As a high school student, Satin enrolled in several AP classes and graduated near the top of her class. She was accepted at her first college choice out of State; however, due to finances, Satin opted to stay in-State for school, hoping her family would have enough money to pay for medical school later on. But with interest rates on subsidized student loans set to double July 1, the chances that Satin's family can afford medical school are getting smaller.

We have 16 days to reach a compromise on this matter here in Congress to help ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to reach their educational dreams.

MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be voting on the National Defense Authorization Act, known as the NDAA. The NDAA's purpose is to ensure that our brave sons and daughters who serve this country will have what they need to be trained and resourced to do their jobs effectively and safely.

This authorization is one of the few policy matters in Washington not viewed through a partisan lens. As a father of a son and daughter-in-law currently serving our country in Afghanistan, I'm proud to say that that is the case.

Today's NDAA includes an amendment I added that would mandate the Department of Defense implement a preliminary mental health assessment before individuals join the military. The goal is to assure mental health resiliency for those who will be facing the combat realities of war. The suicide rate among our military is unacceptable, and this amendment will help reduce it.

The Department of Defense has done medical assessments for many years. It is time we bring mental health to parity in preliminary assessments. We must focus on the overall well-being of the force.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to highlight the four-part plan released last Monday by the International Energy Agency about the importance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It is yet one more report sounding the alarm that we are not on track to meet the agreed-upon target of limiting the rise of average global temperatures to 2 degrees Celsius.

Mr. Speaker, how many more reports must be released before we act? Every day that Congress continues down this self-destructive path of ignoring climate change is a missed opportunity to bring immense benefits to our country. By failing to enact responsible climate change policies, we are missing the opportunity to simultaneously create good paying jobs, protect our environment, and leave a sustainable planet for our future generations.

The time to act is now.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there's a lot going on in our country right now, but we here in Congress need to remember that the number one priority remains getting our economy back on track. That's why, today, I reintroduced the original JOBS Act.

My JOBS Act would reduce the corporate tax rate and capital gains tax to zero. It would totally eliminate them. It would also extend for 3 years bonus depreciation and would allow 100 percent expensing for business assets. Finally, the JOBS Act would permanently repeal the estate and gift taxes—the death taxes.

My bill would give businesses the boost that they need to create more jobs. It would stimulate our economy and would bring manufacturing jobs back to America.

I urge my colleagues to support my JOBS Act.

THE BLACK FOREST FIRE

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the many dedicated firefighters, first responders, and military personnel who are battling the ongoing Black Forest fire to save countless homes and lives in my congressional district. I would also like to recognize the coordinated response of all the Federal, State, and local resources that have come together to contain the fire.

Since erupting Tuesday afternoon, the Black Forest fire has, at this time, claimed two lives, destroyed 379 homes, and displaced over 41,000 people, making it the most destructive fire in Colorado history.

I will continue to do all I can to help the thousands of families displaced by this fire and ensure that our brave firefighters and first responders have all the Federal resources they need.

I ask all of you to keep the people of the Black Forest and the family of the two who have died in your thoughts and prayers during this tragedy.

ALBANIAN PRIME MINISTER BERISHA, AMERICA'S LOYAL FRIEND

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, Albania was struggling to leave behind its years of repression, dependence, and deprivation, a period when it was a North Korea clone. Now, Albania is a democracy with elected representatives who engage in open debates within a vigorous civil society.

Albania is a member of NATO that continues to contribute troops to the International Security Force in Afghanistan and participated in the U.S.-led liberation of Iraq, and it now aspires to have membership in the European Union.

In contrast to the atheist dictatorship it left behind, today, Albanian churches and mosques are full. Similarly, Marxist economics has been replaced with an expanding market economy. America needs to be especially grateful to the Government of Albania and to the Albanian Prime Minister, Sali Berisha, who has been a steadfast and courageous ally of the United States.

Recently, when the U.S. needed countries willing to provide asylum to members of the MEK now stranded in Iraq, Prime Minister Berisha agreed to accept 210 members of that group—far more than any other country. That was a sign of good faith and friendship for America. It will not soon be forgotten, and it took real courage on the part of President Berisha to make this generous offer. We will not forget his friendship.

□ 0910

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Pursuant to House Resolution 260 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. 1960.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0912

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. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose Thursday, June 13, 2013, the seventh set of en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) had been disposed of.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 18 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 405, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1040B. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO TO YEMEN.

None of the amounts authorized to be available to the Department of Defense may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, any individual detained at Guantanamo (as such term is defined in section 1033(f)(2)) to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, in May, the President declared a renewed intention to transfer detainees from Guantanamo ''to the greatest extent possible.'' He also announced he was lifting his self-imposed suspension on the transfers of detainees to Yemen.

This, I believe, is a dangerous policy. It is dangerous for our troops fighting overseas. It is also dangerous for citizens living in the homeland.

The amendment I am offering prohibits the Department of Defense from transferring Gitmo detainees to Yemen for one year. In other words, this amendment simply puts into the law the President's previous judgment that transfers to Yemen should be suspended.

Those listening to the debate today might be asking: ''Why is this prohibition needed?'' For starters, the Defense Department should not transfer detainees to Yemen because they represent some of the most dangerous terrorists known in the world.

It is important to note that these individuals are still in Gitmo because even the Obama administration believes they are being legally held. The Bush administration didn't feel comfortable transferring these terrorists. After Yemen was the starting point for the foiled airline bombing over Detroit, the Obama administration correctly decided not to transfer these terrorists back to that troubled nation.

These individuals pose a real threat to the United States. Detainees at Gitmo pose a real threat to our national security. Transfers to Yemen should be prohibited because Yemen has become a hotbed for terrorist activity. In fact, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—which is widely believed to be the most lethal of all al Qaeda affiliates—is based in Yemen.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper testified in 2011 that AQAP remains the affiliate most likely to conduct a transnational attack. This is an organization with which we are at war, an organization that is resolute on killing as many Americans as they can if we don't stop them first.

It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S. The Christmas Day Detroit bombing attempt, the ink cartridge bomb plot, and the radicalization of the Fort Hood shooter all can be traced back to Yemen.

Let's look at the facts. We should not be in the business of sending Gitmo detainees to Yemen because, one, they represent some of the most dangerous terrorists in the world and, two, Yemen is home of the most active al Qaeda affiliate, and lastly, because Yemen has a poor track record of securing its prisons.

A Yemen citizen, the convicted mastermind of the USS *Cole* bombing who took the lives of 17 American sailors, was being held by Yemeni authorities when he escaped from prison in 2003. Luckily, he was recaptured, but he was able to escape again from Yemeni custody in 2006 along with 22 other terrorists.

Why risk another jailbreak by people who intend to do us harm? This is a commonsense amendment with the purpose of protecting Americans.

My amendment does not say the President can't transfer detainees elsewhere. My amendment is only in effect for 1 year to give Yemen time to demonstrate it can safely and securely handle Gitmo transfers.

Before taking additional steps, I also believe it is prudent that Congress receive the Department of Defense's report on factors that contribute to reengagement so that informed choices about future transfers can be made. This report is mandated by law, and it is currently overdue.

In closing, I want to share a statistic from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. In 2012, ODNI reported that the combined suspected and confirmed re-engagement rate of former Gitmo detainees has risen to an alarming 27.9 percent. When I speak with constituents—moms and dads—back home who ask me how safe we really are, this rate of re-engagement comes to mind.

I ask my colleagues to consider the national security implications of transferring detainees to Yemen, and join me in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The 56 inmates that we are talking about at Guantanamo are not the most dangerous terrorists in the world. In fact, the intel community and the Department of Defense determined they were acceptable risks for release back to Yemen, back to their home country. Not everybody that we rounded up and took to Guantanamo, unfortunately, turned out to be the very, very dangerous terrorists that we thought they were.

The problem we confront with these 56 that we've determined are not a grave threat to the country, determining that if there is any minimal threat whatsoever we are simply going to hold them forever is, well, quite frankly, un-American. That is contrary to our values, to say that we are going to hold somebody indefinitely—I gather forever—because we think there might possibly be some risk. That's not the way the Constitution is supposed to work.

More than anything, this amendment restricts the President's flexibility. If the President determines that this is safe, if the intelligence community determines this is safe, if the Defense Department determines this is safe, they ought to have that option. This amendment takes that option away and, once again, makes Gitmo the classic Hotel California: ''You can check in any time you want, but you can never leave.''

We cannot warehouse people forever. We need to give the President options, not restrict them.

There are certification requirements that will always be in place to make sure that the Secretary of Defense, before releasing these people, certifies that he believes it is an acceptable risk. We will have to have that. But I think an absolute prohibition ties the hands of the President in an unhelpful way.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from Indiana for her effort on this very important amendment. For 4-plus years, the Obama administration has declined to transfer these terrorists at Guantanamo to Yemen. I would suggest that nothing has changed, if you look at the facts of the matter.

□ 0920

Yemen remains a partner in our war on terror, but it still has weak capabilities. It still has not yet demonstrated the ability to house such terrorists or to deter terrorist activity in its own quarters as we've seen from things like the underwear bombing plot or the Fort Hood massacre. If we transfer these terrorists to Yemen, we cannot know for sure that it will not mean more attacks on our soldiers in Afghanistan, on our Ambassadors at our Embassies around the world, on our citizens around the world, here in the United States, or in allied countries.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this temporary and

restrained amendment to ensure that terrorists at Guantanamo Bay do not escape back onto the battlefronts of the war on terror.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

There is more agreement here than meets the eye. I think everyone in this Chamber agrees that no person who is a dangerous threat to the people of the United States should be released. I think most people in this Chamber agree that, if the Government of Yemen is unprepared to effectuate adequate security means, then no person should be released to Yemen.

The question here is who gets to make that decision. In this instance, the people who know the most about this—the leaders of our intelligence community, of our military, of our law enforcement community—have reviewed the specific details of 56 cases, and they have concluded based upon their review of those details that the right thing to do is to release these detainees to Yemen if and when they are satisfied that Yemen's security measures are appropriate.

The question here really comes down to whether this judgment should be made by the Members of this body, who have varying degrees of knowledge about this issue—including the gentlelady, who has very diligently learned a lot about this issue and cares a lot about it—or whether the decision should be made by people whom we have entrusted with the defense of our country, who have developed specific, granular, factual expertise about this question. I believe this is a case where the proper decision belongs with those experts, where the proper decision belongs with those who know the most about this matter. Rigidly limiting the options of those experts is a mistake.

So, although I believe we share the same intentions here, we don't share the same view of this amendment. I believe that the decision should be made by those best positioned to make it. If and when they determine that security conditions in Yemen are appropriate, then the decision to release should be made. In my view, that's the right process. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time just to say that I completely agree with the arguments of the gentleman from New Jersey.

