

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

## NOT VOTING—13

Berman	Lewis (CA)	Scott, David
Coble	McKeon	Shuler
Dicks	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Filner	Napolitano	
Frank (MA)	Paul	

□ 1837

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 344, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 5325, the FY 2013 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents.

Had I been present I would have voted: "yes" on the Fortenberry Amendment; "yes" on the Jackson-Lee Amendment; "yes" on the Connolly Amendment; "no" on the Kucinich Amendment; "yes" on the Burgess Amendment; "no" on the Reed Amendment; "yes" on the Loretta Sanchez Amendment; "yes" on the Polis Amendment; "yes" on the Luján Amendment; "no" on the Chabot Amendment; "no" on the Blackburn Amendment; "no" on the Mulvaney Amendment; "no" on the Flake Amendment; "no" on the King (IA) Amendment; "yes" on the Lummis Amendment; "yes" on the Motion to Recommit; "no" on Final Passage.

In addition, I would have voted: "no" on the Republican Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348; "yes" on the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 4348.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall Nos. 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, and 344. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 320, 321, 325, 327, 329, 330, 331, 340, 341 and 344. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote Nos. 319, 322, 323, 324, 326, 328, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 342, and 343.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 436, HEALTH CARE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2012, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5882, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-518) on

the resolution (H. Res. 679) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 436) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5882) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Pursuant to House Resolution 667 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5855.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEST) kindly take the chair.

□ 1839

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5855) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment who has caused it to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5855

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, namely:*

## TITLE I

## DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

## DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$121,850,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses, of which \$17,000 shall be made available to the Office of Policy for Visa Waiver Program negotiations in Washington, DC,

and for other international activities: *Provided further*, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall not be available for obligation by the Office of General Counsel until a final rule for aircraft repair station security has been published: *Provided further*, That \$71,079,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives all statutorily required reports and plans that are due with the submission of the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit the consolidation plan, as directed under the heading "Consolidation of Weapons of Mass Destruction Defense Programs" in the accompanying report, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$50,000)".

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$43,000)".

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is straightforward. It would reduce funding for the Office of the Secretary by \$50,000 and transfer a revenue neutral amount to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection salaries and expenses.

This is a nominal cut from the Secretary's nearly \$122 million in funding, again only slightly more than the committee provided for the Secretary to spend on receptions this year. I offer this amendment as a means of bringing up an important issue both to Congress and to the Secretary's attention.

Let me start by thanking the chairman and the ranking member for their attention to border issues in this bill, as well as the staff's assistance in bringing this amendment to the floor. In the report accompanying last year's Homeland Security appropriations bill, the committee directed the Department to provide a "resource allocation and staffing model for ports of entry." As would appear to be the trend with congressional requests for information, answers to these questions or budget documentation were never provided. The Department either failed to prioritize or simply ignored the request.

The committee report notes:

As the committee has not yet received the CBP workload staffing allocation model, the committee cannot assess CBP's identified needs.

As we are all no doubt aware, funding for border security efforts between the

ports of entry has increased exponentially over recent years—and justifiably so—while the budget for Customs and Border Patrol officers at the ports has not kept pace.

When I travel on the border region, there are often concerns raised at that point that there is insufficient staffing at the ports. Those serving at the ports of entry have a dual role. They have to facilitate commerce across the border and prevent unauthorized people from crossing the border.

I could talk at length about the benefits of cross-border trade for communities along the border, but let me cite just a couple of examples. Focusing on the southern border, Mexico is the third-largest U.S. trading partner and the second-largest U.S. export market, with a reported 6 million U.S. jobs depending on trade with Mexico.

The executive director of the Arizona-Mexico Commission was recently quoted saying:

Arizona's border is the gateway for some \$26 billion worth of imports and exports and some 44 million people each year.

A recent Maricopa Association of Governments release cited that legal Mexican visitors spend roughly \$7.3 million a day in Arizona, and Arizona businesses exported nearly \$6 billion in goods in 2011. So there are benefits all over for trade of this type.

The Mariposa port of entry in Nogales is one of the largest ports of entry for fruits and vegetables in the U.S. In 2011, the U.S. imported 13.4 billion pounds of fresh produce grown in Mexico, and more than a third of that entered through Nogales.

To summarize, we have to have better staffing at these ports. The Department has been asked to provide us with their needs and they simply won't. We simply haven't been able to get that information.

I'm the last member of the Appropriations Committee that would support writing a blank check to any department, but we have got to make sure that these needs are met, and that's why this amendment is critical, and I am grateful to the chairman and ranking minority member for working with me on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The Secretary has failed to submit critical reports necessary for this committee's oversight, including workload staffing models for CBP officers. Therefore, we do accept the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 9, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,800,000)".

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to restore \$3 million to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Civil Rights and Liberties. This amendment would simply level fund this account at the fiscal year 2012 level.

Mr. Chairman, it troubles me to see the continued rollout of Secure Communities and increase in funding for these 287(g) programs in the underlying bill, especially juxtaposed with a 13 percent decrease in funding for the office of Civil Rights and Liberties. Experts and officials across the country have concerns about these programs that shift Federal immigration laws into the hands of local police.

I have a letter from 88 civil rights organizations urging the Federal Bureau of Investigation to "end its facilitation of the fundamentally flawed Secure Communities deportation program." The letter states:

Secure Communities has caused widespread controversy because it threatens public safety, encourages racial profiling, undermines community policing, and serves as a deportation dragnet, ensnaring anyone who is booked into police custody.

As cochair of the Women's Caucus, I am particularly concerned when I hear stories of the effects this program has on victims across our communities. Women and their children are increasingly afraid to go to local police to get confidential help, to call 911 during an emergency because they are terrified of being caught in this dragnet.

□ 1850

For many, suffering through an abusive situation is better than watching their families being torn apart. Mr. Chairman, these are real people who are victims or witnesses to domestic violence or other crimes, but they cannot come forward.

According to an October 2011 report by the UC Berkeley Law School's Warren Institute, more than one-third of individuals arrested in this program report that they have a U.S. citizen spouse or child. In other words, an estimated 88,000 families with U.S. citizen members have been impacted by Secure Communities. The same report found that Latinos comprise 93 percent of the individuals arrested in this program, despite only compromising 77 percent of the population.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is not the America we want to create. We should all be able to agree that we don't want to see an America where victims are afraid of the police or an America where racial profiling is encouraged or tolerated.

Now, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that increasing enforcement policies is the right approach to solve our broken immigration system. With that being said, I appeal to my colleagues to support efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to ensure adequate oversight of this program.

Steps that the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Civil Rights and Liberties have taken and will take to:

Analyze arrest data to make sure that there are no serious indications of racial profiling in any of the participating communities;

Help improve training for local law enforcement officers to reduce confusion and ensure that there are clear guidelines to prevent misuse of the program;

To inform the public about options they have and recourses they can use if their civil liberties are violated by department action; and, finally,

To help investigate and resolve cases where an individual alleges that their rights were violated.

I support these important efforts towards promoting accountability and oversight over these enforcement programs, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is fully offset, as is required of this appropriations process, and it is not an increase in this program, but it simply level funds it at 2012 levels.

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

MARCH 8, 2012.

R. SCOTT TRENT,  
CJIS Designated Federal Officer, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TRENT: We, the undersigned, call on the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to end its facilitation of the fundamentally flawed Secure Communities deportation program. We urge the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board (APB) to adopt the attached proposal to mitigate the damage this program has done to public safety and community policing. The proposal would respect the wishes of states and localities that chose not to participate in "Secure Communities" and would prevent the implementation of the program in jurisdictions with a documented pattern of civil rights abuses.

Secure Communities is a wide-sweeping deportation program launched in 2008 by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. It has been sharply criticized by the governors and state legislators of Illinois, New York, and Massachusetts; local officials from numerous cities and counties, including the District of Columbia, Los Angeles, Chicago, and San Francisco; dozens of Congressional representatives; many prominent law enforcement officials; hundreds of immigrant rights, criminal justice, and privacy advocates; religious leaders; and community members.

As described in more detail in the attached proposal, Secure Communities has caused widespread controversy because it threatens public safety, encourages racial profiling, undermines community policing, and serves

as a deportation dragnet, ensnaring anyone who is booked into police custody.

The FBI plays a large role in Secure Communities by automatically initiating the immigration background check that sets the deportation process in motion for anyone booked into police custody. The CJIS APB approved this process almost two years ago, well before the problems caused by Secure Communities came to light. It is urgent that in the upcoming August 2012 meeting, the APB Working Groups consider the newly disclosed information regarding the fatal flaws in this program, and adopt the attached proposal to mitigate the damage.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please contact Jessica Karp at 213-380-2214 or jkarp@ndlon.org with any questions or information about the status of this request.

Sincerely,

Alliance for a Just Society; American Friends Service Committee; Angels For Action; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Asian Law Caucus; Bill of Rights Defense Committee; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Blauvelt Dominican Sisters Social Justice Committee; Bronx Defenders; CAAAV Organizing Asian Communities; Casa Esperanza; Casa Freehold; CATA The Farmworker's Support Committee; Center for Constitutional Rights; Central American Refugee Center—New York; Central American Resource Center—Houston; CHIRLA, Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles; Coalicion de Organizaciones Latino-Americanas (COLA); Community Service Organization; Creating Law Enforcement Accountability and Responsibility; Defending Dissent Foundation; Detention Watch Network; Disciples Justice Action Network; Drug Policy Alliance.

El Comite de Apoyo a los Trabajadores Agrícolas; Franciscan Action Network; Grassroots Leadership; Graton Day Labor Center; Hayward Day Labor Center; Hispanic Resource Center of Mamaroneck; Houston's America for All; Houston Peace and Justice Center; Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Immigrant Defense Project; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Immigration Circle of Justice, Sisters of St. Dominic, Blauvelt, NY; Immigration Justice Clinic of John Jay Legal Services, Inc.; inMotion; IRATE & First Friends; Ironbound Community Corporation; Junta for Progressive Action; Kathryn O. Greenberg Immigration Justice Clinic, Cardozo School of Law; Labor Council For Latin American Advancement Central Florida Chapter; Labor Justice Committee; Latino Foundation; Legal Aid Justice Center's Immigrant Advocacy Program; Make the Road by Walking New York; Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition.

Mennonite Central Committee East Coast; Mennonite Central Committee U.S. Washington Office; Muslim Legal Fund of America; National Day Labor Organizing Network; National Employment Law Project; National Guestworker Alliance; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Neighbors in Support of Immigrants; New Orleans Workers Center for Racial Justice; New Sanctuary Coalition NYC; New York Immigration Coalition; Passaic County Coalition for Immigrant Rights; Presente.org; Prison Activist Resource

Center; Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; Progressive States Network; Pueblo Sin Fronteras; Puente Arizona; Queer Women of Color Media Arts Project (QWOCMAP); Rights Working Group; Rockland immigration coalition; Restaurant Opportunities Center of New York; Services, Immigrant Rights & Education Network; South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT); Tenants and Workers United; The Reformed Church of Highland Park Immigration Committee; The Workplace Project; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; VivirLatino; Voces de la Frontera; Voces Unidas Por los Inmigrantes; WeCount!; Welcome Everybody Organization; Wind of the Spirit, Immigrant Resource Center, NJ; Workers Defense Project; Young Workers United.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have to rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The problem with the amendment is it guts the immigration enforcement and it demoralizes the frontline law enforcement personnel. This amendment would actually empower more bureaucrats from Washington to look over the shoulders of the hardworking officers in the field that are trying to keep us safe.

So I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to restore funding for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in order to ensure that both the 287(g) program and the Secure Communities program are not illegally profiling individuals.

The bill before us funds the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at a level that is \$2.2 million below the budget request and \$3 million below current year funding. Now, we're in a tight fiscal environment, we all know that, but surely we can meet the needs of our frontline personnel without jeopardizing the proper and robust and careful oversight of the activities provided by the Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Office.

In fact, at the same time this bill is reducing funding for oversight, it's actually increasing funding for the controversial and all-too-often mismanaged 287(g) program. Three different audits by the DHS inspector general have found serious concerns about the 287(g) program, and ICE has had to terminate some 287(g) task forces, notably in Maricopa County, Arizona, after the Justice Department documented clear racial profiling and other programmatic abuses. So we need

to make sure this authority is being exercised properly, and that's exactly the task of the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

So I thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. It's a good amendment, and I urge colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,655,500)".

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,393,840)".

Page 5, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,492,290)".

Page 5, lines 22 and 23, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,246,290)".

Page 6, line 8, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,522,000)".

Page 6, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,277,920)".

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$157,089,930)".

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$151,236,900)".

Page 19, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,792,540)".

Page 19, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,772,720)".

Page 19, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,859,890)".

Page 20, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$26,388,000)".

Page 29, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$46,681,650)".

Page 32, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,359,630)".

Page 33, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,741,400)".

Page 35, line 10, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,960,090)".

Page 36, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,376,950)".

Page 51, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,357,720)".

Page 52, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,854,010)".

Page 54, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,900,000)".

Page 55, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,140,000)".

Page 99, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$498,099,270)".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the administrative salaries in the expense accounts in the underlying bill by just 3 percent, with the exception of the U.S. Coast Guard. It does not affect their expenses.

Our Nation is facing a total economic meltdown, and now more than ever it is apparent that we have to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington, D.C.

Over the last 2 years, House Members have voted to reduce their own administrative accounts—their Members' Representational Allowances—by more than 11 percent. Yet over that same period of time, many agencies have seen minimal reductions and, in some cases, even increases in their accounts.

For a good example, the TSA has only experienced a 3.5 percent cut over the last 2 years. I know many of my colleagues can agree that the TSA has not only been a complete and utter failure, but it also has been a colossal waste of taxpayer money, amounting to almost \$60 billion.

Moreover, TSA personnel have not prevented the first terrorist attack from happening on American soil. In fact, at least 17 known terrorists have flown in the United States more than 24 different times. Yet this year, TSA screener personnel will receive increased funding for their compensation and benefits that totals more than \$30 million above fiscal year 2012. This is totally unacceptable.

Another example I'd like to point to in the underlying bill is funding for a brand new agency called the Office of Biometric Identity Management. This new office will receive almost \$200 million for their administrative salaries and expense accounts. Mr. Chairman, we need to be looking for areas where we can make cuts, not for opportunities to grow the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Now, certainly we can all agree that many of the offices, agencies, and individuals employed by the Department of Homeland Security are very deserving of the pay for which they receive but, Mr. Chairman, let's be realistic. If we are serious about reducing spending and reducing our deficit, we have to ask every agency to follow Congress' lead and take a small reduction in their administrative funding instead of asking for increases or trying to create new programs.

To be clear, a 3 percent reduction in these accounts would, in many cases, still result in less than a 10 percent reduction in funding from FY11 levels.

□ 1900

While this amount is small, it would pay dividends, huge dividends, resulting in nearly a half a billion dollars in savings in this bill alone.

It is long past time to get serious about spending, Mr. Chairman, and this amendment represents a balanced way to achieve significant savings. I urge my colleagues to support my amend-

ment and to reduce spending in these accounts by just a mere 3 percent.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly oppose my good friend from Georgia's amendment. I think he makes some very good points, but one thing, as I had mentioned in the debate this afternoon and the general debate, this is the third fiscal year in a row that the bill has tried to work at cutting already.

Fiscal discipline and funding for homeland needs are the two most important things. And as I said earlier, that fiscal discipline is something that is a very important aspect of this bill. The bill actually has a decrease of \$484 million below last year's bill, and it is \$394 million below the President's request.

As I had mentioned earlier this afternoon, we do think that we need to be very much mindful of the situation we find ourselves in in this country. But bear in mind that we have cut, we have reached a delicate balance to make sure that we make sure frontline operations are secure, that they are operating at a level that we can make sure that our Nation is secure.

The Office of the Secretary, for example, has been cut 9 percent below the President's request, and it's 8 percent below the FY 2012 act.

This is the 10th year anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security, and certainly we've got to make sure that our Department is strong, it has strong management. My concern is that this amendment would undermine that goal. And so I would ask Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to second the remarks of our chairman. I think this is an amendment that, while well-intentioned in certain respects, is not one that we can or should accept.

I know it's easy to target management and administrative costs. They sometimes lack concreteness. They lack a consistency. But, as a matter of fact, we depend on these management and administrative functions to run the Department. And at the end of the day, cutting those functions will, indeed, affect frontline operations. We should make no mistake about that.

In my opinion, this bill already cuts administrative functions by imprudent amounts. It already slashes funding for offices at the departmental level, for example, by 21 percent below the administration's request.

So while this amendment may be appealing to some, I believe it's unwise, and I urge colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 6, line 8, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 16, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair of this subcommittee and the ranking member for the work they've put into this.

I rise with an amendment that is designed to ensure that our rail and transit systems have the additional resources, or at least some of the additional resources, that they need to help thwart any potential terrorist attacks on buses and trains.

Now, just over a year ago, when our forces raided Osama bin Laden's compound, they discovered materials in his hideout indicating that he was planning attacks on rail and transit systems, and we have no reason to believe that al Qaeda's remnants have abandoned any such plans. As we've seen repeatedly, the threat is very real.

Since 2004, terrorist cells have conducted successful and deadly bombings on major passenger rail systems in Spain, the United Kingdom, India, Belarus, with over 600 people killed, thousands wounded. And despite this threat, over the last few years, our country has been backsliding in providing our rail and transit systems the resources they need.

In years past, rail and transit security funding had its own line item in the budget. But a couple of years ago, it was rolled into the overall State and local grant programs, and it's funding has been slashed, and slashed is not an overstatement, from a previous high of \$300 million, down to only about \$88 million this past year.

The large reduction was made in the face of an existing \$6 billion in rail and transit security funding needs identified by rail and transit operators around the Nation, as reported by the American Public Transportation Association.

My amendment addresses part of this shortfall by moving a total of \$50 million from three accounts—Overall Management and Administration, Intelligence and Analysis, and the Transportation Security Administration—to the State and Local Programs Grant Account for the express purpose of increasing funding available for rail and transit security grants. I propose these moves reluctantly, but we need the funding in the transit security. This would bring to \$138 million the account for rail security, well above the \$88 million currently there, but well below the \$300 million that only a few years ago was the funding level.

This amendment actually saves the taxpayer \$36 million because of the difference in the account spend-down rates. It's a responsible amendment, I believe, that addresses a crucial vulnerability in our rail and transit security posture, and I ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION  
ASSOCIATION,

June 6, 2012.

Hon. RUSH HOLT,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLT: On behalf of the 1,500 members of the American Public Transportation Association, I am writing to express our support for your amendment to H.R. 5855, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The amendment aims to restore critical funding for the public transportation security grant program.

Sharp decreases in public transportation security grant funding over the past several federal budget cycles have hampered the ability of transit agencies to make needed capital security improvements throughout their systems. Decreases in transit security funding could not be more ill timed as transit ridership continues to soar. In 2011, more than 10.4 billion trips were taken on public transportation as Americans commuted to work, school, medical appointments and their houses of worship. This trend has continued as dozens of transit agencies across the country have set ridership records over the first quarter of 2012. We must do all we can to ensure the safety and security of our riders and transit workers. We urge Congress to support your amendment and increase vital funding for the public transportation security grant program.

Thank you for your continued support of public transportation, and we look forward to working with you on this and future legislation. If you have any questions, please have your staff contact Brian Tynan of APTA's Government Affairs Department at (202) 496-4897 or email [btynan@apta.com](mailto:btynan@apta.com). Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL P. MELANIPHY,  
President & CEO.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. The bill that we have before us that we have brought to the floor is something that has already cut programs substantially across the board. But the way that we have cut it, we feel, is responsible and manageable.

Some of the cuts that we have had in here—the Office of Secretary, as I had mentioned earlier, has been cut by 9 percent below the request, 8 percent below FY 2012, and it is 18 percent below the FY 2010 level. The bill has reduced management to a bare minimum, with decrease in most offices, including General Counsel.

The bill has already cut TSA management by \$60 million, and \$20 million is cut in the Aviation Security Account.

This amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey is bringing up, by taking \$15 million more from this account, will impair TSA's ability to manage its aviation security missions and is also simply not responsible. The amendment would slash funding for the Department's intelligence programs, which represent a core homeland security capability.

For grants, the bill provides \$2.8 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants, \$400 million more than provided in FY 2012. Of that, the bill provides \$1.8 billion for the Secretary to provide to programs that address the highest need, based on the threat and based on risk.

Breaking out specific grants, as this amendment does, funds projects for various programs without an overreaching lens. The consolidation of this bill forces the Secretary to examine the intelligence and risk and put scarce dollars where they are needed most. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1910

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I want to commend our colleague from New Jersey for offering an amendment that takes explicit account of the need for robust funding for State and local grant programs, including those aimed at rail and transit security.

As I noted as this debate began, we are indebted to Chairman ADERHOLT and to the majority for increasing the funding for these grants in this fiscal year 2013 bill over the 2012 levels; but as the gentleman from New Jersey has noted, this funding is against a baseline that has been significantly reduced in the previous 2 fiscal years.

I was privileged to serve as the chairman of this subcommittee in the years 2007–2010. We worked very hard in those years to provide robust funding for important grant programs, and we increased the funding for FEMA first responder grants by \$1 billion between fiscal '07 and fiscal '10. Unfortunately,

these programs are now under threat. Since 2010, funding for FEMA grants has been cut by nearly 50 percent to a total level of \$1.3 billion for fiscal 2012. Those cuts are shortsighted and they're dangerous, and I have said so repeatedly.

After all, local governments are the first responders to terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and other major emergencies. Local law enforcement, fire, emergency, medical, as well as county public health and other public safety personnel, are responsible for the on-the-ground response and recovery action. Local communities or public entities own, operate, and secure essential aspects of our Nation's infrastructure, of our ports and transit systems, of our water supplies, and of our schools and hospitals. So, plainly put, these grants protect our communities and are vitally important in our ability to detect, deter, and respond to a variety of threats and disasters.

As the gentleman from New Jersey has stressed, our rail and transit systems are an important part of this network, and they are in many cases very much in need of the kind of funding that this bill has provided and should provide. I reluctantly add, though, Mr. Chairman, that there are problems with these offsets, and I will repeat what the chairman has said about some of the cuts that are included in these bills, these important accounts:

The Secretary's office, that may seem an easy thing to cut, but this bill already reduces the Secretary's office by 9 percent. Analysis and Intelligence, this bill already cuts this by 8 percent. Then TSA aviation security has one of the largest cuts in this bill. It's \$212 million below the 2012 levels.

There are very few good places to turn, I realize. We're so often in a position of trading off worthwhile objectives, but I do feel bound both to commend the gentleman for calling our attention to these grant programs and the need for robust funding, but also to highlight some of the problems with the offsets in this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR  
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), \$213,128,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 shall be for official reception and

representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$5,448,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and \$9,689,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: *Provided further*, That \$124,325,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives all statutorily required reports and plans that are due with the submission of the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary for Management shall, pursuant to the requirements contained in House Report 112-331, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, including the information required under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management" under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), with the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,667,000)".

Page 36, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,667,000)".

Page 37, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,667,000)".

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

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment that would fund the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System at \$35.18 million, which is level with the Senate bill; but it still reflects a reduction of, roughly, \$6 million from fiscal year 2012.

The National Urban Search and Rescue Response System provides a significant national resource for search and rescue assistance in the wake of major disasters and structural collapses. A typical US&R task force will conduct physical search and rescue operations, provide emergency medical care to trapped victims, assess and control hazards such as ruptured gas and electric lines, and evaluate and stabilize damaged structures.

Due to the critical life-saving nature of their missions, US&R task forces must be prepared to deploy within 6 hours of notification and must be self-sufficient for the first 72 hours. These teams have been deployed in response to the Joplin, Missouri, tornado, the Japanese tsunami, the Haiti earthquake, Hurricane Katrina, the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and

the Pentagon, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Turkey earthquakes, the grain elevator explosion in Wichita, Kansas, and many other foreign and domestic disasters.

In 2006, FEMA estimated the annual and recurring cost for each task force to be approximately \$1.7 million. Today, in many jurisdictions, the cost exceeds \$2 million. In addition to program management costs, this estimate includes expenses for training, for exercises, the medical monitoring of personnel, and equipment maintenance and storage. Current Federal funding for the Nation's US&R teams only provides a fraction of the funds necessary to maintain each task force, leaving local government sponsors to pick up the remainder of the cost and diverting much-needed funding away from local first responders' budgets.

The recent tornado in Joplin, Missouri, and the subsequent response underscored the importance of the national search and rescue capability. Providing proper funding for the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System will help ensure that these highly skilled teams are available to respond to major emergencies without jeopardizing the budget priorities for local first responders.

Therefore, I urge you to vote "yes" on my amendment and to properly fund this critical program.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIMM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. We will accept the amendment of the gentleman of New York.

Mr. GRIMM. If I can reclaim my time, I just want to thank a friend and colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, for all of his work in joining me in this effort. I just wanted to say thank you very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I want to thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member and my colleague Mr. GRIMM from New York for this thoughtful amendment and for accepting it.

Fairfax County, which I represent, has one of the outstanding US&R teams in the world. As my colleague from New York indicated, they have served both here in the United States in many, many manmade and natural tragedies, as well as around the world in saving lives. This is a great partnership between local governments and the Federal Government, and it's one that we desperately need to be enhanced.

