of that act,
which contains revisions of the North
American Energy Access Act, essen-
tially calling for the completion of the
Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, in these times of in-
creasing security threats and economic
uncertainty, the construction of the
Keystone XL pipeline represents a win-
win for America's national security
and economic interests. Not only will
this project create thousands of much-
needed jobs, but it will secure Amer-
ica's energy future by reducing our de-
pendence on foreign oil.

By working with our neighbors to the
north on an effort that ramps up our
domestic energy production, we'll bet-
ter protect families here at home from
the effects of energy market insecurity
caused by political and economic trou-
bles in other parts of the world. Esti-
mates vary, but the most conservative
estimates predict that this jobs project
will create 13,000 new construction jobs
and an additional 7,000 manufacturing
jobs.

But that's not all, Mr. Speaker. The
Keystone XL pipeline, when operating
at capacity, will be able to move 840,000
barrels of oil per day into our domestic
refining capacity on the domestic pro-
duction market. To put that in per-
spective, America imports about 8.4
million barrels per day. The carrying
capacity of this pipeline alone is 10 per-
cent of America's net national daily
imports. America consumes 20 million
barrels of oil a day. The carrying ca-
pacity of this pipeline represents 5 per-
cent of current U.S. daily consumption
of oil products.

The U.S. produces about 8.8 million
barrels a day. This pipeline will have
the capacity to bring in 10 percent
more than what we're already pro-
ducing on a daily basis here in this
country. It also represents approxi-
mately a one-third increase in the
total daily imports from Canada. And
if that wasn't enough, the 840,000 bar-
rels a day this pipeline carries comes
real close to the 900,000 barrels that we
import every day from Venezuela.

I don't know about anybody else, but
any policy in this country that private
enterprise is going to lead the way on
and pay for that can cause us to tell
the folks in Venezuela, Good-bye, we'll
see you later, that's good economic
policy and good energy policy for this
country.

Mr. Speaker, we've held hearings on
this matter. We've engaged the public
and energy experts. We've checked and
rechecked for environmental soundness

NOES—252

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake

Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Austria
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino

McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Richardson
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)