It's not a question of whether or not these people should be released. It's a question of who should make that decision. Should Congress make that decision and restrict the President? restrict the intelligence community? restrict the Department of Defense? As the gentleman from Arkansas pointed out, Yemen has been a very capable and helpful partner in the war against al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

I believe these decisions are best left to the experts and not to have Congress restrict them and limit their options. With that, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1032, 1033, and 1034.

Page 399, line 9, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 402, lines 6 through 7, strike ''90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense'' and insert ''30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President''.

Page 402, lines 8 through 9, strike ''of the Department of Defense''.

Page 402, line 10, after ''principal responsibility'' insert the following: '', in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)),''.

Page 402, line 12, after ''Cuba'' insert the following: '', and the closure of the detention facility at such Naval Station''.

Page 402, line 14, after ''transfers'' insert the following: ''and such closure''.

Page 403, line 5, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 403, line 20, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 404, line 24, strike ''90 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 405, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1040B. GUANTANAMO BAY DETENTION FACILITY CLOSURE ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility Closure Act of 2013''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to—

(1) construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment;

(2) transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions an individual detained at Guantanamo; or

(3) transfer an individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before transferring any individual detained at Guantanamo to the United States, its territories, or possessions, or to a foreign country or entity, the President shall submit to Congress a report about such individual that includes—

(1) notice of the proposed transfer; and

(2) the assessment of the Secretary of Defense and the intelligence community (under the meaning given such term section 3(4) of the National Security 18 Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) of available evidence relating to the threat posed by the individual, any security concerns about the individual, the likelihood that the individual will engage in recidivism, and humanitarian concerns about the individual, including—

(A) the likelihood the detainee will resume terrorist activity if transferred or released;

(B) the likelihood the detainee will reestablish ties with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or associated forces that are engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners if transferred or released;

(C) the likelihood of family, tribal, or government rehabilitation or support for the detainee if transferred or released;

(D) the likelihood the detainee may be subject to trial by military commission; and

(E) any law enforcement interest in the detainee.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used after December 31, 2014, for the detention facility or detention operations at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(e) PERIODIC REVIEW BOARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each periodic review board established pursuant to Executive Order No. 13567 or section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1564; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is completed by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

In section 2901, strike subsections (a), (b), and (c).

Page 646, lines 11 and 12, strike ''120 days'' and insert ''60 days''.

Page 648, after line 5, insert the following:

(F) The estimated security costs associated with trying such individuals in courts established under Article III of the Constitution or in military commissions conducted in the United States, including the costs of military personnel, civilian personnel, and contractors associated with the prosecution at such location, including any costs likely to be incurred by other Federal departments or agencies, or State or local governments.

(G) A plan developed by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the heads of other relevant departments and agencies,

identifying a disposition, other than continued detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for each individual detained at such Naval Station as of the date of the enactment of this Act who is designated for prosecution. Such a disposition may include transfer to the United States for trial or detention pursuant to the law of war, transfer to a foreign country for prosecution, or release.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

This is a very straightforward amendment that simply asks the President to put together a plan to close Guantanamo Bay.

One of the complaints in recent weeks is that we've seen Guantanamo become more and more untenable. It continues to be an international eyesore. Way back in 2007, President George W. Bush said it should be closed. Then-candidate JOHN MCCAIN said it should be closed. As recently as last week, Senator MCCAIN and some other Senators went down and reached that conclusion as well. I think a justifiable criticism of that has come from the other side of the aisle that said, well, you can't close it unless you've got a plan for what to do with the inmates and a plan for how to close it, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

It requires the President within 60 days to come up with a plan for closing Guantanamo Bay prison, and then it also removes all of the restrictions that are in this bill that would stop him from generating that plan.

The bottom line is that we do not need Guantanamo. Guantanamo was set up in the first place in the hopes that, because it wasn't actually on American soil, we could somehow hold people outside the normal bounds of due process and the Constitution, but the Court ruled otherwise. The Court ruled that habeas does apply because Guantanamo is effectively under the control of the United States. So there is no benefit there. There are no greater rights in the U.S. than there are in Guantanamo. We just continue to have this prison that has been set up in a way that the international community cannot stand, and it makes a problem for us in terms of being able to cooperate with our allies and to have the ability to get that cooperation to properly prosecute the war on terror.

So I am simply asking that we put a plan in place so that we can close Guantanamo Bay once and for all—something that Republicans and Democrats alike have said that they've wanted to do. We simply haven't taken the steps necessary.

The prison is becoming very, very expensive. There is $250 million in MilCon contained in this bill just to keep it at a somewhat temporary status. Beyond that, the prospect of the United States' simply warehousing 166 people forever with no end in sight is contrary, again, I think, to our values and to our process.

I really want to emphasize the fact that we have here in the United States well over 300 terrorists incarcerated. There is a notion that somehow we couldn't possibly accommodate them here because of the threat, but we have Ramzi Yousef, and we have the Blind Sheikh. We have some of the most notorious terrorists in the world housed here already safely and securely. That is simply not an argument against doing this. The temporary facilities down at Guantanamo are not sustainable.

Now, I'm not going to rush this and say we've got to close it tomorrow if we don't have a plan. I'm simply requiring the President to come up with that plan, and then am giving him the legislative freedom to develop that plan as what we've done in this bill far too often is to have restricted that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, on May 28, 2010, I stood on this floor and made a motion that effectively stopped some of the worst terrorists in the world at Guantanamo Bay from being transferred to the soil in the United States. At that particular point in time, the then-chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Democrat Ike Skelton, stood on the floor and said this:

> We are in a position to accept this motion. I just wish to point out that there is no difference between the Democrats and Republicans when it comes to fighting terrorism.

Today, we step on a course with this amendment to change that as the highest ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee seeks to overturn, essentially, that motion.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman were asking that these terrorists be brought to his district, that would be one thing, but he knows that's very unlikely. What you're having with this motion is very generously saying that they could be brought to any of our districts. We are hearing a uniform chorus stand up from North Carolina, Virginia, Guam, and every other place, saying, Don't bring them to my district.

The reason is they know two things: they know the moment they touch U.S. soil they will receive additional constitutional rights that no one in this room can argue what they are exactly; secondly, they have placed a target on every elementary school, on every shopping mall, on every small business in that district by other terrorists.

□ 0930

That's why, Mr. Chairman, it's important that we come together unified and send a message to the President that we might not be able to stop every terrorist from coming to U.S. soil, but we can stop these terrorists by defeating this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Moran-Nadler amendment, which provides a six-part plan for closing Gitmo.

The amendment will remove the existing limitations on transfers, strike the current requests for construction at Gitmo, and end funding for the facility on December 31, 2014.

The time to close Guantanamo is now. It is a stain on our national honor. We are holding 166 people at Gitmo, 86 of whom have been cleared for release, that is to say they have been found guilty of nothing and judged not to pose any danger. There is no reason and no right for us to hold them further.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder which of our colleagues doesn't believe in the American system of justice. I wonder which one of us does not trust our own American court. I wonder who among us does not believe in the Bill of Rights, who does not believe in the right to counsel or that people should be presumed innocent until proven guilty. What we have at Gitmo is a system that is an affront to those beliefs and to America.

In the last decade, we have begun to let go of our freedoms bit by bit with each new executive order, each new court decision and, yes, each new act of Congress. We have begun giving away our rights to privacy, a right to our day in court when the government harms us; and with this legislation, we are continuing down the path of destroying the right to be free from imprisonment without due process of law.

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Virginia for fighting to close the detention facility at Guantanamo.

The language in this bill without our amendment prohibits moving any detainees into the United States and guarantees that we will continue holding people indefinitely, people who are not necessarily terrorists and who we only suspect to be terrorists and have not had a day in court to prove they are or are not terrorists. We will continue to hold them indefinitely without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for, contrary to due process and civil rights.

Because of this momentous challenge to the founding principles of the United States, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law—and certainly not indefinitely without due process of law—we must close the detention facilitate at Gitmo now in order to restore our national honor.

They will have no additional constitutional rights. The Supreme Court ruled that they have the same constitutional rights at Guantanamo as they do here.

We must close this facility and restore our national honor. Support this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, the Guantanamo Bay detention facility was established to hold unlawful enemy combatants captured during the war on terror.

Any proposal to close the Guantanamo detention facility must first clearly address the transfer of remaining prisoners detained there. Many of the remaining detainees are the most hardened terrorists, including those responsible for the 9/11 mass murders of many Americans.

There are three primary options: transfer to another country or transfer to the United States or stay put.

Transferring these terrorists to another country comes with a substantial risk of reengaging as an American threat. The current reengagement rate of former Guantanamo detainees is nearly 28 percent.

I served for 1 year in Iraq with the Army as a medical officer at one of the largest detention facilities there. Often after prison release deals made by entrusted decisionmakers, we saw the same people return for new offenses. Additionally, there were multiple escapes and attempted escapes, as well as attacks trying to free the detainees.

I've been to Guantanamo, and the facilities there are a safe and secure location away from our soldiers on the battlefield. I don't think there are many people in Cuba that are trying to free the people that are held at Guantanamo, and this was not the case in Iraq, and it may not be the case should they be transferred to the United States.

I believe the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay are being treated appropriately and in a way that we can be proud of as a Nation. The hunger strike policy is carried out humanely with the detainees treated as patients. The access to caregivers and medical facilities is the same for our troops as it is for those detained.

Additionally, transfers to the United States would be very expensive. We've already built a courtroom there that cost us in the millions of dollars.

These terrorist detainees pose a very real danger to our security in America. They mean us real harm. The President has the ability to certify transfers of detainees to other countries, but he has yet to do so. And until the President leads with a better solution, I firmly believe that keeping Guantanamo open is our best option, our safest option, and our most logical option.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say that I think we all agree that our servicemembers who served us at Guantanamo have done a tremendous job and have brought great honor to our country. We thank and respect all of them.

I also believe that there is unanimity here that if someone is a credible threat to the United States, they should be detained, tried, and brought to justice. The question is where to do that.

Why should it be Guantanamo? Do defendants have greater rights if they are transferred from Guantanamo to a place in the United States? The Supreme Court has said, no, they don't. So there's no tactical advantage in a trial.

Are they more likely to escape if they're transferred to the United States? History says ''no.'' The number of escapes from maximum prisons, the supermax prisons, in the United States has been zero.

Is it less expensive to hold them at Guantanamo? Most certainly not. The average cost of incarcerating someone in a Federal maximum security supermax prison is $34,000 a year. The cost to the taxpayer of incarcerating someone at Guantanamo is over $1.6 million a year.