So I very much thank the majority and the minority leaders for accepting this thoughtful amendment. I am proud to join with my colleague, Mr. GRIMM, in cosponsoring this amendment as an original cosponsor, and I am delighted it's going to be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

I am pleased to join my colleague, Congressman GRIMM, in sponsoring this amendment to restore funding for our nation's elite Urban Search and Rescue, USAR, Teams. Our simple common sense amendment would restore about half of the reduction proposed by the Committee, matching the level of the Senate markup, and it has the support of the International Association of Fire Fighters and the National Association of Police Organizations.

When earthquake survivors are trapped in the rubble of a collapsed building, the window of survivability is measured in hours. Without highly-trained responders, rescue attempts can imperil victims and rescuers alike. Thankfully, we have made strategic investments in specialized USAR teams. These elite firefighters and emergency medical technicians are not just first responders. For people awaiting rescue, they are the last hope.

Prior to coming to Congress, I served 14 years on the Fairfax County, Virginia, Board of Supervisors, and for 9 of those years, I shared my office with a fire station. I saw daily the selfless dedication of the men and women who put their lives at risk every day in service to others.

Fairfax County is home to one of nation's outstanding USAR teams. In partnership with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the local county government, the Fairfax team serves U.S. interests at home and abroad. It is comprised of highly-skilled career and volunteer fire and rescue personnel, whose daily duties are to serve the Fairfax community by responding to local fire and medical emergencies.

When called into service by DHS, the Fairfax team, designated as Virginia Task Force One, is mobilized for quick response to domestic disasters, natural or manmade, with special expertise in collapsed building rescue. Our team was deployed to Oklahoma City in the wake of the 1995 bombing, and it was among the first on the scene at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. It also was dispatched to Mississippi and Louisiana in response to Hurricane Katrina in 2005. The team has answered the call for help in multiple states, including California, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, North Carolina, Texas, Florida, Kansas, Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey. In addition, the Fairfax Team deployed and was on call during the Presidential Inauguration in 2009, the Republican National Convention in Minnesota in 2008, the Democratic National Convention in Massachusetts in 2004, and the Olympic Games in Utah in 2002 and Georgia in 1996.

Fairfax and other USAR teams also have answered the call to respond to disasters abroad under the direction of USAID. In the past 2 years alone, the Fairfax Team, designated as USAR Team One, has deployed to offer rescue and recovery assistance following the devastating earthquake in Haiti and Japan. In 1998, the Team deployed to Kenya in response to the bombings at the U.S. embassy. Throughout its more than 20 years of operation, USAR Team One has carried the banner for America's diplomatic efforts in response to disasters in Armenia, the Philippines, Italy, Turkey, Taiwan, Mozambique, the Czech Republic, Iran, Morocco, Pakistan, Bolivia, Peru, Honduras, Burma, China, Panama, and Chile.



When disaster strikes—whether natural or manmade, domestically or internationally—Fairfax and the other select USAR teams have rushed to the scene saving countless lives and property. Their heroic efforts have shown this to be a wise investment and one that ought to be maintained.

I urge my colleague to support the Grimm-Connolly amendment to ensure that this successful partnership with our local partners and first responders continues, so that when the next alarm is called, we can take comfort in knowing they are on the job.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1920

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$10 million to State and local grant programs under this budget, and the offset would be from the management account.

I'm offering this amendment because our State and local units of government don't have the revenue to adequately protect our citizens in the event of a natural disaster or another emergency. The housing crisis has depressed housing values throughout this country and, as a result, has lowered the tax base from which State and local governments depend on raising their revenue.

I urge this House to approve this amendment to better prepare our State and local units of government for emergencies and other natural disasters and terrorist attacks which could occur.

I appreciate your support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, as I have stated earlier, this bill provides \$2.8 billion for Homeland Security first responder grants, \$400 million more than provided in FY12. Of that, the bill provides \$1.8 billion for the Secretary to provide to programs that address the highest need based on threat and based on risk.

The funding for grants has been a high priority for our bill this year, and we believe there's adequate funding for grants. Like I said, I would reluctantly have to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his attention to the need for robust grant programs, FEMA grant programs for State and local governments and their various emergency preparedness functions.

As we said earlier with respect to Mr. HOLT's amendment, these programs have been underfunded in recent years. We're doing better this year in this bill, but we're building on a depleted base. So I commend him for his attention to this.

At the same time, I feel bound to say that the offset is problematic. The Under Secretary for Management—I know that sounds like an easy target. But with the Grimm-Connolly amendment that we just adopted, by my calculation, that brings the Under Secretary for Management \$30 million below the 2012 level. That's 12 percent. It is a cut that, in my opinion, we can ill afford. That's already what we've done with this bill.

Eventually, management and administrative cuts do affect frontline operations. So I feel bound to say that, as we balance the equities here, the need for robust grant programs and for making them more robust wherever we can, but at the same time to preserve essential departmental functions.

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

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

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment along with my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE.

This amendment takes \$10 million from the Office of the Under Secretary of Management of DHS and moves it to the border security, fencing infrastructure, and technology account with the purpose of being used for border cell

phone communication infrastructure to help border residents disseminate border security-related information to the Border Patrol and law enforcement for their protection and the security of the border.

Mr. Chairman, the history goes back to March 27, 2010, when, in Arizona, Rob Krentz was murdered 20 miles north of the border in an isolated area in Arizona. The lack of communications capability made Krentz more vulnerable than he would have been otherwise and complicated the search for the assailant. His wife, Sue—who I've talked to on numerous occasions—believes that he was in a cell phone dead zone when he was killed and that he was trying to call for help at the time of his murder.

Before leaving office, Congresswoman Giffords had been working diligently on this specific issue. I became involved with her staff when they took the time to show me around the Arizona border and introduced me to the Krentz widow, Sue. I thank Gabby Giffords for her work on this issue, bringing it to my attention and other Members of Congress, and wish her well.

Mr. Chairman, these dead zones are so common that oftentimes border ranchers in Arizona and in Texas rely on shortwave radios to communicate or call for help.

The inability of the U.S. Government to secure the U.S.-Mexico border creates public safety hazards for residents who live on the border and the law enforcement agents who patrol them. Many border areas are rural and lack wireless communication capabilities like cellular phone service, making border security a public safety issue.

Last year, I worked with Congresswoman Giffords and Representative ALTMIRE to pass a similar amendment to the Department of Homeland Security bill. We received overwhelming support in this House with a vote of 327-93, and I urge the House to support this initiative again.

However, the omnibus bill passed later that year weakened this provision to make it a mere suggestion for DHS to solve this problem. Despite that language, the Department of Homeland Security has done very little if anything to address this issue. More work needs to be done, and there is a large number of dead zones along our southern border. That's why this amendment is offered again this year.

Rural areas along the border present a unique public safety challenge that can be addressed through the extension of wireless communications into those areas. An additional \$10 million can be used to enhance wireless communication capabilities that would allow residents to report threats against them and instances of illegal activities to law enforcement. Such capabilities would enhance communications among our law enforcement and our border protectors.

Richard Stana, Director of Homeland Security Issues at the Government Accountability Office, recently told the

Senate Homeland Security Committee that, as it stands right now, we have the ability to prevent or stop illegal entries into the U.S. for only 129 miles of the 1,954-mile U.S. border with Mexico. He continued to say that we have achieved, "an acceptable level of control" on 873 miles of the border. Whatever "acceptable level of control" means, I'm not sure.

In any event, that means 1,081 miles of the United States' border is a wide-open space, Mr. Chairman, and we simply cannot stop illegal crossings of any kind in those areas. The United States doesn't control that area of the border. Mexico does not either. I suspect it's the drug cartels that control that area of our sovereignty.

If the Federal Government is not going to secure the border, the least we can do is give the border residents a chance to call for help when they need help. Ten million dollars will go a long way in helping American citizens have a safer place to live and also allow them to communicate with law enforcement.

The Office of the Under Secretary of Management for DHS is funded at \$213 million in the bill, and \$10 million is a 4.5 percent reduction in that account. I think, as the ranking member said, to balance the equities, we need public safety as opposed to more funding for the Under Secretary for Management.

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

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

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my friend, Congressman POE, for his strong leadership on this issue and for again working with me this year to highlight the critical importance of expanded mobile communications along our southern border.

□ 1930

Last year I had the opportunity to visit the district of our former colleague, Gabrielle Giffords, in southwestern Arizona, where I met with customs and Border Patrol agents, examined construction of the border fence and spoke with ranchers and residents who live and work in the remote areas along the U.S.-Mexico border. In rural areas along that border, cell phone service is virtually nonexistent, and where service does exist, it's often unreliable. Some ranchers even have to resort to communicating through the use of two-way radios.

The lack of cell phone service presents an obvious safety issue for ranchers, as my friend, Congressman POE outlined, and it's a safety issue for residents and the National Guard troops who patrol that protected area. If a rancher feels threatened, he cannot currently call for help or alert law enforcement to the situation.

To address this issue, our amendment adds \$10 million to the general account

for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology to expand mobile communications in remote areas along our southern border. These funds may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into public-private partnerships which will provide a more reliable communications link between law enforcement officials and citizens who live and work in our border areas.

Last year, Congressman POE and I offered a similar amendment that passed with a strong bipartisan vote of 327-93. Despite its inclusion in last year's omnibus funding measure, little action to date has been taken by DHS to implement stronger cell coverage along the U.S.-Mexico border. I urge support of our amendment to show DHS that the safety of our southern border is a priority for this Congress.

This is a problem we can and must fix. Supporting this amendment will not increase spending, but what it will do is protect the public and increase the effectiveness of law enforcement in rural border areas.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I do commend the gentlemen from Texas and Pennsylvania for their attention to border security. Border security is a top priority with this subcommittee and with this chairman, but the amendment that is before us at this time proposes to cut the Department of Homeland Security to pay for cell towers to provide phone service, actually to the general public.

I am very sympathetic to the needs of rural communities. I represent a rural community and am certainly sympathetic to remote ranchers, but this is simply not a cost currently with the situation in this country that Homeland Security can bear.

This proposal would cut the Department's management functions below what is possible for our Nation's security. The bill already cuts the Office of Under Secretary for Management 4 percent below the request of the President and 11 percent below the FY12 level. It should be noted that this bill fully funds the Department's tactical communications.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise also to oppose this amendment. I do so reluctantly, because I know that the need that Representative POE and Representative ALTMIRE are addressing is a real one. There are vast expanses of territory,

including a lot of territory near the borders, that suffer from a lack of mobile communications.

We do need to work in concert with State and local governments and the private sector to address this need. This is not something, though, that this bill or the Department of Homeland Security can take on. It simply is not feasible. It is not a DHS function.

We need to work on it, but I think this remedy is flawed, and I, once again, say that I know it's an easy target to go after the administrative expenses of the Department, but in this case the Under Secretary for Management is already something like 12 percent below the 2012 level, that is, assuming the passage of the Grimm-Connelly amendment, and I do not think that further cuts can or should be sustained.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 41, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 41, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 41, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases funding for the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant by \$2.5 million and Assistance to Firefighters Grants, restoring these programs to FY12 levels.

The funding increase is deficit neutral, as it is offset by a \$5 million decrease to the Office of Under Secretary for Management. These grants provide vital funding to our Nation's first responders to help them adequately staff firehouses and to provide the necessary specialized equipment to protect our brave men and women.

With first responder budgets being slashed all around the country, this portion of funding will help ensure fire departments can adequately respond to our constituents' emergency. During this period of budgetary constraints, we must prioritize the programs we need the most.

My amendment clearly shows that our brave first responders are a priority. This amendment is endorsed by



the International Association of Fire Fighters and the International Association of Fire Chiefs.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for helping me support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN) for offering this amendment.

I have joined him in a bipartisan fashion because our local units of governments need this money to be able to rehire their firefighters and to get the training equipment that they need to better prepare our firefighters to respond to a natural disaster or a terrorist attack.

I support this amendment. This will help cities like Detroit and other municipalities in metro Detroit that need to apply for these funds. This provides more money—back to the level in prior years—so that our communities can be safer.

Again, I want to commend the author of this amendment. He has my support. I'm honored to be on this amendment as a cosponsor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. We accept the gentleman from New Jersey's amendment, considering this is only a \$5 million cut.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I appreciate my colleague from New Jersey for bringing this forward. With full support, I agree with him.

I would like to point out that, just for example, June 17 through 23, that week is EMS fire safety survival week. It's just one of the many weeks that we recognize our firemen for what they do for us and the importance of what they do for us. There is an image of 9/11, the firemen and what they did for our Nation in New York when we were attacked.

□ 1940

But that image is also recurring throughout the Nation, throughout the communities, when firemen come to our homes or come to our businesses or go to scenes of accidents. Anywhere our communities need them, the firemen go. This restoring of the grant is just something that we should do—and I'm glad that we are going to do it—to secure that bond to allow them the training and equipment that they need

to take care of us. So this is an investment in them so they can take care of us.

I appreciate my colleague bringing this amendment forward. I'm very happy and proud to be on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of firefighter grant programs. I applaud Chairman ADERHOLT for fully funding the budget request for these programs, that is, providing \$670 million for the assistance to the Firefighter Grant Program equally divided between SAFER hiring grants and equipment grants.

I also commend the chairman for accepting the amendment our colleagues have just offered. Although, again, the offset is not what one would wish, this is a case, I think, where the consideration, the balance of values clearly leads us to bring this program to the present funding levels, which is what the amendment does.

We have approved in committee these firefighter grants and we've also approved the continuation of the waivers. That was my amendment in committee and I am pleased that we were able to adopt those—the economic hardship waivers that are currently in place.

The law traditionally permits SAFER grants only to be used to hire new firefighters. That provision makes sense when our economy is booming and local governments are in a position to hire new workers. But when the local budgets are continuing to shrink and some fire stations are closing their doors and others are laying off workers, FEMA needs the flexibility to use these grants to keep firefighters from being laid off in the first place. The administration has requested this, and FEMA Administrator Fugate testified to this need earlier this year during our appropriations hearings.

I believe strongly in the need to assist local fire departments and ensuring they have the personnel and equipment necessary to keep our communities safe. When I was chairman of the subcommittee from 2007–2010, we were able to more than double the funding for the SAFER program, reaching a peak of \$410 million in fiscal year 2010.

It's regrettable that we're still not able to maintain that level because any cuts to firefighter grants do result in thousands of fewer firefighters on the job. They leave fewer departments able to maintain safe staffing levels and much less to add needed personnel. So we need to maintain this support.

The real challenge in many communities is not the reluctance of local governments to hire new personnel. It's the potential and actual layoffs of personnel, which would mean reduced lev-

els of safety. So it's very important for us to maintain robust grant funding for these programs. It's going to help preserve public safety and security. In this bill we've provided for this. And this amendment adds to that.

So I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$49,743,000, of which \$6,700,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014 for financial systems modernization efforts: *Provided*, That \$29,017,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives all statutorily required reports and plans that are due with the submission of the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$241,543,000; of which \$116,870,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$124,673,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security.

#### ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$317,400,000; of which not to exceed \$4,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$93,764,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$109,264,000, of which not to exceed \$300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

#### TITLE II

#### SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

#### U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; \$8,366,024,000; of which \$3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C.

9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which not to exceed \$38,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not less than \$284,530,000 shall be for Air and Marine Operations; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2013, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be \$35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That \$836,600,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the multi-year investment and management plans that are due with the submission of the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 as submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$30,000,000)”.

Page 9, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$30,000,000)”.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill that strengthens our efforts to have a secure and prosperous border. As you know, these issues are foremost in the thoughts of people across this country. As was noted by my friend and colleague from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, his amendment acknowledged the reality that strengthening the ports of entry should be a national priority. His amendment was accepted as a means to begin to increase and pay attention to that national priority. It's a jobs issue, and it's a security issue.

Land ports of entry are the economic drivers for the U.S. economy and also

the front line for facilitating legitimate trade and travel while preventing unauthorized entry and contraband from crossing the border. Along the nearly 2,000-mile border with Mexico, U.S. Customs and Border Protection carry out this mission in 42 land ports of entry located in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. While significant investments in the border have been made in recent years, including the opening of three new crossings in 2010, more is demanded.

Staffing at our land ports of entry have been severely overlooked, compromising our national and economic security. While a necessary buildup of border enforcement has occurred over the last 10 years, that proportional increase and attention to customs and ports of entry has not occurred.

It is estimated that in Arizona alone, our ports of entry need 500 additional officers to meet a staffing need: 250 at the port of entry in Nogales, 50 in Douglas, and 150 in San Luis. Nationwide there is a need for up to 5,000 additional CBP officers. These shortages are alarming and they have alarming consequences.

A 2008 GAO report said “weakness in traveler inspections exists at our Nation's ports of entry.” And according to this report: “Field office managers said that staffing shortages created vulnerabilities in the inspections process.”

In 2008, the Department of Commerce found that the “cumulative loss in output due to border delays over the next 10 years is estimated at \$86 billion.” Our economy and indeed our security will continue to be compromised unless we take strong measures.

My amendment seeks to redirect within the account of border infrastructure additional funds for the personnel sorely needed.

Let me just end by indicating some facts and points of reference. U.S.-Mexico bilateral trade reached nearly \$400 billion in 2010. Mexico is the third-ranked commercial partner of the U.S. and second largest market for U.S. exports. Mexico spent \$163 billion in U.S. goods in 2010. Twenty-two States count on Mexico as their number one or two export market, and it's the top five for 14 other States. One in every 24 workers in the Nation depends on U.S.-Mexico trade for their employment.

This is an issue of the economy. It's an issue about jobs. My amendment merely addresses a reality: from unobligated and enhancement funds within the budget to transfer \$30 million to begin that initial step to bring our ports of entry and customs to a full force in terms of staffing and to begin to expedite legitimate trade and end long waiting periods, improve our economy, and, yes indeed, continue to provide the advanced security that we need on those borders.

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

□ 1950

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama may state his point of order.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

To be considered en bloc pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 55, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$24,250,000)”.

Page 55, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$24,250,000)”.

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would increase \$10 million in funding to the Customs and Border Protection salaries and expense account and decrease funding of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility by S&T for \$24,250,000 in order to increase the staffing of CBP agents in our Nation's airports.

This amendment is intended to strengthen security and improve the American business advantage by putting more CBP agents in our airports so that they can handle the continuously growing number of travelers to this country.

My own district in California is bookended by two great economic engines of the Los Angeles region—the Port of Los Angeles at the southern end and the Los Angeles International Airport at the north. One of the common complaints I hear from LAX airport is that there are simply not enough Customs and Border Protection agents to effectively and efficiently process the amount of foreign visitors that enter this country every year. In fact, the delays at our country's airports have resulted in losing nearly \$100 billion in economic output over the last 10 years.

If we want to continue being a top destination for immigrants, foreign

visitors, and businesspeople, we need to establish a welcoming presence to people who wish to visit this country. This means ensuring we have an efficient CBP staff that can continue to handle the growing number of people who visit this country.

In a letter sent from the L.A. World Airports to the United States Customs and Border Protection Commissioner, it states that:

Insufficient CBP staff has triggered alarming delays for LAX international passengers waiting to be processed through customs and immigration.

And while this shortage referred to LAX airport, delays due to personnel shortages are prevalent throughout our entire country, and I think this is extremely disconcerting. These delays are weakening our competitiveness in the global market, slowing the pace of business, and impeding the commerce we need to fuel our economic recovery. This adds costs to our Nation's airlines and businesspeople.

What's more, we know if we over-extend and overwork our already over-heroically overperforming CBP personnel guarding the gateways to our Nation, they are more likely to miss things—something or someone is more likely to get through. They deserve support and numbers equal to the scale of the task that we are charging them with.

While I understand the intended purpose of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, the reality is that this facility was appropriated \$75 million even though the President did not need nor request these funds. Additionally, DHS is still waiting for the recommended design modifications made by the National Academy of Sciences and for the administration to review the cost and scope of the project, which isn't anticipated to be completed until 2020.

I think these funds are better spent on increasing the security and promoting American commerce through our country's airports. The commerce that flows through our international airports powers our economy and keeps the United States a global leader in business. We need to preserve that commerce while protecting our homeland from those who would try to sneak through and do us harm.

I urge my colleagues to support what I think is a very important and crucial amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the gentlelady from California in this amendment to increase staffing funding for Customs and Border Protection.

This is a critical issue for our economic competitiveness. If our Nation is going to compete globally, we need to think of ports of entry as strategic assets and real opportunities to expand

our economy. Without adequate resources and staffing, wait times at ports of entry grow longer and longer. And every minute, Mr. Chairman, that goods and people sit at the border waiting to cross is an opportunity lost. That's opportunities lost for American businesses, for manufacturers, and workers. In total, these long delays are projected to result in lost output of more than \$86 billion over the next 10 years. In this tough economy, I don't think we can afford to lose these precious dollars.

And yet, despite the overwhelming need, increases in staffing in past years represent only a small fraction of what is needed to fully staff our ports of entry, according to the Government Accountability Office. To fully meet this need, we need to ensure that CBP has the resources it needs to get the job done. At a time when we need commerce to be moving full steam ahead to drive an economic recovery, we can't afford understaffing at our ports of entry.

Additional funding provided by this amendment to hire additional CBP officers will allow for faster processing times through ports of entry and allow more goods to flow through our borders. By facilitating trade, we not only support businesses and jobs, but we also add revenue, as CBP is the second largest source of revenue for the Treasury. It is only second to the Internal Revenue Service.

As my colleague has stated, the offset for this provision is a cut in funding for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, which was appropriated about \$75 million in spite of the fact that the administration did not request these funds. The National Academy of Science is reviewing the security risk of revised design measures right now, and before that risk is fully mitigated, it's premature, I think, premature to appropriate additional funds, especially when funding for FY 2011 and FY 2012 remains unobligated. So this amendment, Mr. Chairman, will put these dollars to better use by promoting our economic growth, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. This bill already provides robust funding for border security operations. In fact, this year we increase CBP border security inspection and trade facilitation by \$85 million above the President's request.

CBP border security is important, I totally agree, but let me mention that the funding that we've increased supports 21,186 CBP officers and other increases in the National Targeting Center and Global Entry, among other programs and initiatives, to increase efficiency in CBP operations.

CBP's budget faces real challenges. Seventy percent of CBP funds go for pay and benefits, up from 65 percent just last year.

□ 2000

This figure does not include costs associated with supporting frontline officers, such as equipment and facilities, much less new technology.

The committee report outlines opportunities for better managing fee funds and innovating CBP processes. Further, the Secretary has not yet submitted the workload staffing allocation model that will justify any additional CBP officer resources. Given these issues, it is not the time to increase CBP officer staffing.

I will say that it must be noted that the facility that would be cut, we have an immediate need to build up our capacity for research into pathogens that afflict animals and our food chain and, by extension, human beings. The Under Secretary for the Department for Science and Technology herself testified before our subcommittee that the threat of a biological attack through a large and vulnerable food chain is a top priority. She has confirmed that the NBAF facility is required to meet this threat. So the administration itself has said that this is very important.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend. Does the gentlewoman ask unanimous consent to strike the last word?

Mr. HAHN. Yes.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

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

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, after an exhaustive review, the Department of Homeland Security chose Manhattan, Kansas, as the site for the new BSL-4 National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility. This will be the only such facility capable of researching large animals in the United States. The construction of this cutting-edge facility must move forward quickly so we can safely conduct critical research to develop vaccines and countermeasures in order to protect the public and our livestock from the threats of devastating diseases.

But not only will the NBAF accelerate America's ability to protect ourselves, our food supply, and the ag economy from biological threats; it will also be the world's premier animal health research facility and further solidify our Nation's place as the international leader in animal health.

The NBAF is needed to replace the obsolete and increasingly expensive Plum Island Animal Disease Center. This lab was built in the 1950s and has reached the end of its life. The facility does not contain the necessary biosafety level to meet the NBAF research requirements, and it never will. Any attempts to upgrade Plum Island would cost more than building the NBAF as planned. Currently, we do not have the ability to research the effects of these diseases on large animals at any facility in the United States, nor can we rely on international partners for our own security needs.

The NBAF project has a history of broad-based support. DHS, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, and the House Appropriations Committee under both Democrat and Republican leadership have made it clear time and time again that our country needs the NBAF, and the best place for the NBAF is in Manhattan, Kansas.

Congress has already appropriated \$90 million, and the State of Kansas and the city of Manhattan have already committed more than \$200 million towards this project.

In this age of uncertainty and global threats, conducting vital research to protect our Nation could not be more crucial. We cannot just wish away these threats or rely on others for our own security. And the truth of the matter is we are dangerously under-protected from the threat of a biological attack against our people and our food.

While the gentlelady's amendment to increase salaries for the Custom and Border Patrol has merit, it shouldn't be done by cutting 29 percent of the funding for construction of this important lab. The result of this amendment will be stopping or delaying construction of this nationally important NBAF facility, and our Nation's food supply cannot afford another delay.

We need to protect our food and our families from danger. We need to stay on the cutting edge of this research field. Our security is at risk, and delaying this project further should not be an option. We need NBAF.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this destructive amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, just as Congresswoman JENKINS opposed this amendment, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment as well.