Is there some strategic advantage globally to holding these detainees at Guantanamo? The opposite is true. General Petraeus, Admiral Mullen, other leaders of our intelligence and military forces have said that Guantanamo is the best recruiting device against the United States, around the world for those who are trying to sell the lie that the United States is an inhumane and unjust place.

There is simply no rationale for an indefinite extension of the problem at Guantanamo. For reasons of security, for reasons of law, for reasons of cost, for reasons of strategic advantage, we should close Guantanamo Bay. That's why I support the Smith amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I oppose this amendment. I oppose the closure of Guantanamo and the transfer of detainees to the United States.

Guantanamo is a state-of-the-art detention facility in which we've invested millions of dollars in which our troops handle themselves with utmost professionalism.

The detainees there have access to military tribunals and habeas corpus proceedings here in Washington, D.C.

Who are these detainees? They're not innocent goat herders swept up by a marauding United States military of which I was a part in which I detained numerous potential terrorists. They are people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of 9/11; Mohammed al-Qahtani, one of the would-be participants in 9/11; terrorists who are closely associated with Osama bin Laden who have received explosives training, who are recruiters, who are poison experts, who are suicide bombers or who are commanders of al Qaeda training camps. I do not think we should bring them to the United States, give them their Miranda warnings, give them an attorney at taxpayer-provided expense and if acquitted and not accepted by their home countries be released back onto the streets of the United States.

If that is what the advocates of this amendment would like, I suggest they should write their amendment in a fashion that would bring these detainees to their own congressional districts.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, you can pretty much win any battle you want to fight with superior military might. But for wars of consequence, you have to be fighting from the high ground consistently. That's what this amendment is all about.

We will win this war against violent extremism; but in order to do so, we have to win over the hearts and the minds of hundreds of millions of Muslims around the world who want what we have. They want equal justice under the law. They want fairness and truth and transparency and democracy.

The vast majority are young, idealistic, and very impressionable; and, unfortunately, too many of them are misled and manipulated.

□ 0940

We have a superior set of values and principles. It's what defines us as a Nation. But we have to hold steadfast to those values and principles. We have to show that even when we are challenged, even when it's politically difficult, we believe in equal justice under the law. We believe that people are innocent until proven guilty. We believe that every life matters. We believe in human rights, we don't believe in torture. But we do believe in our justice system. It's not our justice system that's operational at Guantanamo. It was set up there to be outside our justice system so we could detain people indefinitely.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MORAN. At this time in our history when we're furloughing 650,000 Department of Defense employees, how can we justify spending $1.5 million per detainee at Guantanamo when half of them have been cleared for release? It doesn't make sense. And now in this bill we're authorizing another quarter of a billion dollars to be spent at Guantanamo. Those are misguided priorities. It costs $34,000 to jail very dangerous terrorists in this country, but in this country, we can convict them.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

There are a few facts that I think are appropriate to bring to this debate. I oppose this amendment vigorously. Just 2 weeks ago I was down at Guantanamo Bay on a trip that was part of the House Select Committee on Intelligence. I will tell you that the soldiers and marines and airmen of Joint Task Force Gitmo are taking tremendous care of the facilities, our assets and the detainees.

Those who suggest that this facility should go away will create a problem that is worse than the one that we have today. This amendment is simply a pattern of appeasement that does not comport with the fact that radical Islamic terrorists will not cease to attack us simply because we wish they would go away.

A few more facts. If we close Guantanamo Bay, we try to release them to countries that will accept them, we know that at least a quarter of them will return to the battlefield. We could bring them back to the United States, where they'd go to civilian courts, and undoubtedly some of them would end up walking the streets of the United States.

One of the final facts, and one that I've heard said in support of this amendment, is that if we simply close this facility that recruiting for radical extremists will diminish. This seems illogical. There's no support for such a statement. They will continue to attack us whether we keep this open or closed. This facility is legal, it's just, and it is an important national asset.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

A whole bunch of false arguments are being laid out here. As has been clear, no greater constitutional rights come to people in the United States than at Guantanamo. So that's just a phony argument.

The second phony argument is that somehow they can't be held safely. I have a Federal prison in my district. I have an INS detention facility in my district. Frankly, if there was a supermax facility in my district, I would not have a problem with them coming to that district. They should be held. I would hope that all of our supermax facilities, which are holding very, very dangerous people, they better be holding them securely right now.

It's $1.5 million a year versus $34,000. It is an absolute recruitment tool for al Qaeda. Our military leaders—General Petraeus—have all said that this is something that is harmful to U.S. security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the vice chairman of the HASC Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, cost is a red herring argument here. Does it cost more to keep a detainee in Guantanamo than a Federal prisoner here? Probably, but nothing like the figures that have been repeatedly cited on the other side. For example, if you look back at the fiscal year '11 Department of Justice budget request for moving the detainees to the U.S., it ends up in the first year being about $1.9 million per detainee, and about $500,000 per detainee in recurring costs.

On the other side of it, even the President, in a speech at the National Defense University, said it is less than a million dollars per prisoner now on detainee. Is there a difference? Sure. Is it anything like what we've been hearing? No.

And the rest of the story is: under the Geneva Convention, if you're holding somebody under the laws of war, you cannot put them with Federal prisoners even in a supermax prison. They have to be segregated. So those costs of bringing them here are higher.

But that's not really the issue here. The issue is what is the best thing to do to secure the country and to deal with the terrorist threat. And I just remind everybody, the ban on closing Guantanamo is not permanent. We have to reapprove it every year. So if the President actually comes up with a real plan, not just a speech, but a real plan to close Guantanamo and then deal with the detainees, then that ban can go away. But you can't say okay, we're going to remove all of the restrictions and we're going to close Guantanamo, and then we're going to figure out what we're going to do with these people, and that's exactly what this amendment does. The gentleman from Washington says it just asks for a plan. The underlying bill just asks for a plan. His amendment, in addition to asking for a plan, removes all of the existing restrictions. And on page 4, subsection (D), says specifically:

No funds shall be used there to detain people after December 31, 2014.

We've got to get the plan first before it closes. I think this amendment should be rejected.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I strongly oppose this amendment. Two-and-a-half years ago I sent the President a letter about these important issues. I said in that letter:

I fully recognize the importance of crafting a careful and comprehensive framework for the detention of terrorists who wish to harm the United States. I also recognize the challenges and legal complexities related to such an endeavor. This appreciation is why this issue is simply too important for the administration to address on its own.

The President did not take up my offer at that time. Nearly a year later in another unanswered letter, I wrote:

While I remain open to working together, I am very disappointed that the administration has frequently shown a greater willingness to engage with international institutions, foreign governments, and the media on issues relating to our national security than it has with the U.S. House of Representatives.

Those are excerpts from two of the five letters that I've written to the President on this issue, which he has not answered. Yet, he still has not come forward with a proposal of oversight or any plan. What to do with Guantanamo is secondary to the President coming forward with a comprehensive plan. Such a plan must include what he proposes to do with those terrorist detainees who are too dangerous to release but cannot be tried.

Number two, how he will ensure terrorists transferred overseas do not return to the fight?

Three, what he will do with the terrorists we capture in the future; specifically, how will he prioritize intelligence questioning?

Finally, what he will do with the high-value terrorists still held in Afghanistan? This is a particularly critical priority for me. There are several extremely dangerous individuals still in custody in Afghanistan. The only option that I see, as completely unacceptable for those detainees, is to allow their release. We've already seen the outcome of making this tragic mistake in Iraq.

While I appreciate the proposed efficiency of my friend and colleague, Ranking Member SMITH's amendment, we cannot strike all prohibitions on transfers of Gitmo detainees, agree to bring them to the United States, release them overseas, and end all funding for Gitmo with absolutely any confidence that any of this will be handled in a way that best protects our national security.

Lastly, and this is important, I want to say that I'm proud of the men and women in uniform who serve our Nation every day at Guantanamo. It's not an easy duty. We owed them a debt of gratitude for their critical service to this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. 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 Washington will be postponed.

□ 0950

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 502. EXPANSION OF CHAPLAIN CORPS.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the appointment, as officers in the Chaplain Corps of the Armed Forces, of persons who are certified or ordained by non-theistic organizations and institutions, such as humanist, ethical culturalist, or atheist.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, it's a very simple amendment. We, through our Chaplaincy Corps, need to support, and do support, various faith and philosophical beliefs among the men and women who bravely serve our country.

We already support some nontheistic beliefs. For instance, we have Buddhist chaplains. Buddhism is a nontheistic faith tradition.

And what my amendment would simply do is allow chaplains who are certified or ordained as secular humanists and ethical culturists or atheists to also be able to support the brave American and women who serve in our military.

Roughly 23 percent of the men and women in our Armed Forces either have no religion, or are atheists; but there are no chaplains that currently are able to represent this important and growing demographic.

Under current law, the Armed Forces only allow chaplains who are granted an endorsement by an approved religious organization and have received a graduate degree in theological or religious studies, precluding many of the seminaries and other institutions that can provide certification to nonreligious chaplains that could provide much-needed services, particularly to the roughly quarter of our servicemembers who have stated that they have no religious beliefs or are atheists.

There's no reason why the only faith tradition and philosophical tradition in our military without chaplains does not have any kind of support to address their health concerns.

Now, I've heard some say that, well, all members of our military, even those who are non-observers, are able to see psychiatrists or counselors for support. But that's a very different need than the spiritual needs and the philosophical needs that people have.

First of all, when someone sees a psychiatrist or counselor, it has a certain stigma that can be attached to it that doesn't exist when you're seeing a chaplain. It also doesn't enjoy the same confidentiality that a chaplain visit does, and the information discussed with a therapist can actually have an impact on the chain of command in terms of negatively impacting the servicemember's future military career.

So, again, the groundwork has already been laid with regard to nontheistic faiths like Buddhism, where we have active chaplains in our military. Many universities already have secular humanist chaplains, these including American University here in Washington, D.C. Other militaries have this as well. Our allied militaries in Belgium and the Netherlands have humanist chaplaincies.

And, again, it's a very simple concept and, I think, something that is long overdue to ensure that all members of the military, regardless of their faith background, whether they're believers or not, whatever their philosophy is in life, they have access to the chaplaincy to support their spiritual needs. And, of course, nonbelievers have spiritual needs just as believers do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCKEON. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Dr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, let's examine what a chaplain really is. A chaplain is a person who is a minister of the faith, someone who ministers on the basis of a belief in a deity, a higher power, who is associated with or attached to a secular organization.

An example, right here in this House, each morning begins, each legislative day, begins with a prayer from our chaplain.

Back home, the hospital that I'm associated with, Mennen Medical Center, my good friend, a Baptist pastor, is chaplain of our hospital. And so this goes to the core of the discussion.

A chaplain is a person who is a man or woman of the faith, of conscience, of spirituality, who ministers to those with respect to a secular organization.

I just heard the gentleman say that, well, we need atheist chaplains—which, to me, is an oxymoron—we need atheist chaplains to minister to the spiritual needs of soldiers.

Well, by definition, as an atheist, he doesn't or she doesn't believe in a spiritual world. Makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, the courts have affirmed that chaplains are mandated by the Constitution to enable military personnel to exercise faith according to their conscience. Nontheistic chaplains, by definition, cannot assist others in worship.

For any concerns my colleague from Colorado may have as to the nonspiritual needs of servicemen and -women who do not hold any sort of faith, I would submit that the military has resources readily available. Counselors, psychologists, and social workers are happy to meet those needs.

I would also note that current chaplains will serve with respect to any servicemember, religious, nonreligious, nontheistic, atheistic or agnostic alike who comes to them, providing these brave men and women with any resources they might need in their service to the Nation. So we have chaplains and secular advisers who can help anybody who claims to be or wants to be an atheist.

Chaplains come to the military via the Department of Defense-recognized faith groups, very important. Faith groups. It would be impossible for an individual who does not belong to any faith group to receive an endorsement, much in the same way that atheists have long insisted that they are not, in fact, a faith group and would thus be implausible that they would serve as a chaplain in the military.

Mr. Chairman, General George Washington founded our Chaplain Corps on July 29, 1775, to make sure that the Continental Army could have worship services.

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

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

Mr. FLEMING. Just in summary, I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman. The saddest thing I could ever imagine is someone standing over a dying man or woman from combat and saying to them, there is no hope. If you die, there is no world, there is no life thereafter. That is the saddest thing I could ever imagine.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say I think we're seeing a double standard here where, if it's a person of particular faith, as perhaps the gentleman approves of, then you say, oh, you go see a chaplain for your needs. However, if you're of no faith, you have to see a psychiatrist.

All of our men and women who bravely serve us deserve the same support.

I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Nothing in this amendment in any way impairs the relationship between a Christian or Jewish or other soldier or servicemember and his or her faith leader. Nothing. Nothing in this amendment impairs the operation of the Chaplain Corps.

What this amendment does is to show respect for the choices made by our servicemembers. My Christianity is an important part of who I am and how I see my life. I don't think that that same right should be denied to a servicemember who does not share my beliefs.

What this amendment says is that, for the thousands of servicemembers who choose a humanist or atheistic philosophy system of life, that they

should be able to confide in an adviser who is not a mental health professional.

Going to a mental health professional is a choice that's laden with risk and some controversy for a member of the service. Going to a faith adviser is not.

Depriving those who share the views that Mr. POLIS outlined of the chance to go to such an adviser is unequal treatment. It's unworthy of the way we operate.

Nothing in this amendment disrupts the Chaplain Corps, but everything in this amendment respects the rights of our servicemembers. I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my good friend.

□ 1000

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to visit here today.

First, I'd like to visit about two heroes in the history of our country. One would be Father Emil Kapaun. I had the honor of being at the White House a couple of months ago where he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his bravery in action of ministering to the needs of not only men and women of faith, but those who claim to have no faith.

In addition, I have the honor of being the nephew of a 95-year-old Army chaplain who also has been honored for serving, ministering to the needs of men and women in uniform.

One thing I will want to note is, instead of being dismissive of those types of sacrifices, I will read a little bit from the duties of the Chaplain Corps: ''Each chaplain shall hold appropriate religious services at least once on each Sunday.'' Or the Navy and Marines say: ''An officer in the Chaplain Corps may conduct public worship according to the manner and forms of the church of which he is a member'' and ''shall cause divine service to be performed on Sunday.'' It goes on and on. Obviously, that's our understanding of the chaplaincy.

Madam Chair, how is it that one can hold a religious service for an organization, as the amendment puts it, that does not consider itself to be a religion? It's completely contrary to the directions, instructions, and the very definition of the Chaplain Corps, represented by Father Emil Kapaun and numerous others, to extend appointments to groups in manners suggested by this amendment.

When you take away the worship, the prayer, everything that makes a religious service religious, you are left with counselors, as has been indicated. There are humanist, atheist, and ethical culturalist counselors available to folks that serve our country. In addition, I'm certain every chaplain that serves our brave men and women are available for those who do not share their faith, and that's the case.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and be very supportive of our current brave men and women who serve alongside our members of the Armed Forces.

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2013, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 79, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 241. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM PURPOSES.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the purposes described in paragraph (2) shall be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense—

(A) certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(i) the ground-based midcourse defense system has performed at least two successful intercept tests at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, before October 1, 2014; and

(ii) the Commander of the United States Northern Command has full confidence in the homeland missile defense system; and

(B) submits to such committees justification with respect to the national security requirement for expanding the ground-based missile defense site located at Fort Greely, Alaska, from 30 ground-based interceptors to 44 ground-based interceptors.

(2) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Advance procurement of 14 ground-based interceptor rocket motor sets.

(B) The missile refurbishment project at Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, Alaska.

(C) The mechanical-electrical building at such Missile Field.

(b) ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the congressional defense committees a certification of whether—

(1) the ground-based midcourse defense system has performed at least two successful intercept tests at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California; and

(2) the Commander of the United States Northern Command has full confidence in the homeland missile defense system.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, this is a very simple amendment to reduce funding for the advanced procurement of 14 Ground-Based Interceptor missiles that simply don't work and are inefficient, and for the refurbishment of the costly Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, Alaska, until the Department of Defense can certify to Congress that these programs have been adequately tested and work. It's simply a question of making sure that something works before we spend additional money on it.

The missile defense program was designed to intercept limited intermediate and long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles before they reenter the Earth's atmosphere. But Congress needs to ensure that these missiles are effective before we continue to provide the Department of Defense with a blank check.

Congress needs to verify every penny of taxpayer money we spend. We have a time of tradeoffs, and of course it's nice to be able to support every program, but during this time of deficits and sequestration we need to make sure we are vigilant to ensure that the money we spend on the Pentagon actually results in the maximum amount of heightened national security.

Since 1997, this weapons system has missed its target more than half the time. My amendment would limit the funding for the procurement of 14 Ground-Based Interceptors until the missiles have had two successful tests before 2015. Very reasonable. If it doesn't have two successful tests, why are we investing enormous amounts of taxpayer money in it?

So, two successful tests before 2015, certified by the Secretary of Defense to Congress as having the full confidence of the Commander of the United States Northern Command, and then it is allowed to move forward.

Now, opponents of this amendment—and I saw a Dear Colleague letter go out talking about how there are long-range missile threats from North Korea and Iran—there's no question, there is complete agreement about the dangers to this country, the dangers of a nuclear Iran, the dangers of a nuclear North Korea. What we're talking about here is the last thing we want to do is trust in an untested and unsuccessful missile to deter very real threats. We need a real threat deterrent system, not something that doesn't work. And my amendment simply requires that this is working.

My amendment would also limit funds for the missile refurbishment project in Missile Field 1 in Alaska. This field was never intended to be

operational. Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates and former Joint Chiefs Chairman Mike Mullen in 2011 said:

> Missile Field 1 was originally designed as a test bed, so it lacks required hardening and redundant power, and has significant infrastructure reliability issues.

There have also been reports of mold and leaks at the facility, and refurbishment would come at a tremendous cost to taxpayers without significantly improving the security that America has.

I urge Congress to demand that these programs work, that the programs we fund actually keep our families safe and are proven to work by certification by the Secretary of Defense.

We need to get our fiscal house in order, we need to make tough choices, and we need to make sure that our expenditures on national defense improve national security. And simply demanding that our costly missile defense system is actually capable of keeping our homeland safe is a very reasonable amendment to the National Defense Authorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCKEON. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the full committee.

I would urge defeat of this amendment. It would reverse what the Obama administration and Secretary of Defense Hagel came forward with on March 15 of this year. After seeing the North Korean threat only increase, they appropriately came to the decision to add more Ground-Based Interceptors.

Now, I believe the administration has been too slow to appropriately address the threats we have from in-coming missiles, but this is a good step forward, and so I applaud that.

The Secretary said:

> We will take steps in the United States to stay ahead of the challenge posed by Iran and North Korea's development of longer-range ballistic missile capabilities.

I have to agree with that. How we came to this point, I know that there has been some disagreement in the intelligence community, but the Defense Intelligence Agency said that they have moderate confidence that the North Koreans can put together long-range ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads. That is a threat we should take seriously. This amendment, if adopted, would not recognize that threat.

Also, by doing advanced procurement, we save the taxpayers $200 million. So this is ill-advised from a financial standpoint.

The military is adopting a fly-before-you-buy approach. There was one successful test a few months ago, another test is scheduled toward the end of this year. Those will be the two tests that the author of this amendment says that he wants.

So this amendment is totally unnecessary. It would delay what even the administration—which has been a little too slow—has said is appropriate. We should not slow things down further. The threats are real, they are serious, and we need to fund them appropriately.

I ask that you defeat this dangerous amendment.

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

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I think that to have any type of meaningful missile defense against potential threats in Korea, Iran, and elsewhere, it needs to work. That's simply what this amendment says—two tests that work before $107 million in spending goes forth.

□ 1010

This is the financially responsible thing to do. Why would we want to spend first stage 107 million, over 6 years over a billion, on a system that doesn't work?

It's a very reasonable threshold to have a certification by the Department of Defense if this works. It provides an additional incentive to make sure that America stays safe, demonstrates this works, have an incentive to actually make it work before the rest of the money is released.

I think that's common sense. I think it aligns incentives of our contractors and our military and the defense of the American people. I think it's fiscally prudent. I think it improves our missile defense opportunities against threats from North Korea, Iran, and elsewhere; and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to adopt this commonsense amendment that would save over 107 million for the ground-based interceptors in the first year, 135 million for the refurbishment of Missile Field 1, and also ensure that our missile defense system works by having two tests and a certification that it's operational by the Secretary of Defense.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the vice chair of our committee, Mr. THORNBERRY.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I'm convinced that the arguments against missile defense are the same today that they were the day that President Reagan proposed it: you can't do it, it costs too much, and it's provocative to try.

And it doesn't really matter how the threat evolves, what North Korea or Iran do, and it doesn't really matter how the technology evolves. We just had a successful test just a few months ago.

The events and facts don't matter. The arguments are still the same, and they will always be the same because some people just don't want to defend the country against missile attack.

This committee pushed in 2010, in 2011, and in 2012 to have more interceptors on the west coast. The President opposed it every step of the way. It didn't happen. And then, all of a sudden, with North Korea this year, the President changes his mind and says, Oh, maybe you all were right after all. At least the President changed his mind. Unfortunately, it seems like some people cannot even do that.

A lot of us think the administration is not doing enough, but to do less would be negligent, and I think we should reject this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Might I inquire how much time we have remaining?