The facility at NBAF is a facility that is not just about Kansas. It's important that it's in Kansas. I'm happy that Kansas went through an incredible competition against businesses all across the State and facilities all across the country to make sure that we had the best facility, the facility that was right not for Kansas, but right for America. After that competi-

tion, Manhattan, Kansas, was chosen for the site of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, and now Kansas and the United States have already invested heavily in this facility. It's a facility that creates a biosafety lab level four. It's like no other asset, no other national security asset in America. It's incredibly important. It's important for our food supply and safety for human health.

It's not a partisan issue. It was supported by both the Bush and Obama administrations and was passed through both a Republican- and a Democrat-controlled Congress. So there's no partisan nature to what's going on at the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility. It's simply about national security.

There have now been multiple reports and commissions indicating that this kind of threat is one of the most imminent threats to our Nation's entire homeland security. It's been for that reason that DHS has been very supportive of NBAF and NBAF being built in Kansas.

The State is uniquely qualified. It has exactly the right kind of scientific experts and precisely the expertise to be applied immediately and for the facility to be built in a way that it can operate safely.

We've got to protect animals and people from disease and make sure that when we do that our communities are safe and secure. This is a challenge that our country is ready and able to undertake at the facility in Kansas.

I urge my colleagues to reject this effort to delay this critical development essential to the health and safety of our food supply, and ultimately the safety of the American people.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection automated systems, \$700,242,000 to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which not less than \$138,794,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

#### BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, \$327,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 10, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$624,000)".

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the Border Patrol does a great job when they are allowed to do a great job. Unfortunately, one of the ironies we have is there are certain areas of access into this country by those who are illegal that seem to be an area of choice, especially of the drug cartels and the human traffickers. There is also an unusual correlation between these areas of access and Federal property which has been designated as wilderness area or endangered species habitat. In fact, in the last year's figures that I have, over half of the illegal entries into this country went through one sector in Arizona. Only a portion of the State of Arizona is 80 percent federally controlled, much of that in wilderness area and endangered species habitat.

Ironically, the Border Patrol is restricted in these areas from the way they can enforce their purpose of patrolling the border. I find that one of the things that's very strange is the Border Patrol, on private property, has almost unlimited ability to do their job in enforcing border security.

□ 2010

It's only on Federal property that the Federal Border Patrol is restricted on how it fulfills its Federal purpose.

Fortunately, the drug cartels and the human trafficking, they don't necessarily care about that restriction. They, for some reason, don't necessarily respect the environmental laws that we have, and the destruction to our environment is caused by them. The trampling of those sensitive areas, pictures of endangered cacti that have been cut down and used by the drug cartels as blockades on the roads, the amount of trash that is left behind is not only destroying the environment, but also an amazingly expensive effort to try and clean it up. I have often flip-flopped said that the drug cartel would rather eat an endangered species than protect it.

Nonetheless, the Border Patrol is required to pay for environmental mitigation damages. Since 2007, the Department of Homeland Security has used the money we think we are appropriating to Homeland Security, to the amount of \$7 million, to go to the Department of the Interior for this proposed mitigation of environmental damages.

Let me give you a couple of examples of what this has bought us in the past. At the Arizona border they had to reposition their surveillance towers, which, of course, did lead to some security gaps in those areas, but it also caused a problem with the lesser long-nosed

bat, which has the nasty habit in evenings of flying into the towers.

So one of the mitigations that was insisted upon by the Department of the Interior is that the Border Patrol had to pay for a bat patrol, costing thousands of dollars, to monitor and track a bat who may, indeed, sometimes fly into a tower.

On the Sonoran pronghorn sheep, over \$5 million has been paid in the last decade for the Border Patrol to create another Sonoran pronghorn herd, and to make sure that they have people there to monitor, feed, and avoid the pronghorn. And if they ever come across it, they have to stand really, really still.

Even though this provision has been revoked in recent years, at times some of this money was used by the Department of the Interior to buy land that had nothing to do with border security whatsoever.

My amendment, therefore, takes what is in this proposal, \$3 million that has been earmarked for environmental mitigation, and moves it to a more legitimate and deserving use of that activity by taking it to the Air and Marine Interdiction Account to provide money for the Border Patrol to recapitalize their aging fleet.

Almost half of all the airplanes that the Border Patrol has are 33 years or older. This has impeded their operational readiness. These obsolete planes that they have make it unable for them to assist in properly securing the border. GAO, in its report, said in 2010 only 73 percent of the over 38,000 requests for air support could be granted simply because the fleet was aging at that particular time.

What it's simply trying to do here is a very simple concept. The better the Border Patrol is at controlling the border, the better the environment will be on the border. It's not the Border Patrol that causes environmental havoc; it is the drugs cartels and the human traffickers coming across. To take this money, which would go to mitigation, and put it where it is desperately needed, to try and help the infrastructure so the Border Patrol can better do their job, simply means we'll actually have a better environment by doing it.

It's the right thing to do. It would be an appropriate and intelligent thing for us to put the money where it would do the most good, in giving the Border Patrol the infrastructure they need to do their jobs along our borders, both in the North and in the South.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. The funds are included in support of border security, albeit to facilitate only the most necessary environmental mitigation activities directly related to border security construction, operation, and main-

tenance. However, I do understand the gentleman's position and concerns and, for that reason, we accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would eliminate \$3 million funding for environmental mitigation in our border security efforts, and add that money to air and marine assets, which is already greatly, greatly increased in this bill.

First a bit of context. Since 2006, this subcommittee has increased funding for border security by over \$2 billion annually. We invested well over \$1 billion for fencing and other tactical infrastructure alone during that period.

Responding to concerns about possible environmental problems associated with such a massive construction undertaking, much of which has taken place on environmentally sensitive lands, Congress provided very modest amounts to mitigate these potential environmental consequences.

Now, as a government, we have many responsibilities and priorities, and these include both securing our borders and protecting our natural and cultural resources. The sort of inter-agency agreement that Homeland Security and Interior have entered into for environmental mitigation is what we should be encouraging and supporting, especially because this arrangement is explicit, in that Interior cannot take any action that CBP does not first agree to.

So we've got to keep that commitment to protecting and preserving our environment. We have to maintain that commitment. And I urge colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the Bishop amendment strikes environmental mitigation funding that has no place in this bill. This is a Homeland Security bill. We spend this money to protect the homeland and secure our borders. These are some of the most important responsibilities we have as a Congress under our Constitution.

But this money won't go to border security. This money will go to pay off Federal agencies just so the Border Patrol can access public lands.

Our Border Patrol is locked out of huge swaths of public lands along our border unless they fork over tax dollars for environmental mitigation. So we, the Congress, under the auspices of border security, are spending the people's hard-earned money on a slush fund for land managers.

Just to name a few examples, agencies have demanded this money to

monitor bats, to monitor pronghorn antelope—my State of Wyoming has three times more antelope than people—and in one case, to protect the endangered ocelot, which hasn't even been seen in the area for 20 years.

This is madness. If you want to protect the species and ecosystems along the border, then secure the border. Rampant border crossings across wilderness do more damage than our Border Patrol ever could.

We need to eliminate restrictions on the Border Patrol's access to Federal land, not enable them. If you want to stop this extortion of border security dollars, vote for the Bishop amendment. This puts money toward air and marine interdiction.

And if you want environmental mitigation, put it in the Interior bill where it belongs, and where Congress can keep track of where the money goes, and where land managers have to justify it.

Let our Border Patrol do its job. Vote for the Bishop amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. 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 Utah will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION, OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND PROCUREMENT

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including operational training and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts, \$518,469,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2013 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under this heading in Public Law 112-74.

## CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, \$252,567,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, an inventory of the real property of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and a plan for each activity and project proposed for funding under this heading that includes the full cost by fiscal year of each activity and project proposed and underway in fiscal year 2014.

## IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; \$5,236,331,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed \$12,750 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than \$305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than \$68,321,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); and of which not to exceed \$11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not less than \$10,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: *Provided further*, That not less than \$134,626,000 shall be for worksite enforcement investigations, audits, and activities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, not less than \$1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable, of which \$138,249,000 shall be for completion of Secure Communities deployment: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 45 days after the end of each quarter of the fis-

cal year, on progress in implementing the preceding proviso and the funds obligated during that quarter to make such progress: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: *Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, not less than \$2,749,840,000 is for detention and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens, of which not less than \$91,460,000 shall be for alternatives to detention: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$10,300,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for the Visa Security Program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been violated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than "adequate" or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000) (increased by \$40,000,000)".

Page 13, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. Let us combat human trafficking and child exploitation.

□ 2020

My amendment would take \$40 million from the Detention and Removal Operations and transfer those funds to the Office of Investigations to support antichild exploitation and trafficking initiatives.

ICE is one of the key global partners aimed at dismantling criminal infrastructures engaged in child exploitation. These special agents are in many countries throughout the world and in the United States, and I have had the opportunity to meet with them overseas where child exploitation is rampant, such as in Thailand and Cambodia.

That is why I would like to increase the funding to combat child exploi-

tation, and I am requesting \$40 million be transferred to them. The funds are coming from an account that is \$70 million over the President's budget. I didn't even take all of that excess. I'm just asking for \$40 million, leaving roughly \$30 million over the President's budget in ICE Detention and Removal Operations.

With women and girls accounting for over 80 percent of the people trafficked throughout the world, including within the United States, this issue is something that is very close to my heart, and I have been a vocal advocate to stop and combat sex exploitation trafficking.

My district represents the largest Vietnamese population in the world outside of Vietnam. The fact is that most of the human trafficking victims originate from Asia. I have a responsibility to the people I represent to seek out ways to ensure that ICE can combat child exploitation globally since it impacts us locally. In fact, in Cambodia, brothel owners pay traffickers anywhere from \$350 to \$450 for each attractive Vietnamese virgin 16 years or younger. Nonvirgins and those considered less beautiful are trafficked for about \$150 apiece.

I am asking the chairman to join me in this outrage that these things still happen in our modern world, and more often than not, they occur in our own districts here in the United States. The only way to eradicate child exploitation is to stand together to protect every child's right to be free from victimization. We can all work towards eliminating child exploitation by ensuring that we have people who combat this and by putting this money into this account. We need to give those people on the front line the tools to stop this. I thank the chairman for the time, and I ask him to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. The concern is that the amendment seeks to gut detention operations just as the administration has tried to do; whereas, this bill holds the administration's feet to the fire and provides the resources to force them to actually enforce the law. The committee recommends \$2.75 billion for ICE Detention and Removal Operations, \$71 million above the request to sustain a minimum of 34,000 detention beds. Detention beds are a necessary resource to support robust immigration enforcement.

Make no mistake. There is a need for these resources. First, by the administration's own estimate, there are at least 1.9 million removable criminal aliens in the United States. There is the general acknowledgment of an illegal alien population of approximately



11 million. With the expansion of Secure Communities and ICE's prior utilization, there is no doubt they need at least 34,000 beds. Despite the fact that Congress has funded every request that ICE has provided for bed spaces, we have gotten excuses that they do not have the resources needed. Now the resources are being provided, and the committee insists that ICE intensify its enforcement efforts and fully utilize these resources.

Let me say that countering child exploitation is a critical effort in this bill for which we already have provided increases for ICE and Secret Service activities. The Wasserman Schultz amendment, which will be brought up shortly, provides an additional 25 percent to the child exploitation center. We have been working with Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ on this amendment. We are accepting that 25 percent increase for the child exploitation center, so I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment, that of the Congresswoman from California, Ms. SANCHEZ.

I think it is a well-designed amendment both in its positive purpose and in the offsets that she has chosen. She proposes that we increase ICE funding for child exploitation, and that is a worthy cause that we do need to fund more generously than is present in the bill as brought to the floor.

Each year, millions of children fall victim to sexual predators. These young victims are left with permanent psychological and physical and emotional scars. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, targets and investigates child pornographers, child sex tourists and facilitators, the human smugglers and traffickers of minors, criminal aliens convicted of offenses against minors, and those deported for child exploitation offenses who have returned illegally. ICE is at the forefront of these activities and can make good use of the funding that our colleague proposes, so I commend her for bringing this issue to our attention and for putting this amendment before us.

The offsets are particularly well chosen. As I said as we began the debate on this bill, this bill contains some ill-advised funding floors, some mandatory spending that is rigid and is wasteful: an increased minimum of detention beds, for example, and the required floor funding for the 287(g) program, a program that is very problematic and that really needs to be transitioned, in my view, to the Secure Communities Program, which maintains the Federal and local roles much more distinctly. These are offsets that we can afford and offsets that, in fact,

would improve the bill, and only rarely can one say that about offsets in these debates.

So I commend the gentlelady for her amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman ADERHOLT.

First, I want to commend his leadership on this appropriations bill concerning the security screenings of children by the Transportation Security Administration. The TSA should absolutely have particular sensitivity in the screening process of children and should minimize children's distress and discomfort. I am very thankful to the gentleman for raising this issue in the manager's amendment and for recognizing this need.

But as this process moves forward, I would encourage the chairman to stress the importance of this same sensitivity to the elderly and the infirm. We have all seen too many images in high-profile news stories about the mistreatment of the elderly and the infirm as well as of passengers with religious or conscience objections. No good American should be forced to check his modesty at the airport door—maybe his luggage but not his modesty.

I also appreciate the fact that the report encourages various alternative screening models that would better preserve the civil liberties and privacy of all passengers by moving toward a more risk-based approach, using intelligence more than relying on technology. I encourage the chairman to continue moving TSA along this path.

□ 2030

Would the chairman be willing to work with me on these issues for the benefit of America's airline passengers?

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I thank the gentleman for his support of the House report language on sensitivity for child passenger screenings, and it is certainly reasonable to include other vul-

nerable individuals like the elderly and the infirm.

I will work with the gentleman going forward on these matters, and thank him for bringing the challenges of screening these other individuals to the floor. I look forward to working with him on this matter.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Alabama again for his leadership on the overall appropriations bill here and for his particular sensitivity to this issue.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

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

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, first let me just say how much I appreciate the opportunity to work with the chairman, and I appreciate his work both when we worked together in the leadership of the legislative branch appropriations subcommittee and also to express appreciation for his commitment to increasing the amount of funds available to pursue child exploitation in this bill, and for your commitment in protecting children. Both of us being parents of 8- and 13-year-olds, I have a particular appreciation for this.

I rise to ask for my colleagues' support for an amendment to protect what we've been talking about here this evening, our most vulnerable constituents, our children.

My amendment would fence off \$20 million in funds through ICE, Homeland Security Investigations, Cyber Crimes Center, for the purposes of child exploitation prevention and interdiction.

There is no question that our children need our support now more than ever. With the proliferation of the Internet and wireless technology, the spread of child pornography on line must be addressed aggressively now. We don't have a moment or an opportunity to waste.

The Department of Justice estimates that at any moment, there are more than 1 million pornographic images of children on the Internet, with an additional 200 images being posted every day. And more than one-third of the world's pedophiles involved in organized pornography rings worldwide live in the United States.

The Internet allows these images to be disseminated indefinitely, victimizing that child victim again and again with each click of the mouse. Because let's not forget that these are not just heinous images—they are crime scene photos. Every face in those photographs is the face of a child who needs our support in order to escape a living hell of constant abuse and exploitation.

Since the 1970s, before we even had a child pornography statute, ICE, which

was then called the U.S. Customs Service, was the leader in the fight to protect our children. That is still true today. As recently as 2009, ICE was responsible for 52 percent of cases prosecuted for receipt or distribution of child pornography and 90 percent of cases prosecuted for child sex tourism.

This is in addition to hundreds of arrests every year and thousands of children rescued to date. Their efforts are second to none, and I know they will put these resources to good use. But for every child rescued, hundreds more remain trapped in a current of abuse, the horrors of which none of us can truly imagine. And we need the absolute best personnel going into the fight to rescue these children.

That's why it's my hope that some of these funds will be used to employ our wounded warriors, in addition to the experienced agents already fighting these battles. Our armed services have already protected us abroad, so naturally our veterans are a perfect choice to protect our most precious resources here at home. In fact, retired Army Master Sergeant Rich Robertson is already fighting child exploitation at the ICE field office in Tennessee. In his words, "Who better to hunt child predators than someone who's already hunted men?"

I'm enthusiastic about this initiative because I know that the immense skills and motivation returning servicemen and -women possess could be the key to our most successful affront on child exploitation yet. Child predators won't stand a chance.

By harnessing the abilities of our wounded warriors, we not only ensure that their skills, dedication, and drive are put to good use back at home, we give them the most dignified thank you of all, a job that truly makes a difference.

So let me be clear: With the passage of this amendment, we would be putting predators on notice. Their reign of terror is coming to an end. You can bet on it. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in committing to fight until every American child can live free from terror and exploitation, and support this important amendment, which, Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk, which I should have started with. So thank you very much.

I want to also add, Mr. Chairman, that I support my colleague from California's amendment to increase the funds available to ICE for the purpose of fighting child exploitation by reducing the funds available for immigration detention and removal operations, which in this bill is unnecessarily increased above the President's request.

I thank the chairman and my colleagues' indulgence for doing this backwards.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000) (increased by \$20,000,000)".

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Now that the amendment is formally before us, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we would gladly accept the gentlelady's amendment.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida.

Each year, millions of children fall victim to sexual predators. These young victims are left with permanent psychological, physical, and emotional scars.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE, targets and investigates child pornographers, child-sex tourists and facilitators, human smugglers and traffickers of minors, criminal aliens convicted of offenses against minors, and those deported for child exploitation offenses who have returned illegally.

The Child Exploitation Center is at the forefront of these investigations. Unfortunately, funding for ICE's Child Exploitation Center has decreased over the past 2 years from \$16.7 million in 2011 to a proposed \$14.7 million in 2013. This amendment bolsters funds for this center by a modest amount, bringing total funding to \$20 million, restoring the budget cuts and providing a small additional amount to make additional headway on ending these heinous crimes.

I appreciate the gentlelady bringing this issue to our attention, and I support the adoption of this amendment. These dollars will be well spent safeguarding our children worldwide.

I appreciate the chairman accepting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to support an amendment by my dear colleague and friend, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to increase the current level of funding to \$20 million for the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE budget for the purpose of investigating child exploitation.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency has played a key role in stopping child pornography from entering our country since the 1970's. With today's technology, abusers across the world can instantly trade and share lewd material of children with the greatest ease, unless we do something to stop it. Additionally, ICE is ramping up its efforts to stop traveling child sex offenders who enter and exit this country preying on innocent children. ICE's efforts are leading the way

identifying and investigating these criminals and rescuing their victims.

Mr. Chair, this is a modest funding increase with the most important of purposes, protecting the world's most vulnerable citizens, the children. I wholeheartedly support this amendment, and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADERHOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas to talk about an important immigration enforcement program.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the chair for yielding to me.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent change made by the Department of Justice to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, also known as SCAAP.

While this program is under the jurisdiction of the DOJ, it is a consequence of the Federal Government's failure to secure our borders, which is why I bring it up during this debate.

SCAAP reimburses States and counties for part of the cost of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. I want to emphasize that this program does not come close to fully reimbursing our States or our counties for the full cost of incarcerating these individuals.

Recently, DOJ announced that they will offer no reimbursement for what they consider to be unknown documented aliens. Being an unknown documented alien simply means that DHS has no information on that individual, a designation that would apply to a majority of the illegal aliens in this country. For example, when the sheriff in my home county picks up someone for aggravated assault and, in accordance with the Secure Communities Checks, the Federal database, if this person has never been processed by DHS, they will be considered unknown documented aliens and therefore ineligible to be reimbursed for any part of the cost of the incarceration under this new rule.

I would like to point out this change disproportionately affects counties over States, both of which are eligible for reimbursement under SCAAP.

□ 2040

The county jail is the first point of contact with the criminal justice system for many illegal aliens, so there is no background on the individual. These inmates are also typically held for a shorter period of time, making it difficult for them to be processed by the Federal Government before they are transferred to a State institution after

they are convicted. This change has much less impact on the States as they typically hold inmates for a much longer period of time, giving them plenty of opportunity to be processed by ICE agents who are typically located at the State prisons, a luxury the counties do not have.

If these changes were implemented in 2010, Williamson County, my home county, would have received \$90,000 less than their full payment for that year, which is only about \$150,000, and which is only a small portion of the overall cost of incarcerating these individuals. That's a lot of money for a moderately sized county in Texas. The impact on larger counties would be much greater.

I do not think that our counties should be punished for the Federal Government's failure to secure our borders and process undocumented aliens in an acceptable timeframe.

Now, I would like to commend Chairman ADERHOLT for prioritizing the frontline operations by funding Border Patrol agents and CBP agents at the highest levels in history. I would like to propose to the chairman that we work together with these Agencies to find a solution to this problem.

In the meantime, I will be writing a letter to the Justice Department, along with my friend and colleague, Congressman HONDA of California, to ask the Department to delay this change while we work to find a solution that will not punish our counties for the failures of the Federal Government.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I share the concerns that have been raised by the gentleman from Texas this evening. The Department of Homeland Security needs the support of States and counties in border security, and SCAAP is an important tool to facilitate that support.

I look forward to working with the gentleman to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice find the right solution. I know that my other distinguished colleague on the Appropriations Committee from the State of Virginia has views on this program within his jurisdiction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Commerce, Justice and Science Subcommittee, I am very sympathetic to the concerns raised by the gentleman from Texas.

I understand that last year DOJ notified prospective FY11 SCAAP applicants of this coming change and encouraged jurisdictions to work closely with DHS to increase inmate alien status verification. I did not hear of any concerns with this new requirement during the consideration of CJS appropriations for FY12 or 13, but I would be pleased to work with you, as well as the Department of Justice and the De-

partment of Homeland Security, to help ensure that the SCAAP reimbursement methodology is equitable for all types of jurisdictions and maximizes the verification of status for individual aliens.

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

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

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

Mr. HONDA. As a member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, I would like to thank our chairman, Mr. WOLF, Chairman ADERHOLT and my friend, Judge CARTER, for speaking on this important issue today.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP, is a bipartisan issue and a bipartisan effort to address it.

California jurisdictions already receive 10 percent of the total cost of reimbursement because of the drastic cuts this program has received over the past few years. The recent funding solicitation change that would stop reimbursements for all "unknowns" by the Department of Justice has the potential to worsen the situation. It will devastate county budgets at a time when they are already feeling the pinch of State and Federal cuts.

As a former member of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, I know firsthand how terrible the impact of this change will be on our counties. It is undisputed that the vast majority of the undocumented immigrants residing in the U.S. are unknown to the Federal Government.

Therefore, the unilateral decision by DOJ to only provide SCAAP funds for those criminal undocumented that are known to the Federal Government is deeply troubling and is a back-door attempt to kill the SCAAP program.

As my friend, Judge CARTER, has noted, counties in particular will be hit by this change the hardest because of the inability for ICE agents to be present at all times to process unknowns in county jails. In State jails, prisoners are held longer and ICE agents are on staff, so there is ample time and opportunity for unknowns to be processed in the system.

If the Department would like to make this change, it has to provide clear, timely, and accessible methods to the counties to process unknowns properly, something which they clearly do not have now.

I look forward to working with the appropriate Agencies and subcommittees to ensure that we can find an equitable solution to this issue. I appreciate both Chairman WOLF and Chairman ADERHOLT's time on this.

Until then, however, I will be writing a letter with my good friend, Judge CARTER, to the Department of Justice to delay this change until the appropriate time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 12, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$10 million to FEMA's State and local grant programs. This will be an additional \$10 million that our State governments and our local units of government could have available to them to better protect their citizens in the case of an emergency and also to respond more effectively to such a disaster.

This money can go to high-risk urban areas such as metro Detroit that really need the resources. It can also go to better protect and secure our ports, which would also benefit regions like metropolitan Detroit.

Again, the reason why I come to this Congress, to this budget and ask for these additional resources is because in the past this Congress failed to properly oversee the housing market, which resulted in a crisis that dramatically reduced property values all around this country and, most tragically, reduced the revenues available to States and localities to fund these important services.

That's why I'm asking this Congress, this House, to amend this budget to provide an additional \$10 million to our States and local units of government so they can better protect our citizens in case of an emergency.

I look for your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. This amendment seeks to cut critical funds for enforcing our Nation's immigration laws. Those laws are important to be enforced.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

It adds \$10 million to FEMA, State and local grants. As we have said many times this evening, these are grant programs that have been cut severely in recent years. While this year's bill improves on that, we certainly can use more funding in this area, and the gentleman has figured out a way to do it. He has come up with an offset that actually improves the bill.

The proposed offset is to the troubled 287(g) program, reduces it by \$10 million, moving it closer to the administration's request.

□ 2050

Mr. Chairman, three Inspector General audits have found serious flaws with this program and ICE has had to terminate some 287(g) agreements because of racial profiling and other abuses. We have no business funding this program at levels above the request, much less having a mandatory funding level, which is included in this bill.

So the gentleman has come up with an amendment that adds needed grant funding and improves the bill and it's offset. I urge its adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$501,331,000)".

Page 99, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$501,331,000)".

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

Mr. POLIS. My amendment would bring down funding for ICE to fiscal year 2008 levels. I know that this is a time when it's critical to balance our budget and to cut government spending, and here's an example of a line item where we simply can't afford to continue to reward failure. This bill is a great place to start in making sure that we have a sound policy for our country. We can't afford to continue wasting billions of dollars of hard-earned taxpayer money to fund an Agency that, frankly, isn't producing results.

This bill proposed to appropriate billions of dollars to ICE to enforce our broken immigration laws. That means they spend this money to continue deporting hardworking immigrants, separating families, and kicking out students who have lived in this country their entire lives, all at taxpayer expense.