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

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona, a member of our committee, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chair, ever since mankind took up arms against his fellow human beings, there has always been an offensive capability and a defensive capability to try to match it. The spear was met with the shield. The bullet was met with armor. And, today, we face the most dangerous weapons in the history of humanity in nuclear-armed missiles.

Madam Chair, we should have a capable defense. Our ground-based mid-course defense is the only system that we have that protects the American homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles coming into this country. And, Madam Chair, it is a limited capability, and we should not further limit it in our policies here today.

As has been so eloquently stated earlier, the President of the United States cut our GBI capability in recent years and now has changed his mind to where we will go from 30 to 44 interceptors. And with a 3- or 4-to-1 shot doctrine, that may give us the ability to defend ourselves up against as many as a dozen incoming missiles.

Madam Chair, it's all right if we have a few too many, but if we have one too few, it changes everything. Across the world, we've all understood that the more we sweat in peace, the less we bleed in war. We need desperately to make sure that we do our fundamental job in this Congress and in this Federal Government by making sure that we protect the citizens against the most dangerous weapons mankind has ever devised, and, Madam Chair, this is why we want to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 563, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 1510. FUNDING LEVELS AS REQUESTED IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

(a) REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this subtitle, as specified in the corresponding funding tables in sections 4102, 4202, 4302, 4402, and 4502, for additional funds for overseas contingency operations are hereby reduced by a total of $5,043,828,000.

(b) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—The amount reduced under subsection (a) shall not be available for any purpose other than deficit reduction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I'm very pleased to offer this bipartisan amendment along with my colleagues, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WOODALL. I'm very pleased that it has the support of the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SMITH.

This amendment is about truth in budgeting and making sure our military has the resources it needs to prosecute the war in Afghanistan and overseas contingency operations. The Defense Department budget is split into two parts: the base budget for ongoing operations and the part of the budget for the war and overseas contingency operations.

What this budget does is provide the military with exactly the resources they say they need in fiscal year 2014 for the overseas contingency account. In fact, on Wednesday, Secretary of Defense Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dempsey, General Dempsey, said that what they needed was what would be provided as a result of this amendment. The problem is the underlying bill added another $5 billion, and this is becoming a slush fund, Madam Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. MCKEON. I yield 1 minute at this time to my friend and colleague, the chair of the Readiness Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, our most important job here, our most sacred duty as outlined in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution is to ''raise and support Armies''—to support the men and women we ask to fight on behalf of our Nation on the fields of battle. This money supports our constitutional duty and, most importantly, our warfighters.

This amendment seriously jeopardizes national security and our ability to replenish readiness accounts raided in prior years to fund underfunded war costs.

The majority of our forces still fighting Afghanistan will be there at least until December 2014. Remember, the goal is December 2014. The war is not over, and these funds are needed to help them do their jobs and execute their missions as outlined in the strategic plan.

Stripping this money from the overseas contingency fund, literally from our all-volunteer force that is engaged in combat operations, places the plan in jeopardy and makes the December 2014 goal irrelevant.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentleman would suggest that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense are not asking for the resources needed to protect our men and women in battle.

I now yield 1½ minutes to Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chairwoman, I haven't been here very long, only 3 years, but I've seen a pattern developing now which is that each year the Defense Department, the Pentagon, comes over and asks for a certain amount of money, and then we give them more than they ask for.

What the amendment does today is simply gives the Pentagon what they ask for. They asked for $80 billion to run the overseas contingency operation. For some reason, we decided to give them 85 billion. They come in; they defined a mission and they tell us what it costs to do that; and then, for some reason, we decide to give them more. All we're doing today is taking the folks who run the military at their word that they know what it costs to defend this Nation.

I think it bears repeating that both Secretary Hagel and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs were here just last week and said that $80 billion worth of OCO funding was enough to meet the mission. Simply spending more money than the Defense Department asks for does not mean we are stronger on defense than anybody else. It's simply foolish to waste money. If the Pentagon tells us they need $80 billion, we should look seriously at giving them $80 billion.

□ 1020

I disagree respectfully with my friend from Virginia who says that this amendment will hurt national security. If you assume that, then you must assume that what the Pentagon asked for in the first place would hurt national security.

I'm simply not willing to agree to that. I'm not willing to believe that the Pentagon would come over and ask for an amount of money that would be bad for national defense.

This is a commonsense amendment, it gives the Defense Department exactly what they need, and it gets us out of this rut of equating higher spending with a stronger nation defense.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I might note that the same gentleman last year said they haven't had enough money, and they spent $13 billion more.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

This amendment will severely undermine the operational readiness of our Guard and Reserve forces. Over the past decade, we have built incredible capability in our Guard and Reserve, and that capability was largely paid for by overseas contingency operation funds.

To mitigate the risk associated with this administration's force reductions of 100,000 Active component servicemembers, our Nation will have to rely on our Reserve component. In fact, in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Army Chief of Staff General Odierno stated that ''in order to lessen the risk of Active Duty force reductions, the Army will continue to rely on Reserve components to provide key enablers and operational depth.''

Decreased funding has already resulted in the cancelation of numerous of Guard and Reserve deployments, which substantially undermines the capabilities and readiness of these units.

It is for these reasons that I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I would just urge all Members to read the amendment itself. There is nothing in here that says we will reduce one penny from the National Guard and Reserve. This is an across-the-board provision and it will be disproportionate.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

We are about to authorize more than half a trillion dollars for our military. The Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says ''we don't want or need this extra $5

billion.'' What's our response? We tell him, No, you have to spend that, but you also have to cut $50 billion from our military in the most stupid, irresponsible, irrational manner possible. And within that $50 billion you have to get $2 billion of savings by furloughing 650,000 Department of Defense employees.

So we are going to save $2 billion by furloughing 650,000 people, but we are going to force them to spend $5 billion over in Afghanistan while we furlough people here.

What's the rationale? We can't justify that. Of course we should hold to what our military says they need in Afghanistan. We ought to also give them what they feel they need here in the United States.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, let me note that the National Guard Association, the Reserve Officers Association, and the National Governors Association all oppose this amendment.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, chair of the Seapower Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Madam Chairman, over the last 4 years, the administration has told the Pentagon—the Pentagon has come back—and they have cut out of national defense $778 billion before they even get to sequestration. Each time they acknowledge they increase the risk, and their definition of ''risk'' is ''acceptable risk.'' When you ask them what that means, it means how many ships we can lose, how many planes we can lose, how many men and women we can lose and still have some probability that we will win the conflict if every single assumption that they make holds true.

If you support that definition of acceptable risk, you need to vote for this amendment. But I believe we need to change the definition of acceptable risk and say it means this: when we send one of our men and women into conflict we have done everything reasonably possible to make sure they have the highest probability possible of returning to the home they are defending and to the families that they love.

If you support that definition of acceptable risk, you need to defeat this amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute and 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I would say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle who have spoken, I agree with absolutely everything you have said. But as I look at the chairman, who I know has more of a love for this Nation and our national security than perhaps any other Member of this body, he and I both voted in favor of the Budget Control Act in August of 2011. Rightly or wrongly, we set the law of the land of how much we were going to spend on national defense. Today, we are talking about how much we are going to spend in Afghanistan.

If we need to spend more money to improve National Guard readiness here at home, to deal with maintenance accounts here at home, we need to come together and change those budget caps; and I support doing that. But I am tired of living in a town where when you don't like the rules, you find a way around them. When the President doesn't like the law of the land, he just ignores it. If we don't like the defense budget caps, we just ignore it and fund it through OCO instead.

We ought to give the Joint Chiefs of Staff every penny they're asking for to support our men and women in Afghanistan. If they come back and ask for more, we should give them every penny of that as well.

But the law means something; these caps mean something. We should either change it or stick with it, Madam Chair.

Mr. MCKEON. Note that OCO was not included in the Budget Control Act, and we are totally within the Budget Control Act on this budget.

Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 30 seconds to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Chair, as counterintuitive as it may appear, when there is a drawdown, there may be a long-term savings, but short-term savings are not there. In fact, the cost spikes.

As all the equipment comes back from the warrior that has to go to the depots for resetting, repair, and restoration, that is an extreme cost that has to be borne by the depots if it is not in this particular bill.

That is one of the reasons why I support the chair's mark, which is supported by the chairman, as well as Chairman RYAN, and as well as the original Obama budget when it was sent here before. For whatever reason, they decided to pull $5 billion out without giving us a plan going forward. This needs to stay.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, might I inquire as to the time we have left.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. And who will be closing?

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The rationale we have been talking about here is a human rationale. We have, as we speak, over 60,000 military serving doing the work of freedom in Afghanistan.

As they prepare to leave, we should not be cutting funding in these very dangerous times. As you are leaving, you are incredibly vulnerable. They're still in the fight, they're still working hard, they need to protect themselves.

While the administration hasn't offered any strategic plan, other than a date for withdrawal, those who serve there deserve our support because they have an important mission to perform. Whether it is in Kabul or a forward-operating base, they are in a dangerous situation.

The reality is that things in Afghanistan are hotter than the administration estimated in their budget request. We need this money for contingencies. We need this money because of the delay due to Pakistan affecting our ground transportation—our exit.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Today, I stand to support keeping the money—that $5 billion—that we need for readiness, and here is why: I think it is absolutely immoral that we would sign up, suit up and ship out men and women in uniform and not give them the readiness and the skills and the training that they need. The flying hours program is a great example of that. In the $5 billion that the gentleman would like to cut is the money for the flying hours program—37,000 flying hours. It would equip us with 500 aviators, whom we need. Let's fund these efforts for the men and women in uniform.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentlelady would suggest that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, would ask for an amount of money for our warfighters that is immoral. What is cynical is to use the Afghan and overseas contingency account as a slush fund to fund operations that are part of the base budget.

This is about truth in budgeting. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam 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 Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

Mr. WALZ. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 5___. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON USE OF DETERMINATION OF PERSONALITY DISORDER OR ADJUSTMENT DISORDER AS BASIS TO SEPARATE MEMBERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) the use by the Secretaries of the military departments, since January 1, 2007, of the authority to separate members of the Armed Forces from the Armed Forces due of unfitness for duty because of a mental condition not amounting to disability, including separation on the basis of a personality disorder or adjustment disorder and the total number of members separated on such basis;

(2) the extent to which the Secretaries failed to comply with regulatory requirements in separating members of the Armed Forces on the basis of a personality or adjustment disorder; and

(3) the impact of such a separation on the ability of veterans so separated to access service-connected disability compensation, disability severance pay, and disability retirement pay.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sergeant Chuck Luther joined the Army after the 9/11 attacks. He served in Iraq until a mortar round hit near him, knocking him unconscious. What followed were classic symptoms of traumatic brain injury—blurred vision, chronic pain, and trouble concentrating.