How much does this cost the American taxpayer? ICE itself has said that each deportation costs \$12,500. Outside estimates actually put the number higher—around \$23,000. In fact, it costs an average of \$112 a night just to detain illegal immigrants. That's right.

This country is putting illegal immigrants up, effectively, at hotels. We might as well put them up at a bargain hotel. Let's find a \$49 room rather than spending \$112 a night to feed and house illegal immigrants every night. My amendment will not end that practice, but it will take it back to 2008 levels.

We simply can't deport our way out of our current immigration problems. One study estimates it would cost \$285 billion to deport all the illegal immigrants in the country, not to mention the devastating impact on the economy that that would have.

We need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works. Simply throwing good money after bad at a failed Agency like ICE, which has not stopped illegal immigration, is simply a recipe for continued disaster.

In addition, ICE is responsible for shutting down Web sites. Frequently, they have taken down legitimate Web sites without any due process of the law. The story of the music blog *dajazzl* should be a warning to all of us that we need to take a closer look at these efforts. This site was seized by ICE for over a year without any explanation or due process. When the government finally return controlled of the site to its owners, they couldn't even explain why they took control of the Internet site. Imagine if the government had seized a printing press or magazine or a newspaper. We would be outraged on the left and on the right. Why is this any different? Seizing a Web site without any due process of the law is contrary to the principles enshrined in our Constitution, is un-American, and violates our freedom of speech.

Now make no mistake: even if my amendment passes, the bill would still appropriate far too much for a failed agency. It still would appropriate billions of dollars. And I would still oppose that appropriation. But at least let's return that appropriation to 2008 levels to stop putting illegal immigrants up at hotels, stop closing down Web sites that are free press, stop funding enormous amounts of taxpayer money not solving our immigration problem.

It's more important than ever that we balance our budget and end the deficit. We can start that by reducing wasteful government spending instead of increasing wasteful government spending. ICE has failed to stop illegal immigration. Let's not reward failure. ICE has shut down Web sites without any due process. Let's not reward failure.

Obviously, there are Members on both sides of the aisle, myself included, that want to address our broken immigration system, and we should have a country that has zero illegal immigrants—not 10 million, not 12 million, not 15 million. Frankly, the less ICE does, the more likely we can eliminate illegal immigration in this country, because all they do is contribute to it. And my bill will at least reduce their

funding to 2008 levels. I think it's a commonsense amendment. Anybody who opposes this amendment is effectively rewarding the continued failure of one of the most poorly performing government Agencies.

I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment slashes immigration enforcement and will result in laying off many, many ICE agents and potentially releasing dangerous criminal aliens from custody.

Now, the gentleman's argument is interesting. His argument seems to be that if you fire the enforcing officers and legalize the criminals, you're not going to have a problem. Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but that's not the way it operates. When you break the law, you have to face the consequences. And we need the enforcement officers to go out and assist us enforcing the law.

Whether or not the immigration law is broken—I happen to agree that it is broken. We might not necessarily agree on how to fix it, but I agree that it is broken. Because I agree we have porous borders. But I believe the ICE people are doing the very best they can. Quite honestly, I'm shocked that the solution to a criminal problem is fire the law enforcement officers. And that's not good policy under anybody's thinking.

Supposedly, those who object are not thinking straight. Well, I would argue the contrary is the case in this particular argument.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It cuts ICE salaries and expenses by over \$500 million and puts all of that spending in the Spending Reduction Account.

There's some ironies in this amendment. It would actually hinder our efforts to move away from the flawed 287(g) program. It would hinder nationwide deployment of the much more conceptually sound Secure Communities effort. It would greatly reduce funding for alternatives to detention, where we very much need to go. It would lay off thousands of ICE personnel. And what do these personnel do? We've hired them to fight the drug trade, to fight human trafficking, to fight violence along the Southwest border.

I urge defeat of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. HONDA. I would like to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and members of the subcommittee for recognizing the importance of supporting a path for legal immigrants to become citizens. The United States has a special interest in and draws unique benefits from extending citizenship to immigrants who have met legal residence, character, English, and civics knowledge requirements. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to encourage U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to keep the naturalization application fee affordable so that we don't prevent legal immigrants from pursuing citizenship simply because they cannot afford it. But I am concerned that the way the bill approaches funding for immigrant integration grant programs could undermine this effort to keep fees affordable.

□ 2100

Integrating immigrants strengthens their commitment to the United States and makes us a stronger and more prosperous democracy. Integration grants have proven to be a cost-effective means of encouraging immigrants to integrate. It is unfair that the cost and limited availability of citizenship education and legal assistance is the reason that many of the more than 8 million legal and taxpaying permanent residents are unable to naturalize, despite their eligibility to do so.

This bill only allows funding of immigrant integration programs through fees collected, departing from past practice of providing discretionary funding to support the program. This approach will require fee hikes that push naturalization further out of the reach of people who already struggle to pay costs of up to thousands of dollars for the current application, attorneys' fees, required document collection and preparation for the naturalization examination, defeating the subcommittee's own stated goal of keeping fees affordable.

The future viability of the immigrant integration grant program may depend on Congress's willingness to reinstate discretionary funding to support it, as the Senate has proposed to do in its version of the bill. I support the Senate's approach to provide direct discretionary funding in the amount of \$5 million, regardless of the funds deposited into the immigration examination fee account, and I hope that as we move forward to conference with the Senate, we can adopt that approach.

It is in this country's interest to support our future U.S. citizens, and so it is in all of our interest to get support for immigrant integration grants right.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, \$232,006,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided*, That, subject to section 503 of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer up to \$5,000,000 to the Office of Biometric Identity Management to support the transition of the Arrival and Departure System: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred pursuant to the preceding provision shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to plan, construct, renovate, equip, and maintain buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs and immigration, \$5,450,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

##### AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$5,041,230,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which not to exceed \$8,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed \$3,969,569,000 shall be for screening operations, of which \$409,000,000 shall be available for explosives detection systems; \$120,239,000 shall be for checkpoint support; and not to exceed \$1,071,661,000 shall be for aviation security direction and enforcement: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available in the preceding proviso for explosives detection systems, \$100,000,000 shall be available for the purchase and installation of these systems, of which not less than 9 percent shall be available for the purchase and installation of certified explosives detection systems at medium- and small-sized airports: *Provided further*, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2013 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$2,971,230,000: *Provided further*, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount made available under this heading shall become available during fiscal year 2014: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2013, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 46,000 full-time equiv-

alent screeners: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities: *Provided further*, That Members of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the United States Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 99, line 17, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$5,041,230,000)".

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would completely eliminate funding for the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, and transfer that money into the deficit reduction account, saving taxpayers more than \$5 billion.

The fact of the matter is very simple: TSA is not doing the job that it was created to do 10 years ago.

Originally, Congress intended for TSA to be an efficient, cutting-edge, intelligence-based agency responsible for protecting our airports and keeping passengers safe and secure. Today it has grown into one of the largest bureaucracies, bigger than the Departments of Labor, Energy, Education, Housing and Urban Development, and State all combined—larger than all of those. They've had a 400 percent increase in staff over the past 10 years. A good portion of that has gone to headquarter employees making six figures on average.

What's worse is that American passengers aren't getting a good return on the nearly \$60 billion that they've invested and spent on TSA. Reports indicate that more than 25,000 security

breaches have occurred at U.S. airports since 2001. Plus, we have evidence today that terrorists that are on the no-fly list have been still able to fly successfully aboard U.S. aircraft.

On top of this startling information, we've all seen the recent news headlines detailing the lack of professionalism, unreliable training, and even alleged corruption in the TSA ranks. Just about the only thing that TSA is good at is using its extensive power to violate American travelers' civil liberties. The stories range from embarrassing near-strip searches all the way to agents being hired without background checks. This is all evidence that TSA has veered dangerously off course from what it was intended to do.

I've repeatedly asked that we use our resources to focus on intelligence and technologies that can be more effective when it comes to catching terrorists—instead of patting down grandmas and children. I've demanded Administrator Pistole's resignation, and I've called for the privatization of TSA, along with some of my other colleagues here in the House. But we have still yet to see the necessary changes made to the TSA personnel or procedures that will ensure the safety and security of our airports and passengers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to zero out funding for TSA forces Congress and the Department of Homeland Security to start all over again, start from scratch on a better, more effective, more progressive system for protecting our airlines without violating the person and liberties of our citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, again, it's never been a solution for failed enforcement to fire all the police officers and get rid of them and then hope it will all work out. Without speaking to the criticisms of the gentleman, the terrorist threat is still real. This is an agency that has that duty and responsibility. To zero them out and lay them all off would not be productive in stopping criminal activity in the United States, and for that reason I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise to oppose this amendment.

Aviation continues to be the main focus for terrorists seeking to do us harm. I would think we all realize that. This amendment would prohibit all of the screening, all of the scanning, all of the protective measures that we have undertaken for our protection. It's in-

discriminate, it's excessive, and it should be rejected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, \$126,418,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

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

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I had intended to offer an amendment at this stage in the proceedings, but I'm not going to do it at this time because I have received some cooperation from the Appropriations Committee, and I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT and the staff and others for including in this DHS bill some reforms of TSA that are long overdue.

The gentleman from Georgia just mentioned that this is an agency that is out of control, and it is important that we as Members of Congress try to get agencies that spin out of control under control, and that's, I think, what we're attempting to do here.

Let me say about this process, this is an incredible process and it's an open process, and so I thank our side of the aisle for allowing Members to have these opportunities.

□ 2110

We were closed off from many opportunities in the past to make these changes that are necessary in reforming agencies like TSA.

Well, let me say what they have done in this bill that is important, and one reason I'm going to support the bill—they need to go a lot further than they've gone, but one reason I'm going to support the bill is they have taken some opportunity to cut some of the administrative overhead.

Listen to this: TSA has grown to 65,000 employees. Of that, there are 14,000 administrative personnel—4,000 in Washington, D.C., not very far from us, 4,000 making on average—and they've got the statistics right here, the staff will give them to you—\$104,000 on average per administrative person. Ten thousand administrative people out in the field. So this bill does reduce—I believe it's by about \$60 million—some of that administrative overhead. That's only the beginning, but at least it's a beginning.

This bill also cuts out programs that have failed, like the Behavior Detection Program. It reduces some of the spending there—another program that doesn't work that we need to cut funds on. It does redirect some money. And I must congratulate the committee for restoring the flight deck officer cuts.

The Obama administration proposed disarming our pilots, 50 percent of that program—volunteer pilots who pay their own way to learn how to arm themselves to protect their aircraft, themselves, and their passengers; one of the most cost-effective programs we had. I guess that would be the way that the Obama administration goes. You want to keep the bureaucracy but do away with cost-effective programs. But thank you, committee members and staff, for restoring that.

So almost every proposal we made from the Transportation Committee for cuts and reassignment of funds have been made here—not to the degree I would like, but at least I will say it's a beginning.

Finally, let me say that we've got to do something to further get this agency under control. Last week, we learned a little bit about a meltdown in security at one of my Florida airports, Fort Myers. We got some information because we get tips all the time. Everybody tells us what's going on at TSA—except the TSA bureaucrats that are trying to protect their positions. You know, they waited until Friday afternoon and released a one-paragraph statement pooh-poohing what had taken place at Fort Myers and keeping our committee in the dark, trying to keep it from the public and the press and from Congress.

I took the opportunity to let the press and the public know what I knew—which wasn't much. And thank goodness for a free and open press because they went after TSA. We found out Monday morning, along with everyone else, what they had done in not providing accurate information, not telling us it was one of the most serious of meltdowns of TSA personnel. And we've had them before in Newark and Charlotte, we've had them in New York City and others. So this is an agency that's out of control. We need to cut the bureaucracy, as they've begun to do here. We need to realign where the moneys need to be spent.

I have no problem with spending money for security and making certain that terrorists don't take advantage of our most vulnerable Achilles' heel in the transportation network, and for the American public, that's aviation. We've seen them go after it again and again. But you need to spend the money where it makes the most sense and does the most as far as true aviation security. Expensive aviation theater security is not the way we're going to go.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to or had considered offering an amendment again this year concerning the Federal Air Marshal Program. I offered an amendment last year to simply keep



the Federal air marshals at level funding. They were approaching almost \$1 billion spending each year, and they've been given 10 straight years of increases.

This program, though, was called to my attention by an article that I read in USA Today in which they said that more air marshals had been arrested than had been arrests made by air marshals, and that they were spending approximately \$200 million per arrest each year. I became convinced, because of that report and other reports, that this really was probably one of the most useless, needless agencies in the entire Federal Government. But I offered the amendment knowing that it's almost impossible to cut a law enforcement agency or an agency that can claim it's doing something toward aviation safety and security. So my amendment received a lot more votes than I expected but did not pass.

But at that time, Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member PRICE assured me that they would look a little more closely at this program, and I feel that they have done so. So I rise to commend them and tell them that I appreciate the fact that they have taken an \$86.5 million cut to this program. That is, frankly, more than I had planned to cut in the amendment that I offered last year.

I want to say that I am a really strong supporter of law enforcement—always have been and always will be—but when you take scarce law enforcement dollars that are especially needed for our local law enforcement people, who are the ones out there fighting the real crime that needs to be fought, then you're depriving the agencies that really need it when you give it to an agency like the Federal Air Marshal Program that is doing almost no good whatsoever for this country. Almost every Member in this Congress flies a couple of times each week; thus, we're doing the same thing that these Federal air marshals are doing. It's one of the softest, easiest jobs in the Federal Government just to fly back and forth, back and forth, back and forth.

So I want to say that I appreciate the fact that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member PRICE have agreed to this \$86.5 million cut. I wish it was a lot more, and I still think this agency needs to be eliminated, but I do appreciate the progress that's being made thus far. So I will not offer an amendment this year because I think at least we've started in the right direction on this program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider my amendment at this point in the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000) (reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2013 Homeland Security appropriations bill to increase the funding for the Federal Flight Deck Officer—or the FFDO—program. This amendment is fully offset, costing the taxpayers no additional money. This amendment is also supported by the National Rifle Association.

Mr. Chairman, 9/11 woke us up. The reality is that we live in a very dangerous world with varied and morphing threats. While screening can reduce some threats, terrorists are constantly probing and exploiting our weaknesses. FFDOs, along with Federal air marshals, act as a chief deterrent, but ultimately the last line of defense is the Federal flight deck officer.

Reinforced doors are an important step to slow an attacker and buy time, but ultimately the armed pilot is the last line of defense in someone taking over the aircraft to be used as a weapon of mass destruction. Let me say that again. The last line of defense is not the secured cockpit door, but the armed pilot behind it.

According to estimates by the Air Line Pilots Association, Federal flight deck officers only cost \$15 per flight segment. Currently, FFDOs defend over 100,000 flight segments per month and 1.5 million flight segments per year. Thousands of Federal flight deck officers have been certified for the program, despite a budget that hasn't grown since this program's inception. Federal flight deck officers pay many of the expenses out of their own pockets for the privilege and the honor to defend our country from terrorist attack.

This year, the Obama administration proposed to half the program, effectively shutting it down. With their proposal of only \$12.5 million in funding, the program would not be able to recertify all of the pilots in the program or even maintain its current management structure, and it certainly would not be able to train any new Federal flight deck officers.

I'm thankful that Chairman ADERHOLT and Ranking Member PRICE have restored the funding levels to the same as they were last year at \$25.5 million, but level funding means that over a thousand pilots who have expressed interest in becoming FFDOs cannot be vetted or trained. Also, at this funding level, the program could only train a limited number of pilots who have been vetted and would take almost 10 years to process the current backlog, to say nothing of future pilots who may volunteer for the program.

□ 2120

With the coming mandatory retirement of many pilots at the age 65 and

with the combination of fewer new FFDOs coming online, the program will not provide the same level of deterrence.

I'd like to reiterate that the increased funding for the program will not come at a greater expense to taxpayers, and the increase in this amendment of \$10 million is fully offset.

For only \$15 per flight, Federal flight deck officers provide the most cost-effective aviation security program in existence. As a former Federal flight deck officer myself, I can personally testify about the sacrifices and expenses pilots undergo to participate in the program. They actually pay to protect and defend the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVAACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. We accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It increases funding for the Federal Flight Deck Officers program. But the bill already greatly increases this program above the request, 50 percent above the request, returning the program to its 2012 level.

And it's not a harmless offset. On the contrary, aviation management is already cut by \$20 million in this bill, and we can ill afford to cut it further. So this is an unnecessary and unwise trade-off, and I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, over 700 pilots have been vetted and not trained; 1,500 pilots have applied for the program but have not yet been vetted. It costs about \$6,000 per pilot to put them through the backlog for check and training. At current funding at \$25.5 million, they're only able to bring about 250 new pilots per year on board, which leaves them in less than a status quo status, probably declining once the age of 65 hits many of the pilots in backlog.

Funding is the bottleneck, rather than the training center capacity. \$10 million would not clear the backlog that currently exists. It would be a good start, though.

The proposal to reduce the funding for screening and maintenance and screener PC&B by \$5 million each, we

have strong approval of many organizations for this program, including the Airline Pilots Association.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most valuable programs and deterrents that is in the air at the current time. It costs again, once again, \$15 per flight to protect the American traveling public. To me, Mr. Chairman, this is a no-brainer.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I would like to commend my friend, my freshman colleague from Minnesota, for offering this amendment, and commend him for his service to our country in the military and then what he's been doing. I think it's a valuable lesson, having been there in that cockpit yourself, dealing with this program. And I support this amendment as well.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I would ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered out of order.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$61,000,000)".

Page 20, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their courtesies.

I am the ranking member on the Transportation Security Committee and have had the privilege of serving as the chairperson of that committee. I now work with the chairperson, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the issues of our committee as relates to the present appropriations.

I think we can all be reminded of a number of incidents, starting with 9/11 and the attack on the Nation's aviation and the Nation's soul. During that time, we did not have the structure of Federal Air Marshals that we have today.

We can be reminded of the shoe bomber, the Christmas Day bomber, the issue of the pilot that caused a disturbance some weeks and months ago. We know that the idea of aviation security is crucial. In the course of that, we have developed a very important system called the Federal Air Marshal system.

If you would query much of the traveling public, whether domestic or international, they would say yes to

more Federal Air Marshals, and I agree. I've offered amendments and legislation to require more Federal Air Marshals on international trips and certainly have encouraged the training and utilization of FAMS on domestic trips.

I have visited their offices. I've sat down and spoken to them. They are committed and dedicated public servants.

My amendment will restore the Federal Air Marshals, FAMS, budget by \$50 million.

As you're aware, FAMS is an integral program to the homeland security mission. I believe that this recommendation takes into consideration the crucial operational challenges FAMS will face as a result of a reduction.

The FAMS risk-based concept of operations, CONOPS, outlines the two constraints that impact its optimal allocation of flight coverage:

First, FAMS is, of course, dependent on the number of Federal Air Marshals available;

Secondly, FAMS' flight coverage is reliant on the mission travel budget which covers all FAM travel expenses, including hotel and per diem costs.

With the large cost difference between domestic and international flight operations, CONOPS must be used to conduct the most optimal mission allocation that can be maintained within those limitations.

In deciding the FAMS appropriation, the House must take into consideration FAMS' plan to extend its current hiring freeze in FY 2013, as mandated by the President's budget. It plans to be cooperative.

With limited employees, if the proposed \$50 million reduction were to be implemented, FAMS' operation would be severely undermined. I would venture to say they would be shut down to a great extent. The program would be forced to extend the hiring freeze to include civilian personnel, implement a furlough of all FAMS personnel for a minimum of 4 days, reduce mission coverage, assess which offices can be shut down, and consider a reduction in force, or RIF, to strategically reduce onboard staffing levels. This is not the time to do this in the course of franchise terrorism.

In addition, FAMS would suffer a significant decline in critical operational programs, including travel, information technology, and logistical support. A reduction would be an obstruction to the good work and progress of this program.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to look closely at the devastation and the loss of these dollars and ask you to restore the \$50 million to the FAMS budget.

I would ask my colleagues to consider this amendment, and I would ask that we include or recognize FAMS as an integral part of a homeland security, Nation security, frontline security, and an important point and program to consider funding necessary to

ensure the security of the traveling public and the Nation's homeland.

With that, I ask support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment to H.R. 5855, Making Appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the Fiscal Year ending September 2012. My amendment will restore The Federal Air Marshals (FAMS) budget by \$50 million. As you are aware, FAMS is an integral program to the homeland security mission. I believe that this recommendation takes into consideration the crucial operational challenges FAMS will face as a result as of a reduction.

The FAMS risk-based concept of operations (CONOPS) outlines the two constraints that impact its optimal allocation of flight coverage. First, FAMS is of course, dependent on the number of Federal Air Marshals available. Secondly, FAMS flight coverage is reliant on the mission travel budget which covers all FAM travel expenses including hotel and per diem costs. With the large cost difference between domestic and international flight missions, CONOPS must be utilized to conduct the most optimal mission allocation that can be maintained within these limitations.

In deciding the FAMS appropriation, the House must take into consideration FAMS' plan to extend its current hiring freeze into FY 2013 as mandated by the President's Budget. With limited employees, if the proposed \$50 million reduction were to be implemented, FAMS' operations would be severely undermined.

The program would be forced to extend the hiring freeze to include civilian personnel, implement a furlough of all FAMS personnel for a minimum of four days, reduce mission coverage, assess which offices can be shut down and consider a reduction in force (RIF) to strategically reduce on-board staffing levels. In addition, FAMS would suffer a significant decline in critical operational programs including travel, information technology and logistical support. A reduction would be an obstruction to the good work and progress of this program. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to restore the \$50 million to the FAMS budget.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. While the Federal Air Marshals Service, known as FAMS, does and certainly will continue to provide an additional layer in aviation security, the committee saw an opportunity in this bill to strike a balance and achieve some savings in a program that, before this year, had been growing rapidly.

FAMS deployment surged following the 9/11 attacks and again following the 2009 Christmas Day bombing attempts. Exactly how they are deployed, and how many there are cannot be discussed in open session. However, it is possible to note that many other security measures have been put into place since both of those events took place.

Intensified screening, new and more capable intelligence, information sharing, a more secure cockpit, and the expansion of the Federal Flight Deck Officer program are examples of steps

taken to secure aviation that reduce the need to rely on FAMS on routes that do not represent the highest threat potential.

□ 2130

The bill takes these security improvements into account and focuses on funding to cover the top priority routes based on threat, whether domestic or whether international. The bill also fully funds the FFDO program, which complements FAMs, and in some cases it is the only security element on board. In addition, the report directs the TSA and the FAMs to look again at how to include other Federal law enforcement agents working with them.

This amendment, while I believe it is well-intentioned, would sustain funding to lower priority flights at the expense of other security measures that offer more immediate security impacts. The committee report calls for FAMs to brief the committee within 60 days on its optimal mix of staffing, scheduling, and recommendations for any regulatory or legislative actions needed to improve the FAMs operation.

I believe the bill will support a robust and targeted FAMs mission, and I look forward to moving forward with a more focused and effective posture in aviation security. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentlelady from Texas for a response.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished ranking member, and I really thank the chairman for his comments.

I don't want to give a whole historical perspective, but I've certainly been on the Homeland Security authorizing committee since 9/11. I am quite familiar with the technologies and various changes in aviation travel in particular, and we've made great strides. We have certainly made great strides, but here is my point that I think is crucial: How long are we going to continue to count on heroic, if you will, passengers and continue to cite them as great heroes until the day of some tragic and horrific incident?

We thank the American traveling public for what it has done to thwart a number of incidences, some of which, obviously, are not terrorist-directed but which do impact on the traveling public's security while airborne.

Air marshals are the frontline support and defense in a vessel, if you will, in an aircraft that, if tampered with airborne, can be a catastrophe of enormous proportions. Air marshals are, in essence, a crucial part of the security of this Nation. If we are to literally obliterate them by the \$50 million reduction, you will see a reduction in mission, what offices will be ultimately shut down, FAMs personnel being fur-

loughed for a minimum of 4 days, and civilian personnel gone.

I don't deny that we can look to be responsible fiscally and that we can find ways that will streamline. I happen to believe that \$50 million is too drastic a cut and should be restored. So I would ask my colleagues, in spite of what changes may have been made, that they do not act superior to that human resource on that aircraft that is standing in the gap for a dastardly devastating terrorist act or some other altercation that needs the resources and expertise of the Federal Air Marshals.

Let me conclude by saying for a very long time I've introduced legislation to give flight attendants the kind of security training that would help them in the course of a potential terrorist incident on the aircraft. We'd hoped that that would have already occurred. I believe the other front-liners are TSO officers. That flight training has not yet occurred, so Federal Air Marshals act in the capacity of that standing in the gap to secure the crew and as well to secure the traveling public.

Who wants to subject the traveling public, domestic or international, to that kind of gaping hole of the reduction of cost or dollars that would ultimately result in this huge reduction of mission, furloughs, loss of civilians, closed offices?

I think that we need to reconsider, and I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment of adding back the \$50 million reduction that has taken place.