Liz Luras served this Nation honorably as a soldier in the United States Army. She survived a rape at the hands of her fellow servicemember. She did her best to continue her military service with the dream of attending West Point. She was raped two more times, with police reports and hospital visits to prove it.

I know each of my colleagues here would expect that both of these warriors would receive the best care this Nation could provide. Sadly, the reality is far from that.

Along with Liz and Chuck, since 2001, over 31,000 of our warriors have been discharged from the military, without benefits, because they were determined to have had a personality or an adjustment disorder. These are considered preexisting conditions, which means they should never have been allowed to enlist in the first place. Even though Sergeant Luther had multiple mental health evaluations and served honorably for a decade, it was only after the mortar attack that the military determined he had a preexisting condition, casually threw him away and denied him benefits and health care.

A 2008 GAO study concluded that at least 40 percent of these personality discharges were handed down without going through the proper Department of Defense process, which means without the servicemember's being diagnosed by a licensed mental health professional, without the servicemember's receiving notification of his discharge and without the servicemember's receiving any formal counseling. Five years after this report, Congress has done nothing to ensure that these servicemembers' records are reviewed or corrected, or to ensure that they receive the care that they earned serving this Nation.

This week, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and I presented an amendment to this bill that would have allowed these warriors the basic appeal process to determine if they were improperly discharged. This amendment is the same as a bill I have, H.R. 975. This would only afford these warriors basic rights and due processes—the same ones that they put their lives on the line for that we have. That amendment was not allowed to come to this floor for debate or for a vote. Shame on us.

A second amendment I offered would have simply put a moratorium on this process until we understood why it was being done and what was happening. That amendment was not allowed to come to this floor to be debated or voted on. Shame on us.

Now, I want to be clear: the chairman and the ranking member of this committee had nothing to do with those decisions, and I am appreciative that they allowed the amendment that I'm debating today to be brought here. That's going to allow us to do another GAO study to determine if the problem is still there.

Fine and good, but I'll tell you what: Chuck Luther doesn't want a study—he wants justice. Liz Luras doesn't want a study—she wants justice. The American people don't want another study—they want justice for their warriors.

I would ask each of my colleagues to go home this weekend and ask your constituents if they think this is fair and if they want a study, or if they'd rather do what's right and take care of these warriors.

I'd also challenge my colleagues to ask the questions: Why wasn't the amendment made in order? Why couldn't we debate other than have a study?

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It's something. It will let us know what the scope of this self-inflicted injury and tragedy to our Nation is. It's not enough. It's not nearly enough. We should be ashamed that we've not shown Liz and Chuck the same respect and courage that they showed us as a Nation to serve in uniform. I, for one, am not going to rest until justice is served, our warriors are cared for and this wrong is made right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WALZ. I rise once again to thank the chairman. I thank him for understanding this.

As I say again very clearly, this was not the chairman's decision. He was gracious enough to bring this down, and I appreciate his support—the same to the ranking member.

I would just say to my colleagues: don't let this issue drop. Get this right. We owe it to our warriors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, pursuant to H. Res. 260, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 8 consisting of amendment Nos. 73, 146, 149, 150, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166, 170, 171, and 172, printed in House Report No. 113–108, offered by Mr. MCKEON of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 273, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 595. GIFTS MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS.

Section 974 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) PERFORMANCES FUNDED BY PRIVATE DONATION.—Notwithstanding section 2601(c) of this title, any gift made to the Secretary of Defense under section 2601 on the condition that such gift be used for the benefit of

a military musical unit shall be credited to the appropriation or account providing the funds for such military musical unit. Any amount so credited shall be merged with amounts in the appropriation or account to which credited, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such appropriation or account.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS OF MICHIGAN

Page 551, line 12, add at the end before the period the following: ''or Iran''.

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA OF NEW YORK

Page 582, insert after line 25 the following:

SEC. 1607. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTORS .

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(16) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTOR.—For purposes of determining whether or not a prime contractor has attained the percentage goals specified in paragraph (6)—

''(A) if the subcontracting goals pertain only to a single contract with the executive agency, the prime contractor shall receive credit for small business concerns performing as first tier subcontractors or subcontractors at any tier pursuant to the subcontracting plans required under paragraph (6)(D) in an amount equal to the dollar value of work awarded to such small business concerns; and

''(B) if the subcontracting goals pertain to more than one contract with one or more executive agencies, or to one contract with more than one executive agency, the prime contractor may only count first tier subcontractors that are small business concerns.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS PERTAINING TO SUBCONTRACTING.—Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(dd) DEFINITIONS PERTAINING TO SUBCONTRACTING.—In this Act:

''(1) SUBCONTRACT.—The term 'subcontract' means a legally binding agreement between a contractor that is already under contract to another party to perform work, and a third party, hereinafter referred to as the subcontractor, for the subcontractor to perform a part, or all, of the work that the contractor has undertaken.

''(2) FIRST TIER SUBCONTRACTOR.—The term 'first tier subcontractor' means a subcontractor who has a subcontract directly with the prime contractor.

''(3) AT ANY TIER.—The term 'at any tier' means any subcontractor other than a subcontractor who is a first tier subcontractor.''.

SEC. 1608. GAO STUDY ON SUBCONTRACTING REPORTING SYSTEMS.

Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate a report studying the feasibility of using Federal subcontracting reporting systems, including the Federal subaward reporting system required by section 2 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 and any electronic subcontracting reporting award system used by the Small Business Administration, to attribute subcontractors to particular contracts in the case of contractors that have subcontracting plans under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act that pertain to multiple contracts with executive agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

Page 582, insert after line 25 the following:

SEC. 1607. INAPPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT TO REVIEW AND JUSTIFY CERTAIN CONTRACTS.

In the case of a contract to which the provisions of section 46 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657s) apply, the requirements under section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 do not apply.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

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

SECTION _____. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, CAMP FRANK D. MERRILL, DAHLONEGA, GEORGIA.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—Not later than September 30, 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army for required Army force protection measures certain Federal land administered as part of the Chattahoochee National Forest, but permitted to the Secretary of the Army for Camp Frank D. Merrill in Dahlonega, Georgia, consisting of approximately 282.304 acres identified in the permit numbered 0018-01.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—Upon receipt of the land under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army shall continue to use the land for military purposes.

(c) PROTECTION OF THE ETOWAH DARTER AND HOLIDAY DARTER.—Nothing in the transfer required by subsection (a) shall affect the prior designation of lands within the Chattahoochee National Forest as critical habitat for the Etowah darter (Etheostoma etowahae) and the Holiday darter (Etheostoma brevirostrum).

(d) LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP.—

(1) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description and map of the land to be transferred under subsection (a) not later than 180 days of this Act's enactment.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The legal description and map filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may correct errors in the legal description and map.

(e) REIMBURSEMENTS OF COSTS.—The transfer required by subsection (a) shall be made without reimbursement, except that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Secretary of Agriculture for any costs incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare the legal description and map under subsection (c).

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

SEC. 27____. CONSIDERATION OF THE VALUE OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY A LOCAL COMMUNITY TO THE ARMED FORCES AS PART OF THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS IN MAKING BASE REALIGNMENT OR CLOSURE DECISIONS.

As part of the economic analysis conducted in making any base realignment or closure decision under section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, or other base realignment or closure authority, or in making any decision under section 993 of such title to reduce the number of members of the armed forces assigned at a military installation, the Secretary of Defense shall include an accounting of the value of services, such as schools, libraries, and utilities, as well as land, structures, and access to infrastructure, such as airports and seaports, that are provided by the local community to the military installation and that result in cost savings for the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Page 617, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 2809. DEVELOPMENT OF MASTER PLANS FOR MAJOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Section 2864 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''At a time'' and inserting ''(1) At a time''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) To address the requirements under paragraph (1), each installation master plan shall include consideration of—

''(A) planning for compact and infill development;

''(B) horizontal and vertical mixed-use development;

''(C) the full lifecycle costs of planning decisions;

''(D) healthy communities with a focus on walking, running and biking infrastructure, pedestrian and cycling plans, and community green and garden space; and

''(E) capacity planning through the establishment of growth boundaries around cantonment areas to focus development towards the core and preserve range and training space.''.

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The transportation'' and inserting ''(1) The transportation''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) To address the requirements under subsection (a) and paragraph (1), each installation master plan shall include consideration of ways to diversify and connect transit systems that do not neglect the pedestrian realm and enable safe walking or biking.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

''(c) VERTICAL MIXED USES.—A master plan for a major military installation shall be designed to strongly multi-story, mixed-use facility solutions that are sited in walkable complexes so as to avoid, when reasonable, single-purpose, inflexible facilities that are sited in a sprawling manner. Vertical mixed-use infrastructure can integrate government, non-government, or jointly financed construction within a single unit.

''(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall supercede the requirements of section 2859(a) of this title.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 28____. CONDITIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPANSION OF PIÑON CANYON MANEUVER SITE, FORT CARSON, COLORADO.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Following Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, Fort Carson was established in 1942 and has since been a vital contributor to our Nation's defense and a valued part of the State of Colorado.

(2) The units at Fort Carson have served with a great honor and distinction in the current War on Terror.

(3) The current Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site near Fort Carson, Colorado, plays an important role in training our men and women in uniform so they are as prepared and effective as possible before going off to war.

(b) CONDITIONS ON EXPANSION.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army may not acquire any land to expand the size of the Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site near Fort Carson, Colorado, unless each of the following occurs:

(1) The land acquisition is specifically authorized in an Act of Congress enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Funds are specifically appropriated for the land acquisition.

(3) The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, completes an environmental impact statement with respect to the land acquisition.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle F of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2866. INCLUSION OF EMBLEMS OF BELIEF AS PART OF MILITARY MEMORIALS.

(a) INCLUSION OF EMBLEMS OF BELIEF AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2115. Inclusion of emblems of belief as part of military memorials

''(a) AUTHORIZED INCLUSION.—For the purpose of honoring the sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces, including those members who make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of the United States, emblems of belief may be included as part of—

''(1) a military memorial that is established or acquired by the United States Government; or

''(2) a military memorial that is not established by the United States Government, but for which the American Battle Monuments Commission cooperated in the establishment of the memorial.

''(b) SCOPE OF INCLUSION.—When including emblems of belief as part of a military memorial, any approved emblem of belief may be included on such a memorial. The list of approved emblems of belief shall include, at a minimum, all those emblems of belief authorized by the National Cemetery Administration.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The terms 'emblem of belief' and 'emblems of belief' refer to the emblems of belief contained on the list maintained by the National Cemetery Administration for placement on Government-provided headstones and markers.

''(2) The term 'military memorial' means a memorial or monument commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces. The term includes works of architecture and art described in section 2105(b) of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2115. Inclusion of emblems of belief as part of military memorials.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of subtitle D of title XXXI, insert the following:

SEC. 3145. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT THE HANFORD SITE.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall convey, for consideration at the estimated fair market value or, in accordance with paragraph (2), below such value, to the Community Reuse Organization of the Hanford Site (in this section referred to as the ''Organization'') all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, described in paragraph (3).

(2) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary may convey real property pursuant to paragraph (1) for consideration below the estimated fair market value of the real property, or without consideration, only if the Organization—

(A) agrees that the net proceeds from any sale or lease of the real property (or any portion thereof) received by the Organization during at least the seven-year period beginning on the date of such conveyance will be used to support the economic redevelopment of, or related to, the Hanford Site; and

(B) executes the agreement for such conveyance and accepts control of the real property within a reasonable time.

(3) REAL PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—The real property described in this paragraph is the real property consisting of two parcels of land of approximately 1,341 acres and 300 acres, respectively, of the Hanford Reservation, as requested by the Community Reuse Organization for the Hanford Site on May 31, 2011, and October 13, 2011, and as depicted within the proposed boundaries on the map titled ''Attachment 2—Revised Map'' included in the letter sent by the Community Reuse Organization for the Hanford Site to the Department of Energy on October 13, 2011.

(b) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall actively solicit, and provide priority consideration to, the views of the cities and counties adjacent to the Hanford Site with respect to the development and execution of the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

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

SEC. 31___. MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to preserve and protect for the benefit of present and future generations the nationally significant historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project and which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy defense environmental cleanup program under this title;

(2) to improve public understanding of the Manhattan Project and the legacy of the Manhattan Project through interpretation of the historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(3) to enhance public access to the Historical Park consistent with protection of public safety, national security, and other aspects of the mission of the Department of Energy; and

(4) to assist the Department of Energy, Historical Park communities, historical societies, and other interested organizations and individuals in efforts to preserve and protect the historically significant resources associated with the Manhattan Project.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''Historical Park'' means the Manhattan Project National Historical Park established under subsection (c).

(2) MANHATTAN PROJECT.—The term ''Manhattan Project'' means the Federal military program to develop an atomic bomb ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) DATE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

(B) AREAS INCLUDED.—The Historical Park shall consist of facilities and areas listed under paragraph (2) as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary shall include the area referred to in paragraph (2)(C)(i), the B Reactor National Historic Landmark, in the Historical Park.

(2) ELIGIBLE AREAS.—The Historical Park may only be comprised of one or more of the following areas, or portions of the areas, as generally depicted in the map titled ''Manhattan Project National Historical Park Sites'', numbered 540/108,834–C, and dated September 2012:

(A) OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) at Buildings 9204–3 and 9731 at the Department of Energy Y–12 National Security Complex;

(ii) at the X–10 Graphite Reactor at the Department of Energy Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(iii) at the K–25 Building site at the Department of Energy East Tennessee Technology Park; and

(iv) at the former Guest House located at 210 East Madison Road.

(B) LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) in the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory National Historic Landmark District, or any addition to the Landmark District proposed in the National Historic Landmark Nomination—Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (LASL) NHL District (Working Draft of NHL Revision), Los Alamos National Laboratory document LA–UR 12–00387 (January 26, 2012);

(ii) at the former East Cafeteria located at 1670 Nectar Street; and

(iii) at the former dormitory located at 1725 17th Street.

(C) HANFORD, WASHINGTON.—Facilities, land, or interests in land on the Department of Energy Hanford Nuclear Reservation that are—

(i) the B Reactor National Historic Landmark;

(ii) the Hanford High School in the town of Hanford and Hanford Construction Camp Historic District;

(iii) the White Bluffs Bank building in the White Bluffs Historic District;

(iv) the warehouse at the Bruggemann's Agricultural Complex;

(v) the Hanford Irrigation District Pump House; and

(vi) the T Plant (221–T Process Building).

(3) WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.—No non-Federal property may be included in the Historical Park without the written consent of the owner.

(d) AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy (acting through the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Richland site offices) shall enter into an agreement governing the respective roles of the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy in administering the facilities, land, or interests in land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Energy that is to be included in the Historical Park under subsection (c)(2), including provisions for enhanced public access, management, interpretation, and historic preservation.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary shall—

(A) have decisionmaking authority for the content of historic interpretation of the Manhattan Project for purposes of administering the Historical Park; and

(B) ensure that the agreement provides an appropriate advisory role for the National Park Service in preserving the historic resources covered by the agreement.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary of Energy—

(A) shall ensure that the agreement appropriately protects public safety, national security, and other aspects of the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy at the Oak Ridge Reservation, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Hanford Site;

(B) may consult with and provide historical information to the Secretary concerning the Manhattan Project;

(C) shall retain responsibility, in accordance with applicable law, for any environmental remediation that may be necessary in or around the facilities, land, or interests in land governed by the agreement; and

(D) shall retain authority and legal obligations for historic preservation and general maintenance, including to ensure safe access, in connection with the Department's Manhattan Project resources.

(4) AMENDMENTS.—The agreement under paragraph (1) may be amended, including to add to the Historical Park facilities, land, or interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy.

(e) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with interested State, county, and local officials, organizations, and interested members of the public—

(A) before executing any agreement under subsection (d); and

(B) in the development of the general management plan under subsection (f)(2).

(2) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which an agreement under subsection (d) is entered into, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the Historical Park, including an official boundary map.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under paragraph (2) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The map shall be updated to reflect any additions to the Historical Park from eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2).

(4) ADDITIONS.—Any land, interest in land, or facility within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that is acquired by the Secretary or included in an amendment to the agreement under subsection (d)(4) shall be added to the Historical Park.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Historical Park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subsection, the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy, and in consultation and collaboration with the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos and Richland Department of Energy site offices, shall complete a general management plan for the Historical Park in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91–383 (commonly known as the National Park Service General Authorities Act; 16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may, subject to applicable law, provide interpretive tours of historically significant Manhattan Project sites and resources in the States of Tennessee, New Mexico, and Washington that are located outside the boundary of the Historical Park.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) by—

(i) transfer of administrative jurisdiction from the Department of Energy by agreement between the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy;

(ii) donation; or

(iii) exchange.

(B) NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land under this section or for the purposes of this section.

(5) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) FEDERAL FACILITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into one or more agreements with the head of a Federal agency to provide public access to, and management, interpretation, and historic preservation of, historically significant Manhattan Project resources under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal agency.

(ii) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may accept donations from, and enter into cooperative agreements with, State governments, units of local government, tribal governments, organizations, or individuals to further the purpose of an interagency agreement entered into under clause (i) or to provide visitor services and administrative facilities within reasonable proximity to the Historical Park.

(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to State, local, or tribal governments, organizations, or individuals for the management, interpretation, and historic preservation of historically significant Manhattan Project resources not included within the Historical Park.

(C) DONATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For the purposes of this section, or for the purpose of preserving and providing access to historically significant Manhattan Project resources, the Secretary of Energy may accept, hold, administer, and use gifts, bequests, and devises (including labor and services).

(g) CLARIFICATION.—

(1) NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.—Nothing in this section, the establishment of the Historical Park, or the management plan for the Historical Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Historical Park. That an activity can be seen and heard from within the Historical Park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the Historical Park.

(2) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall constitute a cause of action with respect to activities outside or adjacent to the established boundary of the Historical Park.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following new division:

DIVISION E—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act''.

SEC. 5002. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this division is as follows:

SEC. 5003. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Acquisition Officers Council'' means the Chief Acquisition Officers Council established by section 1311(a) of title 41, United States Code.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Chief Information Officer'' means a Chief Information Officer (as designated under section 3506(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code)

of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—The term ''Chief Information Officers Council'' or ''CIO Council'' means the Chief Information Officers Council established by section 3603(a) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(6) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term ''Federal Chief Information Officer'' means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code.

(7) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OR IT.—The term ''information technology'' or ''IT'' has the meaning provided in section 11101(6) of title 40, United States Code.

(8) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''relevant congressional committees'' means each of the following:

(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE LI—MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WITHIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 5101. INCREASED AUTHORITY OF AGENCY CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS OVER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF CIOS OF CERTAIN AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (e) and moving such subsection to the end of the section; and

(B) by inserting before subsection (b) the following new subsection (a):

''(a) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OR DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, an agency Chief Information Officer. Each agency Chief Information Officer shall—

''(A)(i) be appointed by the President; or

''(ii) be designated by the President, in consultation with the head of the agency; and

''(B) be appointed or designated, as applicable, from among individuals who possess demonstrated ability in general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, information technology management practices in large governmental or business entities.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—An agency Chief Information Officer appointed or designated under this section shall report directly to the head of the agency and carry out, on a full-time basis, responsibilities as set forth in this section and in section 3506(a) of title 44 for Chief Information Officers designated under paragraph (2) of such section.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3506(a)(2)(A) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''each agency'' the following: '', other than an agency with a Presidentially appointed or designated Chief Information Officer as provided in section 11315(a)(1) of title 40,''.

(b) AUTHORITY RELATING TO BUDGET AND PERSONNEL.—Section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN CIOS.—

''(1) BUDGET-RELATED AUTHORITY.—

''(A) PLANNING.—The head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology or programs that include significant information technology components.

''(B) ALLOCATION.—Amounts appropriated for any agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, for any fiscal year that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as may be specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

''(2) PERSONNEL-RELATED AUTHORITY.—The head of each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31, other than the Department of Defense, shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority necessary to approve the hiring of personnel who will have information technology responsibilities within the agency and to require that such personnel have the obligation to report to the Chief Information Officer in a manner considered sufficient by the Chief Information Officer.''.

(c) SINGLE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER IN EACH AGENCY.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 3506(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) Each agency shall have only one individual with the title and designation of 'Chief Information Officer'. Any bureau, office, or subordinate organization within the agency may designate one individual with the title 'Deputy Chief Information Officer', 'Associate Chief Information Officer', or 'Assistant Chief Information Officer'.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3506(a)(3)(B) of title 44, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect as of October 1, 2014. Any individual serving in a position affected by such section before such date may continue in that position if the requirements of such section are fulfilled with respect to that individual.

SEC. 5102. LEAD COORDINATION ROLE OF CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

(a) LEAD COORDINATION ROLE.—Subsection (d) of section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LEAD INTERAGENCY FORUM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council is designated the lead interagency forum for improving agency coordination of practices related to the design, development, modernization, use, operation, sharing, performance, and review of Federal Government information resources investment. As the lead interagency forum, the Council shall develop cross-agency portfolio management practices to allow and encourage the development of cross-agency shared services and shared platforms. The Council shall also issue guidelines and practices for infrastructure and common information technology applications, including expansion of the Federal Enterprise Architecture process if appropriate. The guidelines and practices may address broader transparency, common inputs, common outputs, and outcomes achieved. The guidelines and practices shall be used as a basis for comparing performance across diverse missions and operations in various agencies.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 1 in each of the 6 years following the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Council shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report (to be known as the 'CIO Council Report') summarizing the Council's activities in the preceding fiscal year and containing such recommendations for further congressional action to fulfill its mission as the Council considers appropriate.