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TRANSPORTATION THREAT ASSESSMENT AND CREDENTIALING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of screening programs of the Office of Transportation Threat Assessment and Credentialing, \$192,424,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support and intelligence pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$928,663,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailed expendi-

ture plans for air cargo security; checkpoint support; and explosives detection systems refurbishment, procurement, and installations; on an airport-by-airport basis for fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That these plans shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Air Marshals, \$879,600,000: *Provided*, That the Director, Federal Air Marshal Service, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act a detailed, classified expenditure and staffing plan for ensuring optimal coverage of high risk flights.

#### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than \$700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of \$31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total cost at any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; \$6,759,627,000; of which \$340,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities; of which \$24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed \$17,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Coast Guard shall comply with the requirements of section 527 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (10 U.S.C. 4331 note) with respect to the Coast Guard Academy: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$75,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a revised future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, as specified under the heading Coast Guard "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" of this Act, is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,200,000)".

Page 22, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,200,000)".

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

Mr. DOLD. I certainly want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this legislation, and I want to thank the staff for working with me on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the Coast Guard operating expenses by \$5.2 million to address search

and rescue capabilities in the Great Lakes Region. Search and rescue is one of the Coast Guard's oldest missions, dating back to the U.S. Revenue Cutter Service that was founded in 1790.

Today, Coast Guard search and rescue response involves multimission stations, cutters, aircraft, and boats linked by communication networks. It also includes over 5,000 commercial vessels that provide a voluntary global response force. Using these assets in the past year, the Coast Guard has responded to over 6,468 search and rescue cases, assisting over 10,000 people and saving over 1,400 lives. Just last week, Mr. Chairman, two young women were saved by the Coast Guard's air assets on Lake Michigan.

Unlike the President's budget, which makes dramatic cuts to critical search and rescue operations, this amendment would increase our Nation's search and rescue capabilities by adding funding for needed assets, assets vital to life-saving capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, these investments build on previous investments that specifically increase capability in the Great Lakes to include the installation of Rescue 21 this past December. Rescue 21 is now standing watch on over 42,000 miles of coastline, improving the Coast Guard's ability to assist mariners in distress and saving lives and property. Further, by the end of this fiscal year, the Coast Guard will have delivered the last of three new long-range response boats to the Great Lakes area, which will enhance response capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, the Great Lakes is one of the most popular recreation areas in our country, and the Coast Guard is a vital part of making it safe for thousands each year. We can't stand by and allow the administration to eliminate lifesaving efforts on our Great Lakes, so I certainly urge support for this amendment.

I do want to yield the remaining time I have to my good friend who has been instrumental in assisting me on this amendment, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we not only serve on the Financial Services Committee together, we also share a Great Lake.

Michigan is uniquely situated, literally bordering all five of the Great Lakes—Lake Superior, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, Lake Saint Clair, Lake Ontario. Four of those are actually international boundary waters with thousands of miles of shoreline that are on there, and there are dozens of ports throughout the Great Lakes. I might add that they are aptly served by the District Nine commander out of Cleveland as he is juggling all of the various assets that the Coast Guard has.

□ 2140

But I do reject the plans by this administration to decrease the search

and rescue capabilities in the Great Lakes. This vital amendment restores funding in order to maintain a level of capability that has been present in the Great Lakes for many years, and it has been much needed, Mr. Chairman.

As the gentleman noted, these funds, combined with offsets in this bill, address shortfalls that this administration has actually advocated for. So Coast Guard search and rescue in all of the Great Lakes cannot be shortchanged. As we see in example after example, whether it be by boat or by helicopter in Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Ontario, some of the busiest boating traffic—recreational, as well as commercial traffic—that we see anywhere in the world concentrated in that area.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. DOLD. I thank the gentleman for his help.

I do urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is commonsense legislation. We cannot afford to have search and rescue capabilities be diminished. As we look at the number of recreational boaters, it's a vital part of making sure that we're saving lives in the Great Lake's region.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlemen from Illinois and from Michigan for their commitment for search and rescue, and we would gladly accept their amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. At this time, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman in a colloquy regarding the *Polar Sea*, the Coast Guard's second heavy icebreaker. It has been decommissioned and will soon be put in dry dock to prepare it for scrapping. However, I believe that before the resale of the *Polar Sea* is significantly reduced by removing its propellers and shafts that the Coast Guard must consider another option.

To date, the Coast Guard has not yet officially surveyed the private sector for interest in the *Polar Sea* in its current condition. Private sector interest in the *Polar Sea* may increase after the summer's Arctic drilling season, when permitted drilling is expected to be shortened due to heavier than usual ice.

My good friend from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and I are offering this colloquy to delay the scrapping. Our goal is to specifically instruct the Coast Guard to provide a survey of whether or not there is a better use for this vessel.

I was prepared to offer an amendment today that would direct the Coast Guard to report back to Congress on the condition of the *Polar Sea*, the costs associated with reactivating the vessel for service, and the interest of private or public entities in purchasing and operating the *Polar Sea*.

This amendment would have prevented the Coast Guard from moving any major equipment or systems from the *Polar Sea* until the Coast Guard submitted its report to Congress. Unfortunately, this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I would ask the chairman for his support and commitment to work with me and Mr. DICKS on this important issue as we pursue an alternative legislative fix in the Transportation Committee. Time is of the essence.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to my good friend from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I thank my good friend from Alaska for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue.

The dramatic reduction in the Arctic sea ice that is happening at the North Pole is leading to substantial growth in activity in the Arctic region.

The Coast Guard in the High Latitude Study determined that it needs a minimum of three heavy and three medium icebreakers to meet its statutory mission. This bill includes funding to start the design phase of a new heavy icebreaker; however, it will not enter service until 2020 at the earliest. Until then, there will be only one heavy icebreaker, the *Polar Star*, and one medium icebreaker in operation. This is clearly not enough for the Coast Guard to accomplish its mission. And given the age of the *Polar Star*, which entered service in the 1970s, the possibility of a breakdown or extended maintenance period is significant, which would leave us without any serviceable heavy icebreaker at all.

As my friend has noted, the *Polar Sea*, the Coast Guard's second heavy icebreaker, has been decommissioned and is awaiting the final orders to scrap it. Given our rapidly growing need in the polar region, I worry that the Coast Guard is not considering other options for the *Polar Sea*.

Personally, I think a compelling case can be made for directing the Coast Guard to make the investment and put it back into service. But, at the very least, the Coast Guard needs to take time to review alternatives. In my judgment, it would be a shame to scrap such a potentially useful asset when there is so much evidence before us that we need more immediate icebreaking capacity.

My friend from Alaska has noted that he and I had been considering working on language that would direct the Coast Guard to consider alternatives but that such an amendment would be subject to a point of order.

I am glad the gentleman will be able to work on the issue on a bill pending

before the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I want to indicate to him that I share his commitment to ensuring that the Nation's icebreaking needs are met and will continue to work with him to ensure that the Coast Guard considers all available options for the *Polar Sea*.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns of my colleagues from the State of Washington and from the State of Alaska. It is important to keep the vessel intact. My subcommittee agrees with this important goal.

I urge the Coast Guard to work with the authorizing committee to accomplish this assessment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am thankful for the understanding of the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee. This is important to our Nation and especially Alaska, and I do appreciate your consideration.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 24, insert before the period at the end the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to the Secretary of Homeland Security to comply with the Coast Guard's energy management requirements under section 543(f)(7) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(7))

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I'm offering along with my colleague, Mr. WELCH from Vermont, addresses an important issue relating to Coast Guard facilities.

We've offered this same amendment to the two other appropriations bills this week, and they've passed by a voice vote. And while my colleague from Vermont is not here this evening, I want to commend him for his hard work on these amendments, and energy savings performance contracts in general.

I think the passage of these amendments sends a clear signal that Congress understands the importance of saving energy and, therefore, saving costs for the Federal Government.

This amendment does one simple thing. It says that the Coast Guard should provide an inventory of ways to improve efficiencies in their buildings, which is already a directive under current law.

Under current law, energy savings performance contracts, or ESPCs, are provided as a mechanism for private companies to come into Federal build-

ings and make energy efficiency upgrades. ESPCs result in savings for the Federal Government and create well-paying private sector jobs at no cost to taxpayers. It creates a win-win situation of reducing debt and creating jobs. The private sector company must guarantee the project improvements will produce energy savings sufficient to pay for the project.

In this fiscal climate, there is no reason we shouldn't be helping the Federal buildings find ways to save money and upgrade Federal buildings with cleaner and more efficient facilities.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman from Colorado's amendment, and we appreciate him bringing this to the subcommittee's attention.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2150

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, \$12,151,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

#### RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; \$115,528,000.

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of the Coast Guard automated systems, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$1,428,593,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); of which \$938,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; of which \$204,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; of which \$59,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for other acquisition programs; of which \$109,911,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for shore facilities and

aids to navigation, including waterfront facilities at Navy installations used by the Coast Guard; of which \$117,182,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$66,000,000 shall be immediately apportioned for contract for long lead-time materials, components, and designs for the seventh National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for production costs or post-production costs: *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 shall be available for infrastructure construction, to include design, engineering, and oversight required to support the continued development of the Department of Homeland Security consolidated headquarters; and all projects using this funding, with all related obligations and expenditures, shall be subject to the management review, approval, and oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, Office of the Under Secretary for Management: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Investment Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated

costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

*Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget proposal as submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year: *Provided further*, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: *Provided further*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110-28 shall apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$19,690,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

#### RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, \$1,423,000,000 to remain available until expended.

#### UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards;

travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; \$1,556,055,000, of which not to exceed \$21,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeiting investigations; of which \$2,366,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; and of which \$6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided*, That up to \$18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That up to \$4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That the Director of the United States Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, \$56,750,000, of which \$4,430,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of facilities, and of which \$52,320,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, shall be for information integration and technology transformation project execution: *Provided*, That the Director of the United States Secret Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for its Infor-

mation Integration and Technology Transformation program that describes funding for the current fiscal year and the following 3 fiscal years, with associated plans for systems acquisition and technology deployment.

#### TITLE III

#### PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

##### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, \$45,321,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$1,110,430,000, of which \$200,000,000, shall remain available until September 30, 2014.

##### FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service: *Provided*, That the Director of the Federal Protective Service shall include with the submission of the President's fiscal year 2014 budget a strategic human capital plan that aligns fee collections to personnel requirements based on a current threat assessment.

##### OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), \$191,380,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$156,486,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That, subject to section 503 of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer up to \$5,000,000 to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to support the transition of the Arrival and Departure Information System: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred pursuant to the preceding proviso shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an expenditure plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$25,000,000 may not be obligated for the Office of Biometric Identity Management until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a multi-year investment and management plan for the Office of Biometric Identity Management: *Provided further*, That such multi-year investment and management plan shall include, for the current fiscal year and the following 3 fiscal years, for the Office of Biometric Identity Management program, the following—

(1) the proposed appropriations for each activity tied to mission requirements and outcomes, program management capabilities,



performance levels, and specific capabilities and services to be delivered, noting any deviations in cost or performance from the prior fiscal year expenditure or investment and management plan;

(2) the total estimated cost, projected funding by fiscal year, and projected timeline of completion for all enhancements, modernizations, and new capabilities proposed in such budget and underway, including and clearly delineating associated efforts and funds requested by other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security and in the Federal Government, and detailing any deviations in cost, performance, schedule, or estimated date of completion provided in the prior fiscal year expenditure or investment and management plan; and

(3) a detailed accounting of operations and maintenance, contractor services, and program costs associated with the management of identity services.

#### OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, \$132,003,000; of which \$27,702,000 is for salaries and expenses and \$85,394,000 is for BioWatch operations: *Provided*, That \$18,907,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for biosurveillance, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Health Affairs shall submit an expenditure plan for fiscal year 2013 to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, \$712,565,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), and the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-295; 120 Stat. 1394): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That for purposes of planning, coordination, execution, and decision making related to mass evacuation during a disaster, the Governors of the State of West Virginia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or their designees, shall be incorporated into efforts to integrate the activities of Federal, State, and local governments in the National Capital Region, as defined in section 882 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$27,513,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which no funds may be used for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That, of the total amount made available under this heading, \$22,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center.

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for automated systems of the Federal Emergency Management

Agency, \$58,048,000 to remain available until September 30, 2015.

#### STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, \$1,762,589,000, which shall be distributed, according to threat, vulnerability, and consequence, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security based on the following authorities:

(1) The State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605): *Provided*, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2012, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(2) The Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604).

(3) The Metropolitan Medical Response System under section 635 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 723).

(4) The Citizen Corps Program.

(5) Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance, under sections 1406 and 1513 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1135 and 1163), including Amtrak security: *Provided*, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(6) Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under section 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (6 U.S.C. 1182).

(7) Port Security Grants in accordance with section 70107 of title 46, United States Code.

(8) The Driver's License Security Grants Program in accordance with section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (49 U.S.C. 30301 note).

(9) The Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program under section 1809 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 579).

(10) Emergency Operations Centers under section 614 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196c).

(11) Buffer Zone Protection Program grants.

(12) Organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary to be at high risk of a terrorist attack:

*Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$55,000,000 shall be for Operation Stonegarden and no less than \$150,000,000 shall be for areas at the highest threat of a terrorist attack: *Provided further*, That \$231,681,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which \$155,500,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) through (12), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)),

or any other provision of law, a grantee may use not more than 5 percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: *Provided further*, That 7.02 percent of the amounts provided under this heading shall be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency "Salaries and Expenses" account for program administration: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communication towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: *Provided further*, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2013: (a) the Center for Domestic Preparedness may provide training to emergency response providers from the Federal Government, foreign governments, or private entities, if the Center for Domestic Preparedness is reimbursed for the cost of such training, and any reimbursement under this subsection shall be credited to the account from which the expenditure being reimbursed was made and shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which amounts in the account may be expended; (b) the head of the Center for Domestic Preparedness shall ensure that any training provided under (a) does not interfere with the primary mission of the Center to train state and local emergency response providers; and (c) subject to (b), nothing in (a) prohibits the Center for Domestic Preparedness from providing training to employees of the Federal Emergency Management Agency in existing chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosives, mass casualty, and medical surge courses pursuant to section 4103 of title 5, United States Code, without reimbursement for the cost of such training.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk designated as No. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$412,908,000)".

Page 99, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$412,908,000)".

Mr. FLAKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I object. We do not have a copy of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to report the amendment.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I apologize that my objecting to the reading took longer than the reading, but we will try to get through this quickly.

This amendment is straightforward and would simply reduce the amount appropriated for State and local programs in the bill by \$412 million, making the amount available for the Homeland Security grants consistent with FY 2012 levels. I understand that some

of these are popular programs, and I'm under no illusions about the prospect of this amendment.

But I also understand that these programs were cut heavily last year within the fiscal year 2012 Homeland Security appropriations bill, but it was reported out of the committee with \$1.3 billion cut from the previous year and a funding level \$2.8 billion less than the President's request.

By comparison, this \$412 million cut looks a bit chintzy. There are good reasons for this. Setting aside the steep financial precipice that we find ourselves on, and we're still on, there are some problems with these programs that led to them being cut last year. According to the House appropriations report from 2012:

"These reductions are due to the persistent lack of quantifiable metrics that measure the additional capability that our Nation has gained for the billions of dollars that have been invested" in these grant programs.

In other words, we don't have good metrics actually to determine if this money is being spent well or not.

The report continues:

"Based on the latest estimates, the Department currently has almost \$13 billion in previously appropriated funds that remain unspent dating back to FY 2005. This level of unexpended balances is unacceptable."

That's what the report reads.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Appropriations approved this bill and the report which accompanies it just less than 1 year ago. When it did, it appropriated only \$1 billion for these programs.

While the conference report increased that to \$1.34 billion today, we are preparing to approve a bill that appropriates more than 750,000 more than the House thought appropriate last year.

These programs, I should mention, were heavily criticized last year, and here we are with this massive increase. What dent has been made in the \$13 billion in unspent funds that existed less than 1 year ago? The criticisms levied by the House against these programs have been echoed by GAO as well.

In 2009 GAO found that:

"FEMA's assessments do not provide a means to measure the effective UASI region's projects that they have had on building regional preparedness capabilities, which is the goal of the program. Taxpayers have footed the bill for tens of billions of dollars in grants to States and localities with no clear way of telling how the money has improved readiness or national security. In fact, it remains difficult for any Member of Congress to even know what these funds are being spent on."

We've got to do better than this. When we don't get good reports back as to how the money is being spent, how can we ensure that additional monies like this are going to be spent in an appropriate manner?

I'm certain that my colleagues want to ensure that money is spent well.

That's why I think we should simply forego spending this additional amount. That's what this amendment is intended to do. This amendment would simply reduce the amount appropriated by \$412 million, making it level with 2012 funding levels.

Again, we have got to start cutting spending somewhere, and when we increase spending on programs like this, where we don't get good information from the Agencies that spend it as to whether or not it's doing the good that it was intended to do, then I say this is an area that we should cut.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

In fact, he beat me to the microphone because I had intended to introduce the same amendment that he is presenting to us now.

I would like to say that this amendment of Mr. FLAKE's will keep funding the State and local programs that fall under FEMA set at those 2012 levels. It does not affect disaster assistance, only State and local programs.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is broke and many Agencies, along with entire branches of the Federal Government, are experiencing drastic cutbacks. As it stands, the underlying bill increases funding for State and local FEMA programs by more than \$400 million. While I'm well aware that FEMA provides necessary support for various grant training programs, I'm also a firm believer that these would be better regulated solely by State and local governments, not by the Federal Government.

Therefore, I feel it is more than reasonable to ask that, for right now, particularly while we are in such a crisis economically as a Nation, that we simply freeze funding for these programs at the 2012 level.

□ 2200

I congratulate my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for his amendment and I heartily support it. I congratulate him on his longstanding efforts to bring the Federal Government into fiscal sanity. I urge support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would decimate the funding for our FEMA Homeland Security grants. By that I mean the State and local grants on which our communities depend. I mean the transit and rail grants that we've heard so much about in this evening's debate; I mean the port security grants; I mean the UASI grants—the

urban area grants that are risk based and targeted to the areas in this country that are under the greatest risk; and other programs of smaller size. These programs have helped keep our communities safe. After all, our first responders are not at the Federal level. Our first responders are at home. And our States and our communities are on the frontlines of responding and preparing to respond, mitigating, and then dealing with disasters—disasters of terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and other major emergencies.

This amendment would return to the 2012 funding levels, which were greatly reduced from previous-year funding levels. In fact, the levels in 2012 were at an all-time low and were widely decimated by our States and localities. So this year we've begun in this bill to build those funding levels where they need to be, and this amendment would wipe all that out in a single stroke.

The author of this amendment has made a great deal of the pace of the spending on these grant programs. I have to say that the figures cited tonight are misleading in the sense that these are multiyear programs. They're often dealing with large construction projects. All of this money except the money for the current year is obligated. It's not just sitting there. The money is obligated. Of course, after the projects are completed, the full amount will be registered as spent.

And so we need to oversee these programs carefully. We need to make sure that they're being administered in a responsible way. We need to exercise careful oversight. But the notion that we would come in and wipe it out with a single amendment the progress we've made in getting these funds back to a level that will give our communities and States the support they need, I think, is unthinkable.

I hope this body will reject this amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I would just like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I feel these programs are very important and that there have been major cuts made in the last 2 years, as I understand it, and that this would just be another major cut on top of this.

To my friend from Georgia, austerity isn't helping England, it isn't helping France, it isn't helping Greece, and it's not going to help the United States. We need the recovery here at home. That's what we need—not mindless cutting and slashing of the budget that will throw people out of work and not create jobs for the American people.

Austerity has failed. I think it's time for the majority to wake up and recognize that.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding.

I would just remark about, Mr. Chairman, my friend from Washington State's remark. The countries in Europe are failing because they spend too much money. The government does not make jobs. It's the private sector that makes jobs. Republicans have passed bill after bill after bill here in the House that HARRY REID throws in the trash can as soon as they get over to the Senate.

We've passed bills here that would lower the cost of gasoline and oil. Natural gas, of course, is very low because of the amount that we have, and it's gone down because the marketplace works. We need to develop our God-given resources.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, we are talking here about State and local grant programs whereby the Federal Government shares in emergency preparedness and response. It is virtually without dissent in our communities that this funding is needed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. We rise to oppose the amendment as well. We have concerns about the cuts in funding as well. I want to go on record that we do have concerns about this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$75,000,000)".

Page 55, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 55, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

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

Ms. HAHN. My amendment would increase funding for port security grants by \$75 million.

I came to Congress to really bring the issue of our ports into our national dialogue and how important they are to our economy, to our jobs, to our national security. I've been the co-founder, with my friend TED POE, of the Congressional Ports Caucus. As a Representative of a district that borders one of the largest ports in the country, this issue is very important to me.

The lessons of 9/11 have taught us that we must continuously be vigilant in proactively seeking out and preventing our country's most pressing

threats. The Port Security Grant Program helps address these threats by providing key funding to port areas for enhancing maritime security.

We have millions of tons of cargo shipments coming into ports across this country, and they provide viable entry points for terrorists who seek to use weapons of mass destruction. When people ask me what keeps me up at night, it's the thought of what could happen at one of our ports and what that would mean not only to our national economy but to the global economy. An attack at our Nation's ports could severely damage our own fragile economy right now and cause a ripple effect across the global supply chain. This requires us to take proactive steps and invest in critical detection and response operations and equipment.

Each year, port security officials attempt to address these many threats that exist at our Nation's ports by applying for these port security grants. Unfortunately, the irresponsible cuts to preparing these grants this last year resulted in huge gaps being left unaddressed and security officials unable to build and sustain capabilities needed to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from a potential attack.

While I commend the chairman and ranking member's efforts in bolstering funding for State and local homeland security programs this year, this amendment will ensure that the ports receive the funding they need in order to address the lingering gaps in port security of which there are many.

And even though I understand the intended purpose of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, the reality is that this facility was appropriated \$75 million even though President did not need or request these funds.

□ 2210

Additionally, Department of Homeland Security is still waiting for the recommended design modifications made by the National Academy of Sciences and for the administration to review the cost and scope of this project which isn't anticipated to be completed until 2020. I think this money could be better spent on providing critical support for our American ports and inland waterway system which is provided through this Port Security Grant Program.

I have no doubt that all of us recognize the urgency of this threat and the importance of having safe and secure maritime facilities in order to protect our critical borders, moving goods, and our American citizens. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. As I mentioned earlier in the evening, our Nation does

have an immediate need to build up our research capacity into pathogens that afflict animals and our food chain and, by extension, human beings. This amendment would put that at risk, and therefore, I would oppose the amendment.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Kansas to have her speak on this amendment as well.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

DHS, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, has made it clear that a BSL-4 lab is essential to our national security, and building a new structure to host the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility is both responsible and cost effective. Manhattan, Kansas, was selected as the new site for the NBAF after an exhaustive study by the Bush administration's DHS, and then reconfirmed by the current administration's 2012 budget. We need NBAF, and Manhattan is the best place to build it, a fact that Secretary Napolitano confirmed earlier this year in a hearing with the Appropriations Committee.

While FEMA's State and local grants are important, increasing them by eliminating the funding for construction of this lab is simply irresponsible. Make no mistake about it; if we had a surplus, it might be nice to increase these grants. But the result of this amendment will be stopping or delaying construction of the nationally important NBAF facility and jeopardizing the security of our Nation's food supply.

I urge the body to reject this amendment.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, we oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I hope we've established in the course of this discussion tonight that I and our side of the aisle are strongly in favor of the FEMA grants, and that most certainly includes the port grants. And so I commend our colleague for calling our attention to the importance of these port security grants and the need for more funding. Although in this bill we have begun the way back in terms of restoring funding for the State and local grants and the port grants and the rail and transit grants and the UASI high risk area grants, we're not there yet. And so our colleague has made a constructive suggestion as to how we might augment this funding.

I do feel obligated, though, to make a comment about the proposed offset. Our colleague has made some very cogent points about the NBAF project. I believe that with the funding that's already in the pipeline and the National Academy of Sciences reviews that are underway, that we do not need to include money in this year's bill for

NBAF construction. But this is part of the science and technology account, and we're going to have later this evening an amendment from our colleague from New York that will suggest taking the NBAF-designated funding and restoring it to the science and technology account. And I have to say that that science and technology account is very much in need of that funding.

Science and technology research activities have been drastically and unwisely cut in recent years. They were cut by 60 percent over the past 2 years. There's a \$158 million increase in this bill that restores some of these cuts, but that's taking place against a baseline that was simply too low to meet the needs of the different homeland security components and the needs of our Nation.

So in weighing the equities here, as we said earlier, we have one compelling need and we also have an offset that raises some serious issues. We will have an occasion later this evening to talk about the science and technology account and the place of NBAF within that account.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hahn amendment, which strikes a dagger in our efforts to protect our country, our homeland security, from threats to our food system, our agriculture system, and threats to the American people.

As horrific as it is to imagine, reports show that one of our greatest vulnerabilities is threats to our food supply, to agriculture. One doesn't have to stretch too far to think how mad cow disease or some other viral spread could grind our economy to a halt and strike fear in the hearts of all Americans. This simply cannot happen.

The Hahn amendment, which completely defunds 100 percent of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in this year's appropriations bill, would completely set us back, would make us very vulnerable to threats to our agricultural system from foreign-borne illness and those terrorists who would seek to injure and strike fear in the hearts of Americans.

Currently, our country lacks a bio-safety level 4 lab needed to keep our food supply safe. Both Secretary Vilsack and Secretary Napolitano have stated that this is a priority, and it has bipartisan support within the administration. Both President Bush and President Obama have supported it. Homeland security is not a partisan issue. We're here today to do what we can to protect the American people.

I want to commend the chairman and the committee for their work in ensuring that the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility was properly funded and that we can move forward and continue

to protect ourselves from terrorists around the world. I can assure us here today that terrorists are not sleeping. They are not waiting for this committee to debate. They're not waiting for conference committees. They're doing everything they can to strike fear in the hearts of Americans and disrupt our food supply.

This weakness is something that we can not continue to let go by. That's why I stand strongly against the Hahn amendment. It's dangerous for our national security. It's dangerous for the American people, and I ask the body to reject it this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. HAHN. I demand a recorded vote.

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

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$58,000,000)".

Page 55, line 2, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$58,000,000)".

Page 55, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$58,000,000)".

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which is cosponsored by Representative STIVERS, is a bipartisan effort to provide essential public safety funding to communities across the country that have been determined to be at high risk of a terrorist threat.

This amendment would provide for an additional \$58 million to State and local grant programs that the Secretary of Homeland Security should use to increase eligibility for the Urban Areas Security Initiatives to all communities at high risk, including Buffalo, which I represent. The intent is to restore the eligibility of these communities to again participate in the UASI program after being unfortunately cut out in the past.

The Buffalo-Niagara region was made ineligible without merit. The area includes four international border crossings and the busiest passenger crossing along the northern border with Canada, the largest electricity producer in New York State, and the area was home to the al Qaeda terrorist cell, the Lackawanna Six. It sits along two Great Lakes, which contain the largest freshwater supply in the world, and is within a 500-mile radius of 55 percent of the American population and 62 percent of the Canadian population.

□ 2220

Buffalo is not alone either. Border communities like El Paso, San Antonio, and Austin were cut as well. Cities in close proximity to large ports, refineries, and utilities like Columbus, New Orleans, Memphis, Nashville, and Oklahoma City were cut as well. Thirty-six communities in total were cut from all across the country. Now, as we are only beginning to realize the threats posed by these places, is it penny-wise and pound-foolish to leave them without the resources to maintain the capacity gains they developed throughout this program?

Mr. Chairman, the 9/11 Commission made it clear that protecting the homeland from terrorist threats can and should be a Federal priority. Yet the Department has hedged on this commitment by excluding too many vulnerable communities that need to participate in this Department of Homeland Security program. We know that the threats to these areas are real, and we should be doing everything possible to provide law enforcement with the tools to prevent and to respond to them.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment because the terrorist threat to these communities is real and it is dynamic. We should be doing everything that we can to empower these communities to protect themselves from these threats.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge my colleagues to support fiscal discipline as well as critical research and development. Therefore, with the concerns we have about the gentleman's amendment, we ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, here we have another amendment dealing with FEMA grants. And once again, we've come to appreciate the need for more robust support for urban area grants, for State and local grants, for transit and port grants, rail grants, the kind of protective efforts that our communities require. We are reminded again that those grants have been cut very drastically in recent years, and in this bill we are only beginning to bring them back to the levels required.

So I want to commend our colleague for this amendment, which proposes \$58 million, I believe, in increased funding for these grants. This is money that could be well spent, wisely spent, prudently spent by our States and local communities.

Again, I simply call attention to the problems posed by the offset. Members will have to make their own judgments about this. The money is taken out of the Science and Technology Directorate at the Department of Homeland Security, taken out of the labs accounts, as I understand it, which does include the NBAF item discussed earlier, but isn't limited to NBAF.

I just remind colleagues that science and technology research activities have been cut 60 percent over the last 2 years. And so there's an increase in this bill. We fought our way back in this area, too, in this bill, restoring some of these cuts against the baseline that was way too low. And so these science and technology—this is not free money. This is related just as surely as anything in the bill to this country's security, and its underinvested in at the moment. So we do have to weigh competing values here, and certainly in the balance the science and technology priorities deserve serious consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For necessary expenses for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), \$670,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which \$335,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and \$335,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a): *Provided*, That in addition to the purposes otherwise authorized for SAFER grants in section 34 of that Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall make such grants available for the retention of firefighters: *Provided further*, That subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(E), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4)(A) of section 34 of that Act shall not apply to amounts made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4.7 percent of the amount available under this heading shall be available for program administration.

#### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For necessary expenses for emergency management performance grants, as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$350,000,000: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 2.7 percent of the total amount appropriated under this heading.

#### RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2013, as authorized in title III of the

Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5196e), shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: *Provided*, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: *Provided further*, That fees received under this heading shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2013, and remain available until September 30, 2015.

#### UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the United States Fire Administration and for other purposes, as authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$42,460,000.

#### DISASTER RELIEF FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$6,088,926,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$5,481,000,000 is for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That the latter amount is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177, 2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)): *Provided further*, That of which \$24,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit an expenditure plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing the use of the funds made available in this or any other Act for disaster readiness and support not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to such Committees a quarterly report detailing obligations against the expenditure plan and a justification for any changes from the initial plan: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following reports, including a specific description of the methodology and the source data used in developing such reports:

(1) an estimate of the following amounts shall be submitted for the budget year at the time that the President's budget is submitted each year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code:

(A) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the prior fiscal year to the budget year;

(B) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the budget year to the budget year plus 1;

(C) the amount of obligations for non-catastrophic events for the budget year;

(D) the amount of obligations for the budget year for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State;

(E) the total amount that has been previously obligated or will be required for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State for all prior years, the current year,

the budget year, the budget year plus 1, the budget year plus 2, and the budget year plus 3 and beyond;

(F) the amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered for the budget year;

(G) the amount that will be required for obligations for emergencies, as described in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), major disasters, as described in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), fire management assistance grants, as described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187), surge activities, and disaster readiness and support activities; and

(H) the amount required for activities not covered under section 251(b)(2)(D)(iii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)(iii); Public Law 99-177);

(2) an estimate or actual amounts, if available, of the following for the current fiscal year shall be submitted not later than the fifth day of each month beginning with the first full month after the date of enactment of this Act:

(A) a summary of the amount of appropriations made available by source, the transfers executed, the previously allocated funds recovered, and the commitments, allocations, and obligations made;

(B) a table of disaster relief activity delineated by month, including—

(i) the beginning and ending balances;

(ii) the total obligations to include amounts obligated for fire assistance, emergencies, surge, and disaster support activities;

(iii) the obligations for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State; and

(iv) the amount of previously obligated funds that are recovered;

(C) a summary of allocations, obligations, and expenditures for catastrophic events delineated by event; and

(D) the date on which funds appropriated will be exhausted.

#### DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall not exceed \$25,000,000.

#### FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, including administrative costs, under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), \$92,145,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4101(f)(2)), to remain available until expended.

#### NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), \$171,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2014, shall be derived from offsetting collections assessed and collected under section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)), and shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and floodplain management and flood mapping: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$22,000,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and not less than \$149,000,000 shall be available for flood plain

management and flood mapping, which shall remain available until September 30, 2014: *Provided further*, That any additional fees collected pursuant to section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to this account, to be available for flood plain management and flood mapping: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2013, no funds shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund under section 1310 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 4017) in excess of:

- (1) \$132,000,000 for operating expenses;
- (2) \$1,056,602,000 for commissions and taxes of agents;
- (3) such sums as are necessary for interest on Treasury borrowings; and
- (4) \$120,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for flood mitigation actions; for repetitive insurance claims properties under section 1323 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4030); and for flood mitigation assistance under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c), notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3) and subsection (f) of section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c) and notwithstanding subsection (a)(7) of section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017):

*Provided further*, That the amounts collected under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) and section 1366(i) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 shall be deposited in the National Flood Insurance Fund to supplement other amounts specified as available for section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, notwithstanding subsection (f)(8) of such section 102 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(8)), and section 1366(i) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1367(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c(i), 4104d(b)(2)–(3)): *Provided further*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 4 percent of the total appropriation.

#### NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

For the predisaster mitigation grant program under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133), \$14,331,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total administrative costs associated with such grants shall not exceed 3 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

#### EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out the emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

#### TITLE IV

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES

#### UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, \$111,924,000 for the E-Verify Program, as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), to assist United States employers with maintaining a legal workforce: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds otherwise made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may be used to acquire, operate, equip, and dispose of up to 5 vehicles, for replacement only, for areas where the Administrator of General Services

does not provide vehicles for lease: *Provided further*, That the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may authorize employees who are assigned to those areas to use such vehicles to travel between the employees' residences and places of employment.

#### FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; the purchase of not to exceed 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in firearms matches and presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; \$228,467,000; of which up to \$44,758,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2014, for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; of which \$300,000 shall remain available until expended to be distributed to Federal law enforcement agencies for expenses incurred participating in training accreditation; and of which not to exceed \$10,200 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that such training facilities are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board, including representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training, shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

#### ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, construction, and ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$27,385,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities.

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

#### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and for management and administration of programs and activities, as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), \$130,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

Mr. ADERHOLT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 54, line 19, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for science and technology research, including advanced research projects, development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and operations as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), and the purchase or lease of not to exceed 5 vehicles, \$695,971,000, of which \$493,539,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2015; and of which \$202,432,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017, solely for operation and construction of laboratory facilities: *Provided*, That \$20,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives an updated plan for the expenditure of funds for construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 55, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$75,000,000)".

Page 55, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple: It reduces by \$75 million the amount that DHS can spend on construction of laboratory facilities—specifically, the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, or NBAF, planned for Manhattan, Kansas—and returns those funds to the research, development, acquisitions, and operations account. This unnecessary government spending is little more than an attempt to earmark funds for a project that the Obama administration zeroed out in its FY13 budget proposal, that the DHS acknowledges will cost over \$1 billion to construct, that the National Academy of Sciences has raised real concerns about the possibility of foot and mouth disease release, and that many in the agricultural community are asking, why take the chance?

When the National Academy of Sciences last reviewed the NBAF proposal, they indicated that the risk of foot and mouth disease in the Nation's Heartland was a 70 percent risk over a 50-year period. The academy also estimated the cost of a potential release of foot and mouth disease at \$9 billion to \$50 billion.



While it is correct that earlier this year DHS indicated this risk had been mitigated with additional design features, the National Academy of Sciences is still revising the Revised Risk Assessment. Common sense requires that until the Revised Risk Assessment is complete, we should not be entertaining the idea of appropriating precious taxpayer dollars for construction of this project.

NBAF has also become a financial boondoggle. The estimated cost of construction has skyrocketed from an original estimate of \$451 million only a few years ago to well over \$1 billion today. At this time, it is a colossal risk to the American taxpayer to advance a project the cost of which has doubled in less than 5 years, and when funding for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 remain unobligated.

At a time when my Republican colleagues continually argue that our Nation's debt is out of control and the deficit must be reined in, it is both hypocritical and unwise to spend taxpayer dollars that the President has not requested for a project that is still under design review, to be placed in a region that is acutely sensitive to the horrible diseases that will be studied at the facility. The only logical, responsible thing to do while the many questions surrounding NBAF remain unanswered is to wait to invest taxpayers' hard-earned money and continue to utilize existing DHS assets to study the various animal diseases that face our agricultural community.

Mr. Chairman, funding for the construction of NBAF is tantamount to a \$75 million earmark for the Kansas delegation. Funds were not included in the President's budget, and the project has yet to spend the money that has already been appropriated. DHS has other important research and more pressing construction projects than NBAF.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. I oppose the amendment because of concerns that we had noted earlier about the importance of the NBAF program that the administration has stressed, and also the need that was stressed in our hearings earlier in the spring.

At this time I'd like to yield to the lady from Kansas to speak on this amendment as well.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The first priority of the Federal Government is to protect the American people, and the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility has been declared necessary to provide that protection.

The Department of Homeland Security, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, and the House Appro-

priations Committee under both Democrat and Republican leadership, have made it quite clear time and time again that the country needs the NBAF, and the best place to do that research is in Manhattan, Kansas.

Congress has already appropriated \$90 million, and the State of Kansas and the city of Manhattan have already committed more than \$200 million towards the project. For the record, the calculations performed in this updated SSRA that were previously mentioned indicated that the estimated probability that an accident happening at this facility was less than 11 percent.

□ 2230

While again, this proposal might be nice if we had a surplus, the result of this amendment will be stopping or delaying construction of this vital NBAF facility, jeopardizing our security and our Nation's food supply. I urge the body to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend from New York (Mr. BISHOP), an amendment that will increase funding for research and development activities within the Science and Technology Directorate by \$75 million, and it will dictate that no new appropriated funds will be available in fiscal year 2013 for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, NBAF. I stress, no new funds.

The administration did not request funds for NBAF in 2013, and I simply cannot support inclusion of the \$75 million contained in this bill until two National Academy of Sciences reviews are completed on the security of this new facility to prevent the accidental release of foot-and-mouth virus or other harmful pathogens.

Members may recall that the GAO, the National Academy of Sciences, and Congress itself have had longstanding concerns about the decision to relocate the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility to the mainland unless we have a comprehensive and validated strategy to prevent the release of foot-and-mouth virus and other harmful pathogens into the community.

In 2011, the National Academy of Sciences found that, based on preliminary designs of the facility, there would be a 70 percent risk of a release of foot-and-mouth disease leading to infection outside the laboratory. The economic cost was estimated to be between \$9 billion and \$50 billion over the next 50 years as the life span of NBAF would be projected.

DHS has redone its site security risk assessment now that the NBAF design is further along, adding additional protective measures suggested by the

original National Academy study. As required by statute, the National Academy is reviewing the site security risks again to take into account these new mitigation strategies.

Now, even if we assume that the National Academy gives a positive review to NBAF, and I very much hope such a review will be warranted, the facility has 2 years of previously appropriated funds that remain unobligated. Science and Technology has told us that these funds will permit construction to begin and fund all necessary activities through fiscal year 2013, so the \$75 million included in the bill before us is not needed at this time and will not be needed in the new fiscal year.

This \$75 million set-aside in the bill for NBAF has some serious consequences for the science and technology function. It will eliminate most, if not all, funding for new research projects at the Department that they plan to begin in 2013. These projects focus on critical homeland security capabilities and would do the following:

Improve maritime transit security, improve explosive detection capability for mass transit, bulk cargo and suicide bombers, provide building security and checkpoint security with a stand-off ability to detect trace explosives on people and personal items, would improve TSA's capability to identify threats to aviation security, would integrate passenger screening at airports to improve security and the travelers' overall screening experience, would increase government security when using cloud-based computing systems, would improve Federal, State and local and animal health officials' emergency response to control the spread of foreign animal diseases and mitigate any impact on the livestock industry, develop countermeasures against high-priority diseases that threaten U.S. livestock, provide building and facility operators a rapid warning and response capability to protect occupants in the event of a chemical or biological attack, and would improve the national, State and local ability to respond to and recover from the effects of a nuclear radiological attack.

Mr. Chairman, that is an impressive list of research priorities. We should take very, very seriously any budget proposal that would displace or move aside these research priorities.

So, under this amendment, this \$75 million will be returned to this critical research and development function, restoring these efforts, taking them back to their requested level. These funds will permit S&T to resume research and development work on 22 projects not funded in fiscal 2012, and would increase funding for 34 projects in the important Homeland Security missions such as border security, bio security, chemical security, explosives detection, hostile behavior detection and disaster resiliency.

There's a lot at stake in this amendment, my colleagues. I urge you to adopt it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, as a farmer and rancher myself, I am very concerned by this amendment. One might be led to believe that with the adoption of this amendment, somehow important research would continue. Actually the opposite is true, Mr. Chairman.

We have billions and billions of dollars in this country that are based on our livestock industries, and unless this Congress and this President continue forward with a plan to build a BSL level 4 security research facility, we will not do the necessary research to protect critical industries, livestock industries in particular, in this Nation. Let me identify two diseases, the Hendra virus and the Nipah virus, that research is not occurring on right now. The Hendra virus' first outbreak was in Australia in 1994. It killed 13 horses. But more importantly, it killed a number of humans. It's a zoonotic disease, and the research is not occurring now.

Secondly, how about the Nipah virus? First identified in Malaysia in 1999, the outbreak resulted in the killing of more than 1 million hogs and 257 cases in humans, killing 105 of them.

Without this type of research, Mr. Chairman, these are the kinds of viruses we have no protection for. Folks might say, well, don't worry, if we would have this type of virus in America, we can outsource the research to friendly countries, Australia and Canada, that will do the research for us.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm not willing to rely on outsourcing the protection of very important industries. And these are just accidental outbreaks. There are numerous other viruses, numerous other diseases that are in the hands, I believe—and research will show—in the hands potentially of enemies of our country. And we need to oppose this amendment and protect our key vital food and agriculture industries from accidental, as well as potential bioterrorist, attacks.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and defend our critical industries.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, as authorized by title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.), for management and administration of programs and activities, \$38,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the time of the submission of the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a strategic plan of investments necessary to implement the Department of Homeland Security's responsibilities under the domestic component of the global nuclear detection architecture that shall—

(1) define each departmental entity's roles and responsibilities in support of the domestic detection architecture, including any existing or planned programs to pre-screen cargo or conveyances overseas;

(2) identify and describe the specific investments being made by departmental components in fiscal year 2013, and planned for fiscal year 2014, to support the domestic architecture and the security of sea, land, and air pathways into the United States;

(3) describe the investments necessary to close known vulnerabilities and gaps, including associated costs and timeframes, and estimates of feasibility and cost effectiveness; and

(4) explain how the Department's research and development funding is furthering the implementation of the domestic nuclear detection architecture, including specific investments planned for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for radiological and nuclear research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations, \$226,830,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

#### SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For expenses for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office acquisition and deployment of radiological detection systems in accordance with the global nuclear detection architecture, \$51,455,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

#### TITLE V

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act, may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts, and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates a new program, project, or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project, office, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; or

(5) contracts out any function or activity for which funding levels were requested for Federal full-time equivalents in the object classification tables contained in the fiscal year 2013 Budget Appendix for the Department of Homeland Security, as modified by the joint explanatory statement accompanying this Act, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2013, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or proceeds available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that:

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or reduces the numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by the Congress; or

(3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by the Congress, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security by this Act or provided by previous appropriations Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer under this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under subsection (b) and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, no funds shall be reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriations after June 30, except in extraordinary circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.

(e) The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in this section shall apply to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided in previous Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 504. The Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund, established pursuant to section 403 of Public Law 103-356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note), shall continue operations as a permanent working capital fund for fiscal year 2013: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security may be used to make payments to the Working Capital Fund, except for the activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working

Capital Fund shall be available for obligation until expended to carry out the purposes of the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That all departmental components shall be charged only for direct usage of each Working Capital Fund service: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be used only for purposes consistent with the contributing component: *Provided further*, That the Working Capital Fund shall be paid in advance or reimbursed at rates which will return the full cost of each service: *Provided further*, That the Working Capital Fund shall be subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2013 from appropriations for salaries and expenses and operating expenses for fiscal year 2013 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2014, in the account and for the purposes for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2013 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2013.

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) make or award a grant allocation, grant, contract, other transaction agreement, task or delivery order on a Department of Homeland Security multiple award contract, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of \$1,000,000;

(2) award a task or delivery order requiring an obligation of funds in an amount greater than \$10,000,000 from multi-year Department of Homeland Security funds or a task or delivery order that would cause cumulative obligations of multi-year funds in a single account to exceed 50 percent of the total amount appropriated;

(3) make a sole-source grant award; or  
(4) announce publicly the intention to make or award items under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance of making an award or issuing a letter as described in that subsection.

(c) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with this section would pose a substantial risk to human life, health, or safety, an award may be made without notification, and the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 5 full business days after such an award is made or letter issued.

(d) A notification under this section—

(1) may not involve funds that are not available for obligation; and

(2) shall include the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, and the account from which the funds are being drawn.

(e) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 full business days in advance of announcing publicly

the intention of making an award under “State and Local Programs”.

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training that cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus otherwise required under chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 510. (a) Sections 520, 522, and 530, of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008 (division E of Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 2073 and 2074) shall apply with respect to funds made available in this Act in the same manner as such sections applied to funds made available in that Act.

(b) The third proviso of section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006 (6 U.S.C. 114), shall not apply with respect to funds made available in this Act.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term “Buy American Act” means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any person other than the Privacy Officer appointed under subsection (a) of section 222 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 142(a)) to alter, direct that changes be made to, delay, or prohibit the transmission to Congress of any report prepared under paragraph (6) of such subsection.

SEC. 513. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448).

SEC. 514. Within 45 days after the end of each month, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a monthly budget and staffing report for that month that includes total obligations, on-board versus funded full-time equivalent staffing levels, and the number of contract employees for each office of the Department.

SEC. 515. Except as provided in section 44945 of title 49, United States Code, funds appropriated or transferred to Transportation Security Administration “Aviation Security”, “Administration”, and “Transportation Security Support” for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for the procurement or installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification: *Provided*, That quarterly reports shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

SEC. 516. Any funds appropriated to Coast Guard “Acquisition, Construction, and Im-

provements” for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 for the 110-123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as the result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

SEC. 517. Section 532(a) of Public Law 109-295 (120 Stat. 1384) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2013”.

SEC. 518. The functions of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center instructor staff shall be classified as inherently governmental for the purpose of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note).

SEC. 519. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act to the “Office of the Secretary and Executive Management”, the “Office of the Under Secretary for Management”, or the “Office of the Chief Financial Officer”, may be obligated for a grant or contract funded under such headings by any means other than full and open competition.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to obligation of funds for a contract awarded—

(1) by a means that is required by a Federal statute, including obligation for a purchase made under a mandated preferential program, including the AbilityOne Program, that is authorized under chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code;

(2) pursuant to the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.);

(3) in an amount less than the simplified acquisition threshold described under section 3101 (b) of title 41, United States Code; or

(4) by another Federal agency using funds provided through an interagency agreement.

(c)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of this section for the award of a contract in the interest of national security or if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare.

(2) Not later than 5 days after the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security issues a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit notification of that waiver to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including a description of the applicable contract to which the waiver applies and an explanation of why the waiver authority was used: *Provided*, That the Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(d) In addition to the requirements established by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall review departmental contracts awarded through means other than a full and open competition to assess departmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall review selected contracts awarded in the previous fiscal year through means other than a full and open competition: *Provided further*, That in selecting which contracts to review, the Inspector General shall consider the cost and complexity of the goods and services to be provided under the contract, the criticality of the contract to fulfilling Department missions, past performance problems on similar contracts or by the selected vendor, complaints received about the award process or contractor performance, and such other factors as the Inspector General deems relevant: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General shall report the results of the reviews to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than February 4, 2013.

SEC. 520. None of the funds provided by this or previous appropriations Acts shall be used

to fund any position designated as a Principal Federal Official (or the successor thereto) for any Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) declared disasters or emergencies unless—

(1) the responsibilities of the Principal Federal Official do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations, and are consistent with the requirements of section 509(c) and sections 503(c)(3) and 503(c)(4)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 319(c) and 313(c)(3) and 313(c)(4)(A)) and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

(2) not later than 10 business days after the latter of the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security appoints the Principal Federal Official and the date on which the President issues a declaration under section 401 or section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191, respectively), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a notification of the appointment of the Principal Federal Official and a description of the responsibilities of such Official and how such responsibilities are consistent with paragraph (1) to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report specifying timeframes and milestones regarding the update of operations, planning and policy documents, and training and exercise protocols, to ensure consistency with paragraph (1) of this section.

SEC. 521. None of the funds provided or otherwise made available in this Act shall be available to carry out section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452).

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit unless the results of background checks required by law to be completed prior to the granting of the benefit have been received by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the results do not preclude the granting of the benefit.

SEC. 523. Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “September 30, 2012” and inserting “September 30, 2013”;

and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2012” and inserting “September 30, 2013”.

SEC. 524. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that all contracts of the Department of Homeland Security that provide award fees link such fees to successful acquisition outcomes (which outcomes shall be specified in terms of cost, schedule, and performance).

SEC. 525. None of the funds made available to the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management under this Act may be expended for any new hires by the Department of Homeland Security that are not verified through the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note).

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act for U.S. Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescrip-

tion drug (within the meaning of section 801(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) from importing a prescription drug from Canada that complies with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That this section shall apply only to individuals transporting on their person a personal-use quantity of the prescription drug, not to exceed a 90-day supply: *Provided further*, That the prescription drug may not be—

(1) a controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); or

(2) a biological product, as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

SEC. 527. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any proposed transfers of funds available under section 9703.1(g)(4)(B) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102-393) from the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency within the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That none of the funds identified for such a transfer may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the proposed transfers.

SEC. 528. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

SEC. 529. If the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration determines that an airport does not need to participate in the E-Verify Program as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), the Administrator shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that no security risks will result from such non-participation.

SEC. 530. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law during fiscal year 2013 or any subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the Administrator of General Services sells through public sale all real and related personal property and transportation assets which support Plum Island operations, subject to such terms and conditions as may be necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements.

(b) The proceeds of the sale described in subsection (a) shall be deposited as offsetting collections into the Department of Homeland Security—Science and Technology—“Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations” account and, subject to appropriation, shall be available until expended, for site acquisition, construction, and costs related to the construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility, including the costs associated with the sale, including due diligence requirements, necessary environmental remediation at Plum Island, and reimbursement of expenses incurred by the General Services Administration.

SEC. 531. Any official that is required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may not delegate such authority to perform that act unless specifically authorized herein.

SEC. 532. Section 550(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note), as amended by section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-83), is further amended by striking “on October 4, 2012” and inserting “on October 4, 2013”.

SEC. 533. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 534. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301.10–124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 535. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to propose or effect a disciplinary or adverse action, with respect to any Department of Homeland Security employee who engages regularly with the public in the performance of his or her official duties solely because that employee elects to utilize protective equipment or measures, including but not limited to surgical masks, N95 respirators, gloves, or hand-sanitizers, where use of such equipment or measures is in accord with Department of Homeland Security policy, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Office of Personnel Management guidance.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

SEC. 537. (a) Any company that collects or retains personal information directly from any individual who participates in the Registered Traveler or successor program of the Transportation Security Administration shall safeguard and dispose of such information in accordance with the requirements in—

(1) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800-30, entitled “Risk Management Guide for Information Technology Systems”;

(2) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800-53, Revision 3, entitled “Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations,”; and

(3) any supplemental standards established by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”).

(b) The airport authority or air carrier operator that sponsors the company under the Registered Traveler program shall be known as the “Sponsoring Entity”.

(c) The Administrator shall require any company covered by subsection (a) to provide, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Sponsoring Entity written certification that the procedures used by the company to safeguard and dispose of information are in compliance with the requirements under subsection (a). Such certification shall include a description of the procedures used by the company to comply with such requirements.

SEC. 538. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractor performance that has been judged to be below satisfactory performance or performance that does not meet the basic requirements of a contract.

SEC. 539. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the

House of Representatives, a report that either—

(1) certifies that the requirement for screening all air cargo on passenger aircraft by the deadline under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, has been met; or

(2) includes a strategy to comply with the requirements under title 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, including—

(A) a plan to meet the requirement under section 44901(g) of title 49, United States Code, to screen 100 percent of air cargo transported on passenger aircraft arriving in the United States in foreign air transportation (as that term is defined in section 40102 of that title); and

(B) specification of—

(i) the percentage of such air cargo that is being screened; and

(ii) the schedule for achieving screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

(b) The Administrator shall continue to submit reports described in subsection (a)(2) every 90 days until the Administrator certifies that the Transportation Security Administration has achieved screening of 100 percent of such air cargo.

SEC. 540. In developing any process to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security purposes, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all such processes take into consideration such passengers' and crews' privacy and civil liberties consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

SEC. 541. (a) Notwithstanding section 286(n) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(n)), of the funds deposited into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, \$9,200,000 shall be available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in fiscal year 2013 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

(b) None of the funds made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for grants for immigrant integration may be used to provide services to aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SEC. 542. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless such contract is otherwise authorized by statute to be entered into without regard to the above referenced statutes.

SEC. 543. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that specific U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities no longer meet the mission need, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of individual Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities by directing the Administrator of General Services to sell all real and related personal property which support Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities, subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements: *Provided*, That the proceeds, net of the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall be deposited as offsetting collections into a separate account that shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended for other real property capital asset needs of existing U.S. Immigration and Customs

Enforcement assets, excluding daily operations and maintenance costs, as the Secretary deems appropriate: *Provided further*, That any sale or collocation of federally owned detention facilities shall not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified 15 days prior to the announcement of any proposed sale or collocation.

SEC. 544. None of the funds made available under this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

SEC. 545. The Department of Homeland Security Chief Information Officer, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall, with respect to fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the information required in the multi-year investment and management plans required, respectively, under the headings "Office of the Chief Information Officer" under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), "U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses" under title II of such division, and "U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology" under such title, and section 568 of such Act.

SEC. 546. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure enforcement of immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

SEC. 547. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure by submitting proposals that the fees collected pursuant to section 13031(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(b)(1)(A)(i)) and described in section 601 of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-42) shall be available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection in fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years.

(b) The President's budget request shall include proposals to completely offset any budgetary cost associated with the provisions of subsection (a).

SEC. 548. Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2012" and inserting "September 30, 2013".

SEC. 549. (a) RESTRICTION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commandant and Vice Commandant of the Coast Guard may not travel aboard any Coast Guard owned or operated fixed-wing aircraft after the date of the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014 if the Secretary has not provided the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the Comprehensive Acquisition Strategy Report required in title I and the Commandant has not provided the Capital Investment Plan, required in Coast Guard Acquisition, Construction and Improvement of title II.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of travel aboard an aircraft described in such subsection—

(1) to respond to a major disaster or emergency declared under section 401 of the Rob-

ert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170);

(2) to respond to a discharge classified as a spill of national significance under part 300.323 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations;

(3) for evacuation purposes, including for a medical emergency; or

(4) to respond to emergent national security issues as required by the President.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing not later than 5 days after engaging in travel prohibited in subsection (a) under an exception provided in subsection (b).

SEC. 550. Notwithstanding Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11, in a budget submission of the Coast Guard for Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" for fiscal year 2014 or any fiscal year thereafter, costs related to the construction or conversion of a cutter shall be requested in accordance with the following guidelines:

(1) Costs of outfitting and post-delivery activities and spare or repair parts shall be requested not earlier than for the first fiscal year in which it is necessary to incur such costs to maintain a planned production schedule, which may be subsequent to the fiscal year for which cutter end costs are requested.

(2) Costs of long lead time items shall be requested for the fiscal year in which it is necessary to incur such costs to maintain a planned production schedule, which may be in advance of the fiscal year for which cutter end costs are requested.

(3) Costs of program management shall be requested for each fiscal year, for the portion of program management costs attributable to such fiscal year.

(4) For purposes of the preceding paragraphs—

(A) the term "long lead time items" means components, parts, material, or effort with significantly longer lead times than other elements of an end item;

(B) the term "outfitting" means procurement or installation of on board repair parts, other secondary items, equipment, and recreation items; precommissioning crew support; general use consumables furnished to the shipbuilder; the fitting out activity to fill a vessel's initial allowances; and contractor-furnished spares;

(C) the term "post delivery activities" includes design, planning, Government furnished material, and related labor for Government-responsible defects and deficiencies identified during builders trials, acceptance trials, and testing during the post-delivery period; costs of all work required to correct defects or deficiencies identified during the post-delivery period; and costs of all work required to correct trial card deficiencies on a vessel of a particular class, as well as on subsequent vessels of that class (whether or not delivered) until the corrective action for that cutter class is completed; and

(D) the term "cutter end costs" includes the cost of construction or conversion of a vessel, deferred work identified prior to vessel delivery, and, when unrelated to a specific fix, normal changes authorized prior to completion of fitting out, advanced planning, and travel.

SEC. 551. (a) The President, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall establish new procedures to administer assistance for debris and wreckage removal provided under sections 403(a)(3)(A), 407, and 502(a)(5) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b(a)(3)(A), 5173, and 5192(a)(5)).

(b) The new procedures established under paragraph (a) may include—

(1) making grants on the basis of fixed estimates to provide financial incentives and disincentives for the timely or cost effective completion of projects under sections 403(a)(3)(A), 407, and 502(a)(5) of such Act if the State, local government, or owner or operator of the private non-profit facility agrees to be responsible to pay for any actual costs that exceed the estimate;

(2) using a sliding scale for the Federal share for removal of debris and wreckage based on the time it takes to complete debris and wreckage removal;

(3) allowing utilization of program income from recycled debris without offset to grant amount;

(4) reimbursing base and overtime wages for employees and extra hires of a State, local government, or owner or operator of a private non-profit facility performing or administering debris and wreckage removal; and

(5) notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the actual costs of projects under subparagraph (b)(1) are less than the estimated costs thereof, the Administrator may permit a grantee or sub grantee to use all or part of the excess funds for any of the following purposes:

(A) Debris management planning.

(B) Acquisition of debris management equipment for current or future use.

(C) Other activities to improve future debris removal operations, as determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 552. (a) Of the amounts made available by this Act for “Department of Homeland Security—National Protection and Programs Directorate—Infrastructure Protection and Information Security—Federal Network Security”, \$202,000,000 shall be used to deploy on Federal systems technology to improve the information security of agency information systems covered by section 3543(a) of title 44, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds made available under this section shall be used to assist and support Government-wide and agency-specific efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective cybersecurity to address escalating and rapidly evolving threats to information security, including the acquisition by the Department of Homeland Security of an automated and continuous monitoring program that includes equipment, software, and Department of Homeland Security-supplied services: *Provided further*, That not later than January 1, 2013, and quarterly thereafter, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security of the National Protection and Programs Directorate shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the obligation and expenditure of funds made available under this section: *Provided further*, That automated and continuous monitoring software procured by the funds made available by this section shall not collect or store personally identifiable information, nor monitor the content of network traffic: *Provided further*, That such software shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with all applicable privacy laws and agency-specific restrictions and standards on access to personally identifiable information.

(b) Funds made available under this section may not be used to supplant funds provided for any such system within an agency budget.

(c) Not later than April 1, 2013, the heads of all Federal agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives expenditure plans for necessary cybersecurity improvements to address known vulnerabilities to information systems described in subsection (a).

(d) Not later July 1, 2013, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a report on the execution of the expenditure plan for that agency required by subsection (c): *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall summarize such execution reports and annually submit such summaries to Congress in conjunction with the annual progress report on implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347), as required by section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

(e) This section shall not apply to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government and shall apply to all Federal agencies within the executive branch except for the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 553. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 555. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government receiving funds appropriated in this Act to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts and include in its annual performance plan and performance and accountability reports the following:

(1) Details on future action the department, agency, or instrumentality will take to resolve undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(2) The method that the department, agency, or instrumentality uses to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(3) Identification of undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts that may be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(4) In the preceding 3 fiscal years, details on the total number of expired grant accounts with undisbursed balances (on the first day of each fiscal year) for the department, agency, or instrumentality and the total finances that have not been obligated to a specific project remaining in the accounts.

SEC. 556. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States, unless —

(1) such conference is a law enforcement training or operational conference for law enforcement personnel and the majority of Federal employees in attendance are law enforcement personnel stationed outside the United States; or

(2) such attendance is pursuant to law enforcement, security, or military operations.

SEC. 557. (a) The head of any agency, office, or component funded by this Act shall submit quarterly reports to the Inspector General regarding the costs and contracting procedures relating to each conference, cere-

mony, and similar event, to include commissioning, de-commissioning, change of command, and other ceremonies, held by the agency during fiscal year 2013 for which the cost to the Government was more than \$20,000.

(b) Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include, for each event described in that subsection held during the applicable quarter—

(1) a description of the subject of and number of participants attending that event;

(2) a detailed statement of the costs to the Government relating to that event, including—

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services; and

(C) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to that event; and

(3) a description of the contracting procedures relating to that event, including—

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis for that event; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the agency in evaluating potential contractors for that event.

(c) Not later than 30 days after the end of fiscal year 2013, the Inspector General shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Department of Homeland Security spending on conferences, ceremonies, and similar events in fiscal year 2013, as reported pursuant to subsections (a) and (b). The report shall list the relevant events, substantiate that the Department complied with all applicable laws and regulations associated with spending on such events, and describe in detail the total costs to the Government associated with those events, to include the amount of funding obligated and expended by appropriation or other source of funding, including relevant budget accounts.

SEC. 558. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless an agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 559. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless an agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

#### (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 560. The unobligated balance of each amount specified for a project or activity under the heading “Federal Emergency Management Agency—National Predisaster Mitigation Fund” in the explanatory statement accompanying Public Law 110-161 where the Federal Emergency Management Agency has received written notification of the intent by



the recipient to not apply for the grant is rescinded, and the overall unobligated balance available under such heading in such Act is reduced accordingly.

## (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 561. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Homeland Security Acts the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended:

(1) \$42,500,000 from Coast Guard "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements," 2010/2014.

(2) \$91,100,000 from Coast Guard "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements," 2011/2015.

(3) \$40,412,000 from U.S. Customs and Border Protection "Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology," 2012/2014.

(4) \$48,000,000 from Coast Guard "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements," 2012/2016.

## (RESCISSION)

SEC. 562. From the unobligated balances made available in the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund established by section 9703.1 of title 31, United States Code, which was added to such title by section 638 of Public Law 102-393, \$60,000,000 shall be permanently rescinded.

## (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 563. Of the funds transferred to the Department of Homeland Security when it was created in 2003, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

(1) \$1,316,000 from Department of Homeland Security "Office for Domestic Preparedness"; and

(2) \$2,831,000 from Federal Emergency Management Agency "National Predisaster Mitigation Fund".

SEC. 564. (a) Section 44945 of Title 49, United States Code, is hereafter repealed.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is hereafter amended by striking the item relating to such section.

SEC. 565. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a facility to employ or to not employ a particular security measure for personnel surety if the facility has adopted personnel measures designed to—

(1) verify and validate individuals' identification;

(2) check individuals' criminal history;

(3) verify and validate individuals' legal authorization to work; and

(4) identify people with terrorist ties.

SEC. 566. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape or incest: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 567. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 568. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to pro-

vide escort services necessary for a female detainee to receive such service outside the detention facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 567 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Mr. ADERHOLT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 99, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 569. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

□ 2240

## 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:

An amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

First amendment by Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

Second amendment by Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

First amendment by Ms. HAHN of California.

Second amendment by Ms. HAHN of California.

An amendment by Mr. POE of Texas. An amendment by Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

An amendment by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

An amendment by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

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

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) 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 154, noes 260, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

## AYES—154

Ackerman	Garamendi	Neal
Andrews	Gonzalez	Pallone
Baca	Green, Al	Pascarell
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Berkley	Hahn	Peters
Berman	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Higgins	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Himes	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Richmond
Butterfield	Hirono	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Holt	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Honda	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Hoyer	Rush
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	(TX)	T.
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Schiff
Clay	Kildee	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kucinich	Serrano
Cohen	Langevin	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sires
Costa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Costello	Levin	Speier
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Sutton
Crowley	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Tonko
DeFazio	Lynch	Towns
DeGette	Maloney	Tsongas
DeLauro	Markey	Van Hollen
Deutch	Matsui	Velázquez
Dicks	McCollum	Visclosky
Dingell	McDermott	Wasserman
Doggett	McGovern	Schultz
Doyle	McNerney	Waters
Edwards	Meeks	Watt
Ellison	Michaud	Waxman
Engel	Miller (NC)	Welch
Eshoo	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Moore	Woolsey
Fattah	Moran	Yarmuth
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	
Fudge	Nadler	

## NOES—260

Adams	Burton (IN)	Fleischmann
Aderholt	Calvert	Fleming
Akin	Camp	Flores
Alexander	Campbell	Forbes
Altmire	Canseco	Fortenberry
Amash	Cantor	Fox
Amodei	Capito	Franks (AZ)
Austria	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Bachmann	Cassidy	Galleghy
Bachus	Chabot	Gardner
Barletta	Chaffetz	Garrett
Barrow	Chandler	Gerlach
Bartlett	Coffman (CO)	Gibbs
Barton (TX)	Cole	Gibson
Bass (NH)	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Benishek	Cravaack	Gohmert
Berg	Crawford	Goodlatte
Biggert	Crenshaw	Gosar
Billray	Critz	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Davis (KY)	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Black	DesJarlais	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Bonner	Dold	Griffith (VA)
Bono Mack	Donnelly (IN)	Grimm
Boren	Dreier	Guinta
Boswell	Duffy	Guthrie
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hall
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hanna
Brooks	Ellmers	Harper
Broun (GA)	Emerson	Harris
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hartzler
Bucshon	Fincher	Hastings (WA)
Buerkle	Fitzpatrick	Hayworth
Burgess	Flake	Heck

Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Hochul  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre

McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
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  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
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)  
Walz (MN)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—17

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Coble  
Conyers  
Culberson  
Denham

Filner  
Holden  
Lewis (CA)  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Oliver

Paul  
Scott, David  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Stark

## □ 2304

Messrs. BISHOP of New York and ISRAEL changed their 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 345, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) 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 140, noes 273, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

## AYES—140

Adams  
Akin  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Benishok  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Conaway  
Cravaack  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar

Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
King (IA)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latta  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Mulvaney  
Neugebauer

Nugent  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Paulsen  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Ribble  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Scallise  
Schmidt  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Smith (NE)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)

## NOES—273

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bucshon  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Castor (FL)

Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson

Farr  
Fattah  
Forbes  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lujan  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore

Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Noem  
Nunes  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling

Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Stivers  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—18

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Coble  
Conyers  
Culberson  
Filner

Grijalva  
Holden  
Honda  
Lewis (CA)  
Myrick  
Napolitano

Oliver  
Paul  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Stark

## □ 2308

Mr. CASSIDY changed his 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 346, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) 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 173, noes 240, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—173

Ackerman Fudge Murphy (CT)  
 Andrews Gibson Nadler  
 Baca Goodlatte  
 Baldwin Green, Al  
 Barletta Griffith (VA)  
 Bass (NH) Grimm  
 Becerra Gutierrez  
 Berkley Hahn  
 Berman Hanabusa  
 Bishop (GA) Hanna  
 Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL)  
 Blumenauer Hayworth  
 Bonamici Heinrich  
 Buchanan Holt  
 Burgess Honda  
 Butterfield Israel  
 Capps Jackson (IL)  
 Capuano Jackson Lee  
 Carnahan (TX)  
 Carney Johnson, E. B.  
 Carson (IN) Jones  
 Chandler Kaptur  
 Chu Keating  
 Cicilline Kind  
 Clarke (MI) Kissell  
 Clarke (NY) Kucinich  
 Clay Landry  
 Cleaver Langevin  
 Clyburn Larson (CT)  
 Cohen Lee (CA)  
 Connolly (VA) Levin  
 Cooper Lewis (GA)  
 Courtney Lipinski  
 Crowley Loeb sack  
 Cummings Lofgren, Zoe  
 Davis (CA) Lowey  
 Davis (IL) Lujan  
 DeFazio Lynch  
 DeGette Maloney  
 DeLauro Marino  
 Denham Markey  
 Deutch Matheson  
 Dingell Matsui  
 Doggett McCarthy (NY)  
 Doyle McCollum  
 Duncan (TN) McDermott  
 Edwards McGovern  
 Ellison Meeks  
 Engel Mica  
 Eshoo Michaud  
 Farr Miller (NC)  
 Fattah Miller, George  
 Fitzpatrick Moore  
 Frank (MA) Moran

NOES—240

Adams Capito  
 Aderholt Carter  
 Akin Cassidy  
 Alexander Castor (FL)  
 Altmire Chabot  
 Amash Chaffetz  
 Amodei Coffman (CO)  
 Austria Cole  
 Bachmann Conaway  
 Bachus Costa  
 Barrow Costello  
 Bartlett Cravaack  
 Barton (TX) Crawford  
 Benishek Crenshaw  
 Berg Critz  
 Biggert Cuellar  
 Bilbray Davis (KY)  
 Bilirakis Dent  
 Bishop (UT) DesJarlais  
 Black Dicks  
 Blackburn Dold  
 Bonner Donnelly (IN)  
 Bono Mack Dreier  
 Boren Duffy  
 Brady (TX) Duncan (SC)  
 Brooks Ellmers  
 Broun (GA) Emerson  
 Bucshon Farenthold  
 Buerkle Fincher  
 Burton (IN) Flake  
 Calvert Fleischmann  
 Camp Fleming  
 Campbell Flores  
 Canseco Forbes  
 Cantor Fortenberry

Hunter Miller (MI)  
 Hurt Miller, Gary  
 Issa Mulvaney  
 Jenkins Murphy (PA)  
 Johnson (GA) Neugebauer  
 Johnson (IL) Noem  
 Johnson (OH) Nugent  
 Johnson, Sam Nunes  
 Jordan Nunnelee  
 Kelly Olson  
 King (IA) Palazzo  
 King (NY) Pastor (AZ)  
 Kingston Paulsen  
 Kinsinger (IL) Pearce  
 Kline Peterson  
 Labrador Pitts  
 Lamborn Platts  
 Lance Poe (TX)  
 Lankford Pompeo  
 Larsen (WA) Posey  
 Latham Price (GA)  
 LaTourette Price (NC)  
 Latta Quayle  
 LoBiondo Reed  
 Long Rehberg  
 Lucas Reichert  
 Luetkemeyer Renacci  
 Lummis Ribble  
 Lungren, Daniel Rigell  
 E. Rivera  
 Mack Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross (AR)  
 Ross (FL)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Rush  
 Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—18

Bass (CA)  
 Cardoza  
 Coble  
 Conyers  
 Culberson  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Filner  
 Grijalva  
 Hirono  
 Holden  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Myrick

□ 2312

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 347, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) 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 211, noes 202, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—211

Ackerman Gonzalez Murphy (CT)  
 Aderholt Goodlatte Nadler  
 Andrews Graves (MO)  
 Baca Green, Al  
 Bachmann Green, Gene  
 Baldwin Griffith (VA)  
 Barletta Grijalva  
 Barrow Guthrie  
 Bass (NH) Gutierrez  
 Benishek Hahn  
 Berkley Hanabusa  
 Berman Hastings (FL)  
 Biggert Hayworth  
 Bilirakis Heinrich  
 Bishop (NY) Higgins  
 Blumenauer Himes  
 Bonamici Hinchey  
 Boren Hinojosa  
 Boswell Hirono  
 Brady (PA) Hochul  
 Braley (IA) Holt  
 Brown (FL) Honda  
 Buchanan Huizenga (MI)  
 Buerkle Hunter  
 Butterfield Israel  
 Camp Jackson (IL)  
 Capps Jackson Lee  
 Capuano (TX)  
 Carnahan Johnson (GA)  
 Carney Johnson, E. B.  
 Carson (IN) Jordan  
 Chandler Kaptur  
 Chu Keating  
 Cicilline Kildee  
 Clarke (MI) Kind  
 Clarke (NY) Kissell  
 Clay Kucinich  
 Cleaver Landry  
 Clyburn Larson (CT)  
 Cohen Latham  
 Connolly (VA) Lee (CA)  
 Cooper Lewis (GA)  
 Costello Lipinski  
 Courtney LoBiondo  
 Critz Loeb sack  
 Crowley Lofgren, Zoe  
 Cuellar Lowey  
 Cummings Luetkemeyer  
 Davis (CA) Lujan  
 Davis (IL) Maloney  
 DeFazio Marino  
 DeGette Markey  
 DeLauro Matheson  
 Denham Matsui  
 Deutch McCarthy (NY)  
 Diaz-Balart McCollum  
 Dingell McCotter  
 Doggett McDermott  
 Donnelly (IN) McGovern  
 Doyle McIntyre  
 Edwards McNerney  
 Ellison Meehan  
 Emerson Meeks  
 Eshoo Mica  
 Farr Michaud  
 Fattah Miller (MI)  
 Fitzpatrick Miller (NC)  
 Fudge Miller, George  
 Garamendi Moore  
 Gibson Mulvaney

NOES—202

Adams Bucshon Dold  
 Akin Burgess Dreier  
 Alexander Burton (IN) Duffy  
 Altmire Calvert Duncan (SC)  
 Amash Campbell Duncan (TN)  
 Amodei Canseco Ellmers  
 Austria Cantor Engel  
 Bachus Capito Farenthold  
 Bartlett Carter Fincher  
 Barton (TX) Cassidy Flake  
 Becerra Chaffetz Fleischmann  
 Berg Coffman (CO) Fleming  
 Bilbray Cole Flores  
 Bishop (UT) Conaway Forbes  
 Black Costa Fortenberry  
 Blackburn Cravaack Foxx  
 Bonner Crawford Frank (MA)  
 Bono Mack Crenshaw Franks (AZ)  
 Boren Davis (KY) Frelinghuysen  
 Boustany Dent Gallegly  
 Brady (TX) DesJarlais Gardner  
 Brooks Dicks Garrett  
 Broun (GA)

Gerlach Lummis Rohrabacher  
Gibbs Lungren, Daniel  
Gingrey (GA) E.  
Gohmert Lynch  
Gosar Mack  
Gowdy Manzullo  
Granger Marchant  
Graves (GA) McCarthy (CA)  
Griffin (AR) McCaul  
Grimm McClintock  
Guinta McHenry  
Hall McKeon  
Hanna McKinley  
Harper McMorris  
Harris Rodgers  
Hartzler Miller (FL)  
Hastings (WA) Miller, Gary  
Heck Moran  
Hensarling Murphy (PA)  
Herger Neugebauer  
Herrera Beutler Noem  
Hoyer Nugent  
Huelskamp Nunes  
Hultgren Nunnelee  
Hurt Olson  
Issa Palazzo  
Jenkins Pastor (AZ)  
Johnson (IL) Paulsen  
Johnson (OH) Pearce  
Johnson, Sam Pence  
Jones Pitts  
Kelly Visclosky  
King (IA) Walberg  
King (NY) Walden  
Kingston Pompeo  
Kinzinger (IL) Posey  
Kline Price (GA)  
Labrador Price (NC)  
Lamborn Quayle  
Lance Reed  
Langevin Rehberg  
Lankford Ribble  
LaTourette Roby  
Latta Roe (TN)  
Long Rogers (AL)  
Lucas Rogers (KY)

## NOT VOTING—18

Bass (CA) Filner  
Bishop (GA) Holden  
Cardoza Lewis (CA)  
Coble Myrick  
Conyers Napolitano  
Culberson Oliver

□ 2315

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 348, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) 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 159, noes 254, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]  
AYES—159  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baldwin  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayworth  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney

## NOES—254

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Benishek  
Berg  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
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  
Chandler  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cravack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam

Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
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)

## NOT VOTING—18

Barton (TX) Culberson  
Bass (CA) Filner  
Butterfield Holden  
Cardoza Lewis (CA)  
Clarke (NY) Myrick  
Coble Napolitano

□ 2318

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

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 349, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the first amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) 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 156, noes 261, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

## AYES—156

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Amash  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow

Becerra	Grijalva	Murphy (CT)	LaTourette	Peterson	Shuster	Ciilline	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Gutierrez	Nadler	Latta	Petri	Simpson	Clarke (MI)	Israel	Quigley
Berman	Hahn	Neal	Lipinski	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Clay	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens	LoBiondo	Platts	Smith (NJ)	Cohen	(TX)	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Loeb sack	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Pascarell	Lofgren, Zoe	Pompeo	Smith (WA)	Conyers	Keating	Richmond
Bonamici	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Long	Posey	Southerland	Courtney	Kildee	Rothman (NJ)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pelosi	Lucas	Price (GA)	Stearns	Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA)	Hinche y	Peters	Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Stivers	Cummings	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)	Lummis	Quayle	Stutzman	Davis (CA)	Lance	Rush
Butterfield	Hirono	Polis	Lungren, Daniel	Reed	Sullivan	Davis (IL)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Hochul	Quigley	E.	Rehberg	Terry	DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Holt	Rahall	Mack	Reichert	Thompson (CA)	DeGette	Lee (CA)	T.
Carnahan	Honda	Rangel	Manzullo	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	DeLauro	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Hoyer	Reyes	Marchant	Ribble	Thornberry	Dent	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Israel	Richardson	Marino	Rigell	Tiberi	Deutch	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Richmond	McCarthy (CA)	Rivera	Tipton	Dicks	Lowe y	Schiff
Chandler	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher	McCaul	Roby	Turner (NY)	Dingell	Maloney	Schrader
Chu	(TX)	Roybal-Allard	McCollum	Roe (TN)	Turner (OH)	Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Ciilline	Johnson (GA)	Royce	McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Upton	Donnelly (IN)	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Doyle	Matsui	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rush	McIntyre	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky	Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Clay	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	McKeon	Rokita	Walberg	Fattah	McCa ul	Sewell
Cohen	Kind	Sánchez, Linda	McKinley	Rooney	Walden	Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Sherman
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	T.	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh (IL)	Frank (MA)	McGovern	Sires
Conyers	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Rodgers	Roskam	Walz (MN)	Frelinghuysen	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky	Mica	Ross (AR)	Gonzalez	Meeks	McNerney	Sutton
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schiff	Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)	Green, Al	Michaud	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Schrader	Miller (MI)	Rothman (NJ)	Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	McNerney	Tierney
Cummings	Levin	Schwartz	Mulvaney	Runyan	Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Miller (NC)	Tonko
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)	Ryan (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Gutierrez	Miller, George	Miller, George	Towns
Davis (IL)	Lowe y	Scott, David	Neugebauer	Sarbanes	Hahn	Moore	Moore	Tsongas
DeFazio	Luján	Serrano	Noem	Scalise	Hanabusa	Moran	Moran	Van Hollen
DeGette	Lynch	Sewell	Nugent	Schilling	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez
DeLauro	Maloney	Sherman	Nunes	Schmidt	Higgins	Nadler	Nadler	Wasserman
Deutch	Markey	Sires	Nunnelee	Schock	Himes	Neal	Neal	Schultz
Dicks	Matheson	Speier	Olson	Schweikert	Hinche y	Owens	Owens	Waters
Dingell	Matsui	Sutton	Palazzo	Scott (SC)	Hinojosa	Pallone	Pallone	Waxman
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)	Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Hirono	Pascarell	Pascarell	West
Donnelly (IN)	McClintock	Tierney	Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Hochul	Pastor (AZ)	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)
Doyle	McDermott	Tonko	Pence	Sessions	Holt	Pelosi	Pelosi	Woolsey
Ellison	McGovern	Towns	Perlmutter	Shimkus	Honda	Peters	Peters	Yarmuth
Engel	McNerney	Tsongas						
Fattah	Meehan	Van Hollen						
Frank (MA)	Meeks	Velázquez						
Fudge	Michaud	Wasserman						
Galle y	Miller (NC)	Schultz						
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Waxman						
Gonzalez	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)						
Green, Al	Moore	Woolsey						
Green, Gene	Moran	Yarmuth						

## NOT VOTING—14

## NOES—273

## NOES—261

Adams	Coffman (CO)	Rowdy
Aderholt	Cole	Granger
Akin	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Alexander	Cooper	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Andrews	Costello	Griffith (VA)
Austria	Cravaack	Grimm
Bachmann	Crawford	Guinta
Bachus	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barletta	Critz	Hall
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Hanna
Barton (TX)	Denham	Harper
Bass (NH)	Dent	Harris
Benishkek	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	Dold	Hayworth
Billray	Dreier	Heck
Billirakis	Duffy	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Herger
Black	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	Edwards	Huelskamp
Bonner	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Bono Mack	Emerson	Hultgren
Boren	Eshoo	Hunter
Boswell	Farenthold	Hurt
Boustany	Farr	Issa
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Jenkins
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (IL)
Broun (GA)	Flake	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Johnson, E. B.
Bucshon	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Buerkle	Flores	Jones
Burgess	Forbes	Jordan
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Kelly
Calvert	Fox	King (IA)
Camp	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Canseco	Garamendi	Kinzing (IL)
Cantor	Gardner	Kissell
Capito	Garrett	Kline
Carter	Gerlach	Labrador
Cassidy	Gibbs	Lamborn
Chabot	Gibson	Lance
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Landry
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Lankford
Clyburn	Gosar	Latham

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

Stated for:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 350, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HAHN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the second amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) 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 144, noes 273, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

## AYES—144

Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Barrow	Bonamici	Carney
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Berkley	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Berman	Butterfield	Chu

Ackerman	Costa	Harper
Adams	Costello	Harris
Aderholt	Cravaack	Hartzler
Akin	Crawford	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hayworth
Amash	Critz	Heck
Amodei	Crowley	Heinrich
Andrews	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Austria	Denham	Herger
Bachmann	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Barletta	Dold	Huizenga (MI)
Bartlett	Dreier	Hultgren
Barton (TX)	Duffy	Hunter
Bass (NH)	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Benishkek	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Berg	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Biggert	Ellmers	Jenkins
Billray	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Billirakis	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Black	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Farr	Jones
Bonner	Fincher	Jordan
Bono Mack	Flake	Kaptur
Boren	Fleischmann	Kelly
Boswell	Fleming	King (IA)
Boustany	Flores	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kingston
Brooks	Fortenberry	Kinzing (IL)
Broun (GA)	Fox	Kissell
Brown (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Buchanan	Fudge	Labrador
Bucshon	Galle y	Lamborn
Buerkle	Garamendi	Landry
Burgess	Gardner	Lankford
Burton (IN)	Garrett	Larsen (WA)
Calvert	Gerlach	Latham
Camp	Gibbs	LaTourette
Campbell	Gibson	Latta
Canseco	Gingrey (GA)	Lipinski
Cantor	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Capito	Goodlatte	Lofgren, Zoe
Carter	Gosar	Long
Cassidy	Gowdy	Lucas
Chabot	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Luján
Chandler	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Clarke (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Lungren, Daniel
Cleaver	Griffith (VA)	E.
Clyburn	Grimm	Lynch
	Guinta	Mack
	Guthrie	Manzullo
	Hall	Marchant
	Hanna	Marino

McCarthy (CA) Quayle  
McClintock Rangel  
McCollum Reed  
McCotter Rehberg  
McHenry Reichert  
McIntyre Renacci  
McKeon Ribble  
McKinley Rigell  
McMorris Rivera  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)

## NOT VOTING—14

Bass (CA) Holden  
Cardoza Lewis (CA)  
Coble Myrick  
Culberson Napolitano  
Filner Oliver

□ 2324

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 351, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) 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 302, noes 113, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—302

Adams Barletta  
Akin Barrow  
Alexander Bartlett  
Altmire Barton (TX)  
Amodei Bass (NH)  
Austria Benishek  
Bachmann Berg  
Bachus Berkley  
Baldwin Biggert

Bilbray Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren

Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Speier  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Watt  
Webster  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Paul  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Stark

Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Carney  
Carter  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper

Ackerman  
Adersholt  
Bilirakis  
Andrews  
Baca

Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hochul  
Holt  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lankford  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Schilling  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter

NOES—113

Becerra  
Berman  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer

Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Waters  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carson (IN)

Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Costello  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Coble  
Culberson  
Filner  
Holden

Hirono  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kildee  
Kingston  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Long  
Lowey  
Maloney  
Matsui  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Neal  
Pallone  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Polis

## NOT VOTING—16

Lewis (CA)  
McCollum  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Myrick  
Napolitano

□ 2327

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 352, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 186, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—230

Adams Biggert  
Aderholt Bilbray  
Akin Bilirakis  
Alexander Bishop (GA)  
Altmire Bishop (UT)  
Amash Black  
Amodei Blackburn  
Austria Bonner  
Bachmann Bono Mack  
Bachus Boren  
Barrow Boustany  
Bartlett Brooks  
Benishek Broun (GA)  
Berg Brown (FL)

Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cole



Conaway Johnson (IL) Reyes  
 Costa Johnson (OH) Ribble  
 Cravaack Johnson, Sam Rigell  
 Crawford Jones Rivera  
 Crenshaw Jordan Roby  
 Cuellar Kelly Roe (TN)  
 Cummings King (NY) Rogers (AL)  
 Davis (CA) Kingston Rogers (KY)  
 Davis (KY) Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (MI)  
 Denham Kline Rohrabacher  
 Dent Labrador Rokita  
 Diaz-Balart Lamborn Rooney  
 Dold Lance Ros-Lehtinen  
 Donnelly (IN) Landry Roskam  
 Dreier Lankford Ross (AR)  
 Duffy Latham Ross (FL)  
 Duncan (SC) Latta Runyan  
 Duncan (TN) Lipinski Ruppertsberger  
 Edwards LoBiondo Ryan (WI)  
 Ellmers Lucas Sánchez, Linda  
 Emerson Luetkemeyer T.  
 Farenthold Lummis  
 Fincher Mack  
 Flake Manzullo  
 Fleischmann Marchant  
 Fleming Marino  
 Flores Matheson  
 Forbes McCarthy (CA)  
 Foxx McClintock  
 Franks (AZ) McCotter  
 Frelinghuysen McHenry  
 Gallegly McIntyre  
 Gardner McKeon  
 Garrett McKinley  
 Gerlach McMorris  
 Gibbs Rodgers  
 Gibson Meehan  
 Gingrey (GA) Mica  
 Gohmert Miller (FL)  
 Goodlatte Miller (MI)  
 Gosar Miller, Gary  
 Gowdy Mulvaney  
 Granger Murphy (PA)  
 Graves (GA) Neugebauer  
 Graves (MO) Noem  
 Green, Gene Nugent  
 Griffin (AR) Nunes  
 Griffith (VA) Nunnelee  
 Grimm Olson  
 Guinta Palazzo  
 Guthrie Paulsen  
 Hall Pearce  
 Hanna Pence  
 Harper Peterson  
 Harris Petri  
 Hartzler Pitts  
 Hastings (WA) Platts  
 Hayworth Pompeo  
 Hensarling Posey  
 Herger Price (GA)  
 Herrera Beutler Quayle  
 Huizenga (MI) Reed  
 Hurt Reichert  
 Issa Renacci

## NOES—186

Ackerman Clyburn  
 Andrews Coffman (CO)  
 Baca Cohen  
 Baldwin Connolly (VA)  
 Barletta Conyers  
 Barton (TX) Cooper  
 Bass (NH) Costello  
 Becerra Courtney  
 Berkley Critz  
 Berman Crowley  
 Bishop (NY) Davis (IL)  
 Blumenauer DeFazio  
 Bonamici DeGette  
 Boswell DeLauro  
 Brady (PA) DesJarlais  
 Brady (TX) Deutch  
 Braley (IA) Dicks  
 Buchanan Dingell  
 Burgess Doggett  
 Butterfield Doyle  
 Capps Ellison  
 Capuano Engel  
 Carnahan Eshoo  
 Carney Farr  
 Carson (IN) Fattah  
 Castor (FL) Fitzpatrick  
 Chandler Fortenberry  
 Chu Frank (MA)  
 Cicilline Kildee  
 Clarke (MI) Kind  
 Clarke (NY) King (IA)  
 Clay Kissell  
 Cleaver Green, Al  
 Grijalva Kucinich  
 Langevin

Larsen (WA) Neal  
 Larson (CT) Owens  
 LaTourette Pallone  
 Lee (CA) Pascrell  
 Levin Pastor (AZ)  
 Lewis (GA) Pelosi  
 Loeb sack Perlmutter  
 Lofgren, Zoe Peters  
 Long Pingree (ME)  
 Lowey Poe (TX)  
 Lujan Polis  
 Lungren, Daniel Price (NC)  
 E. Quigley  
 Lynch Rahall  
 Maloney Rangel  
 Markey Rehberg  
 Matsui Richardson  
 McCarthy (NY) Richmond  
 McCollum Rothman (NJ)  
 McDermott Roybal-Allard  
 McGovern Royce  
 McNeerney Rush  
 Meeks Ryan (OH)  
 Michael Sanchez, Loretta  
 Miller (NC) Sarbanes  
 Miller, George Scalise  
 Moore Schakowsky  
 Moran Schiff  
 Murphy (CT) Schmidt  
 Nadler Schrader

## NOT VOTING—15

Bass (CA) Holden  
 Cardoza Lewis (CA)  
 Coble McCaul  
 Culbertson Myrick  
 Filner Napolitano

□ 2330

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

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 353, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA  
 SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) 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 167, noes 249, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

## AYES—167

Ackerman Capps  
 Andrews Capuano  
 Baca Carnahan  
 Baldwin Carney  
 Becerra Carson (IN)  
 Berkley Castor (FL)  
 Berman Chu  
 Biggart Cicilline  
 Bishop (GA) Clarke (MI)  
 Bishop (NY) Clarke (NY)  
 Blumenauer Clay  
 Bonamici Cleaver  
 Boswell Dicks  
 Brady (PA) Cohen  
 Braley (IA) Connolly (VA)  
 Brown (FL) Conyers  
 Butterfield Cooper

Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Critz  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Deutch  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Edwards

Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Frank (MA)  
 Fudge  
 Garamendi  
 Gonzalez  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 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, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)

## NOES—249

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Austria  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 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  
 Chandler  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Cravaack  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Davis (KY)  
 DeFazio  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart

Dold  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Dreier  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Emerson  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Flake  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson

Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Woolsey  
 Yarmuth

Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Royce  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
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  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
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)

## NOT VOTING—15

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Coble  
Culberson  
Filner

Holden  
Larsen (WA)  
Lewis (CA)  
Myrick  
Napolitano

Oliver  
Paul  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Stark

□ 2333

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 354, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON 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 60, noes 355, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

## AYES—60

Ackerman  
Amash  
Baldwin  
Bishop (GA)  
Braley (IA)  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Conyers  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Ellison  
Engel  
Fitzpatrick  
Fudge  
Garrett  
Green, Al

Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Harris  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Holt  
Honda  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Jordan  
Kucinich  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Maloney  
Markey

Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Mulvaney  
Nadler  
Polis  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Southerland  
Stutzman

Sutton  
Thompson (MS)  
Townes  
Walsh (IL)

## NOES—355

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clyburn  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle

Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Lujan  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clyburn  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle

Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Loftgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungrun, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Gosar  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce

Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster

Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

## NOT VOTING—16

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Coble  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Filner

Holden  
Larsen (WA)  
Lewis (CA)  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Oliver

Paul  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Stark

□ 2336

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 355, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) 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 150, noes 266, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

## AYES—150

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Braley (IA)  
Browne  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan

Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Critz  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette

DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Ellison  
Engel  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Frank (MA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hanna

Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sarbanes	Price (GA)	Scalise	Tiberi	Higgins	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Higgins	Meeks	Schakowsky	Price (NC)	Schiff	Tipton	Himes	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Himes	Michaud	Schrader	Quayle	Schilling	Turner (NY)	Hinchev	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Hinchev	Miller (MI)	Scott, David	Rangel	Schmidt	Turner (OH)	Hinojosa	McGovern	Sarbanes
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Rehberg	Schock	Van Hollen	Hirono	McIntyre	Schakowsky
Hirono	Moore	Serrano	Renacci	Schwartz	Walberg	Hochul	McNerney	Schiff
Hochul	Murphy (CT)	Sewell	Reyes	Schweikert	Walden	Holt	Meeks	Schrader
Honda	Nadler	Sherman	Ribble	Scott (SC)	Walsh (IL)	Honda	Michaud	Schwartz
Jackson (IL)	Neal	Sires	Rivera	Scott (VA)	Waxman	Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	Owens	Speier	Roby	Scott, Austin	Webster	Israel	Miller, George	Scott, David
(TX)	Pallone	Stivers	Roe (TN)	Sessions	West	Jackson (IL)	Moore	Serrano
Johnson (GA)	Pascarell	Sutton	Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Westmoreland	Jackson Lee	Moran	Sewell
Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Whitfield	(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Sherman
Keating	Paulsen	Thompson (MS)	Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Shimkus
Kildee	Pelosi	Tierney	Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Wittman	Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Sires
Kind	Perlmutter	Tonko	Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Wolf	Jones	Owens	Smith (WA)
Kline	Peters	Towns	Rooney	Smith (TX)	Womack	Keating	Pallone	Speier
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Tsongas	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Woodall	Kildee	Pascarell	Sutton
Langevin	Quigley	Upton	Roskam	Southerland	Woolsey	Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Velázquez	Ross (AR)	Stearns	Yoder	King (NY)	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Reed	Visclosky	Ross (FL)	Stutzman	Young (AK)	Kucinich	Peters	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Reichert	Walz (MN)	Roybal-Allard	Sullivan	Young (FL)	Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Tonko
Lowey	Richardson	Wasserman	Royce	Terry	Young (IN)	Larson (CT)	Polis	Towns
Lynch	Richmond	Schultz	Runyan	Thompson (PA)		Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Maloney	Rigell	Waters	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry		Levin	Quigley	Turner (NY)
Manzullo	Rothman (NJ)	Watt				Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Van Hollen
Markey	Ruppersberger	Welch	Bass (CA)	Holden	Olver	Lipinski	Rangel	Velázquez
Matheson	Rush	Wilson (FL)	Cardoza	Larsen (WA)	Paul	Lofgren, Zoe	Reyes	Visclosky
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth	Coble	Lewis (CA)	Shuler	Lowey	Richmond	Wasserman
McCaul	Sánchez, Linda		Culberson	Myrick	Slaughter	Lujan	Rothman (NJ)	Schultz
McCollum	T.		Filner	Napolitano	Stark	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta					Maloney	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
						Manzullo	Rush	Woolsey
						Markey	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
						Matheson		

## NOES—266

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Kelly
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Akin	Edwards	King (NY)
Alexander	Ellmers	Kingston
Amash	Emerson	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodel	Eshoo	Kissell
Austria	Farenthold	Labrador
Bachmann	Fattah	Lamborn
Bachus	Flake	Lance
Barletta	Fleischmann	Landry
Bartlett	Fleming	Lankford
Barton (TX)	Flores	Latham
Benishkek	Forbes	LaTourette
Berg	Fortenberry	Latta
Biggert	Fox	Lee (CA)
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Fudge	Loeb
Black	Gallely	Lofgren, Zoe
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Long
Bonner	Gardner	Lucas
Bono Mack	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Boren	Gerlach	Lujan
Boswell	Gibbs	Lummis
Boustany	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Brooks	Gohmert	Mack
Broun (GA)	Gonzalez	Marchant
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Marino
Bucshon	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Buerkle	Gowdy	McCarthy (NY)
Burgess	Granger	McClintock
Burton (IN)	Graves (GA)	McCotter
Butterfield	Griffin (AR)	McDermott
Calvert	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Camp	Grimm	McKeon
Campbell	Guinta	McKinley
Canseco	Guthrie	McMorris
Cantor	Hall	Rodgers
Capito	Harper	McNerney
Carney	Harris	Meehan
Carter	Hartzler	Mica
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hayworth	Miller, Gary
Chaffetz	Heck	Miller, George
Chandler	Heinrich	Moran
Clyburn	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Coffman (CO)	Herger	Murphy (PA)
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Conaway	Holt	Noem
Costa	Hoyer	Nugent
Costello	Huelskamp	Nunes
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Olson
Crowley	Hunter	Palazzo
Davis (CA)	Hurt	Pearce
Davis (KY)	Israel	Pence
Denham	Issa	Peterson
Dent	Jenkins	Petri
DesJarlais	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)	Platts
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Poe (TX)
Dold	Johnson, Sam	Polis
Dreier	Jones	Pompeo
Duffy	Jordan	Posey

## NOT VOTING—15

□ 2341

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
Stated for:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 356, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) 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 166, noes 245, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

## AYES—166

Ackerman	Chu	Doggett
Amodel	Cicilline	Donnelly (IN)
Andrews	Clarke (MI)	Doyle
Baca	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Baldwin	Clyburn	Ellison
Barrow	Cohen	Engel
Becerra	Connolly (VA)	Eshoo
Berkley	Conyers	Fattah
Berman	Costello	Foxx
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Critz	Fudge
Blumenauer	Crowley	Gonzalez
Bonamici	Cueellar	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)	Grimm
Butterfield	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Capps	DeGette	Hahn
Capuano	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Carnahan	Deutch	Hanna
Carney	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Heinrich

## NOES—245

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Labrador
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Lamborn
Akin	Ellmers	Lance
Alexander	Emerson	Landry
Altmire	Farenthold	Lankford
Amash	Farr	Latham
Austria	Fincher	LaTourette
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Bachus	Flake	LoBiondo
Barletta	Fleischmann	Loeb
Bartlett	Fleming	Long
Barton (TX)	Flores	Lucas
Bass (NH)	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Benishkek	Fortenberry	Lummis
Berg	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Biggert	Frelinghuysen	E.
Bilbray	Gallely	Mack
Bilirakis	Garamendi	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Marino
Black	Garrett	McCarthy (CA)
Blackburn	Gerlach	McCaul
Bonner	Gibbs	McClintock
Bono Mack	Gibson	McCormack
Boren	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter
Boswell	Gohmert	McHenry
Boustany	Goodlatte	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Gosar	McKinley
Brooks	Gowdy	McMorris
Broun (GA)	Granger	Rodgers
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Mica
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Burton (IN)	Guinta	Mulvaney
Calvert	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Camp	Hall	Neugebauer
Campbell	Harper	Noem
Canseco	Harris	Nugent
Cantor	Hartzler	Nunes
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee
Carson (IN)	Hayworth	Olson
Cassidy	Heck	Palazzo
Chabot	Hensarling	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Herger	Pearce
Chandler	Herrera Beutler	Pence
Clyburn	Huelskamp	Perlmutter
Coffman (CO)	Huizenga (MI)	Peterson
Cole	Hultgren	Petri
Conaway	Hunter	Pitts
Cooper	Hurt	Platts
Cravaack	Issa	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Jenkins	Pompeo
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Davis (KY)	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
Dent	Jordan	Reed
DesJarlais	Kelly	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Reichert
Dicks	Kingston	Renacci
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
Dreier	Kissell	Richardson
Duffy	Kline	Rigell

Rivera  
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  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberti  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Watt  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder

## NOT VOTING—20

Bass (CA)  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Coble  
Costa  
Culberson  
Filner

Holden  
Kaptur  
Larsen (WA)  
Lewis (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Myrick  
Napolitano

Olver  
Paul  
Shuler  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Waters

□ 2344

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 357, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 345, 347, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, and 357. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 345, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 354, 356 and 357. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall Nos. 346, 352, 353, and 355.

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5855) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

## EXCHANGE OF NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION PROPERTY IN PASCAGOULA, MISSISSIPPI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 363) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey property of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SALMON LAKE LAND SELECTION RESOLUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 292) to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 10 p.m. on account of illness.

## PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 503 of H. Con. Res. 112, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2013, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 614 and H. Res. 643, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates set forth pursuant to the budget for fiscal year 2013. The revision is designated for the Health Care Cost Reduction Act of 2012, H.R. 436. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 112.

## BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year		
	2012	2013	2013–2022
Current Aggregates:			
Budget Authority .....	2,858,503	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays .....	2,947,662	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues .....	1,877,839	2,260,625	32,439,140
Change for Health Care Cost Reduction Act (H.R. 436):			
Budget Authority .....	0	0	(1)
Outlays .....	0	0	(1)
Revenues .....	0	–2,103	–22,627
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority .....	2,858,503	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays .....	2,947,662	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues .....	1,877,839	2,258,863	32,416,513

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2061. An act to provide for an exchange of land between the Department of Homeland Security and the South Carolina State Ports Authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6321. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commodity Options (RIN: 3038-AD62) received April 30, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6322. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Facility Loans (RIN: 0575-AC78) received May 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6323. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Specification for 15 kV and 25 kV Primary Underground Power Cable received May 1, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acequinocyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0449; FRL-9346-4] received May 1, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6325. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-