''(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of the report required by paragraph (2), the relevant congressional committees are each of the following:

''(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNCTION.—Subsection (f) of section 3603 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) Assist the Administrator in developing and providing guidance for effective operations of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center established under section 11501 of title 40.''.

(c) REFERENCES TO ADMINISTRATOR OF E-GOVERNMENT AS FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—

(1) REFERENCES.—Section 3602(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The Administrator may also be referred to as the Federal Chief Information Officer.''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 3601(1) of such title is amended by inserting ''or 'Federal Chief Information Officer' '' before ''means''.

SEC. 5103. REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO EXAMINE EFFECTIVENESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall examine the effectiveness of the Chief Information Officers Council in meeting its responsibilities under section 3603(d) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 5102, with particular focus on—

(1) whether agencies are actively participating in the Council and heeding the Council's advice and guidance; and

(2) whether the Council is actively using and developing the capabilities of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center created under section 11501 of title 40, United States Code, as added by section 5401.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General from the examination required by subsection (a).

TITLE LII—DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION

SEC. 5201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to optimize Federal data center usage and efficiency.

SEC. 5202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.—The term ''Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative'' or the ''Initiative'' means the initiative developed and implemented by the Director, through the Federal Chief Information Officer, as required under section 5203.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency'' means any agency included in the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(3) DATA CENTER.—The term ''data center'' means a closet, room, floor, or building for the storage, management, and dissemination

of data and information, as defined by the Federal Chief Information Officer under guidance issued pursuant to this section.

(4) FEDERAL DATA CENTER.—The term ''Federal data center'' means any data center of a covered agency used or operated by a covered agency, by a contractor of a covered agency, or by another organization on behalf of a covered agency.

(5) SERVER UTILIZATION.—The term ''server utilization'' refers to the activity level of a server relative to its maximum activity level, expressed as a percentage.

(6) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—The term ''power usage effectiveness'' means the ratio obtained by dividing the total amount of electricity and other power consumed in running a data center by the power consumed by the information and communications technology in the data center.

SEC. 5203. FEDERAL DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INITIATIVE.—The Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and implement an initiative, to be known as the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, to optimize the usage and efficiency of Federal data centers by meeting the requirements of this division and taking additional measures, as appropriate.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, shall develop and submit to Congress a plan for implementation of the Initiative required by subsection (a) by each covered agency. In developing the plan, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General review required by section 5205(e).

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall include—

(1) descriptions of how covered agencies will use reductions in floor space, energy use, infrastructure, equipment, applications, personnel, increases in multiorganizational use, server virtualization, cloud computing, and other appropriate methods to meet the requirements of the initiative; and

(2) appropriate consideration of shifting Federally owned data centers to commercially owned data centers.

SEC. 5204. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION.

(a) SERVER UTILIZATION.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum server utilization possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(1) The closing of existing data centers that lack adequate server utilization, as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer. If the agency fails to close such data centers, the agency shall provide a detailed explanation as to why this data center should remain in use as part of the submitted plan. The Federal Chief Information Officer shall include an assessment of the agency explanation in the annual report to Congress.

(2) The consolidation of services within existing data centers to increase server utilization rates.

(3) Any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the chief information officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize server utilization.

(b) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—Each covered agency may use the following methods to achieve the maximum energy efficiency possible as determined by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

(1) The use of the measurement of power usage effectiveness to calculate data center energy efficiency.

(2) The use of power meters in data centers to frequently measure power consumption over time.

(3) The establishment of power usage effectiveness goals for each data center.

(4) The adoption of best practices for managing—

(A) temperature and airflow in data centers; and

(B) power supply efficiency.

(5) The implementation of any other method that the Federal Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of covered agencies, determines necessary to optimize data center energy efficiency.

SEC. 5205. COST SAVINGS RELATED TO DATA CENTER OPTIMIZATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track costs resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those costs annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net costs from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net costs each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy costs.

(B) Personnel costs.

(C) Real estate costs.

(D) Capital expense costs.

(E) Maintenance and support costs such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense costs.

(F) Other appropriate costs, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO TRACK SAVINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency shall track savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within the agency and submit a report on those savings annually to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Covered agencies shall determine the net savings from data consolidation on an annual basis.

(2) FACTORS.—In calculating net savings each year under paragraph (1), a covered agency shall use the following factors:

(A) Energy savings.

(B) Personnel savings.

(C) Real estate savings.

(D) Capital expense savings.

(E) Maintenance and support savings such as operating subsystem, database, hardware, and software license expense savings.

(F) Other appropriate savings, as determined by the agency in consultation with the Federal Chief Information Officer.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE COST-EFFECTIVE MEASURES.—Covered agencies shall use the most cost-effective measures to implement the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

(d) USE OF SAVINGS.—Subject to appropriations, any savings resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative within a covered agency shall be used for the following purposes:

(1) To offset the costs of implementing the Initiative within the agency.

(2) To further enhance information technology capabilities and services within the agency.

(e) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall examine methods for calculating savings from the Initiative and using them for the purposes identified in subsection (d), including establishment and use of a special revolving fund that supports data centers and server optimization, and shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer and Congress a report on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations.

SEC. 5206. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO CONGRESS AND THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.

(a) AGENCY REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CIO.—Each year, each covered agency shall submit to the Federal Chief Information Officer a report on the implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative, including savings resulting from such implementation. The report shall include an update of the agency's plan for implementing the Initiative.

(b) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER REQUIREMENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Each year, the Federal Chief Information Officer shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report that assesses agency progress in carrying out the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative and updates the plan under section 5203. The report may be included as part of the annual report required under section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

TITLE LIII—ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATION AND WASTE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION

SEC. 5301. INVENTORY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASSETS.

(a) PLAN.—The Director shall develop a plan for conducting a Governmentwide inventory of information technology assets.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall cover the following:

(1) The manner in which Federal agencies can achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and cost savings in the procurement of information technology assets, through measures such as reducing hardware or software products or services that are duplicative or overlapping and reducing the procurement of new software licenses until such time as agency needs exceed the number of existing and unused licenses.

(2) The capability to conduct ongoing Governmentwide inventories of all existing software licenses on an application-by-application basis, including duplicative, unused, overused, and underused licenses, and to assess the need of agencies for software licenses.

(3) A Governmentwide spending analysis to provide knowledge about how much is being spent for software products or services to support decisions for strategic sourcing under the Federal strategic sourcing program managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

(c) OTHER INVENTORIES.—In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the Director shall review the inventory of information systems maintained by each agency under section 3505(c) of title 44, United States Code, and the inventory of information resources maintained by each agency under section 3506(b)(4) of such title.

(d) AVAILABILITY.—The inventory of information technology assets shall be available to Chief Information Officers and such other Federal officials as the Chief Information Officers may, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, designate.

(e) DEADLINE AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete and submit to Congress the plan required by subsection (a).

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall complete implementation of the plan required by subsection (a).

(g) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of

the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan required by subsection (a) and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

SEC. 5302. WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION AND TRANSPARENCY.

(a) WEBSITE CONSOLIDATION.—The Director shall—

(1) in consultation with Federal agencies, and after reviewing the directory of public Federal Government websites of each agency (as required to be established and updated under section 207(f)(3) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note)), assess all the publicly available websites of Federal agencies to determine whether there are duplicative or overlapping websites; and

(2) require Federal agencies to eliminate or consolidate those websites that are duplicative or overlapping.

(b) WEBSITE TRANSPARENCY.—The Director shall issue guidance to Federal agencies to ensure that the data on publicly available websites of the agencies are open and accessible to the public.

(c) MATTERS COVERED.—In preparing the guidance required by subsection (b), the Director shall—

(1) develop guidelines, standards, and best practices for interoperability and transparency;

(2) identify interfaces that provide for shared, open solutions on the publicly available websites of the agencies; and

(3) ensure that Federal agency Internet home pages, web-based forms, and web-based applications are accessible to individuals with disabilities in conformance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

(d) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance required by subsection (b) shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5303. TRANSITION TO THE CLOUD.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that transition to cloud computing offers significant potential benefits for the implementation of Federal information technology projects in terms of flexibility, cost, and operational benefits.

(b) GOVERNMENTWIDE APPLICATION.—In assessing cloud computing opportunities, the Chief Information Officers Council shall define policies and guidelines for the adoption of Governmentwide programs providing for a standardized approach to security assessment and operational authorization for cloud products and services.

(c) ADDITIONAL BUDGET AUTHORITIES FOR TRANSITION.—In transitioning to the cloud, a Chief Information Officer of an agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, may establish such cloud service Working Capital Funds, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency, as may be necessary to transition to cloud-based solutions. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such cloud service Working Capital Funds may preserve funding for cloud service transitions for a period not to exceed 5 years per appropriation. Any establishment of a new Working Capital Fund under this subsection shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and relevant Congressional committees.

SEC. 5304. ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF CONTRACTS BY REQUIRING BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to leverage the Government's buying power and achieve administrative efficiencies and cost savings by eliminating unnecessary duplication of contracts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR BUSINESS CASE APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on and after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, an executive agency may not issue a solicitation for a covered contract vehicle unless the agency performs a business case analysis for the contract vehicle and obtains an approval of the business case analysis from the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

(2) REVIEW OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any covered contract vehicle, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall review the business case analysis submitted for the contract vehicle and provide an approval or disapproval within 60 days after the date of submission. Any business case analysis not disapproved within such 60-day period is deemed to be approved.

(B) BASIS FOR APPROVAL OF BUSINESS CASE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall approve or disapprove a business case analysis based on the adequacy of the analysis submitted. The Administrator shall give primary consideration to whether an agency has demonstrated a compelling need that cannot be satisfied by existing Governmentwide contract vehicles in a timely and cost-effective manner.

(3) CONTENT OF BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance specifying the content for a business case analysis submitted pursuant to this section. At a minimum, the business case analysis shall include details on the administrative resources needed for such contract vehicle, including an analysis of all direct and indirect costs to the Federal Government of awarding and administering such contract vehicle and the impact such contract vehicle will have on the ability of the Federal Government to leverage its purchasing power.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) COVERED CONTRACT VEHICLE.—The term ''covered contract vehicle'' has the meaning provided by the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy in guidance issued pursuant to this section and includes, at a minimum, any Governmentwide contract vehicle, whether for acquisition of information technology or other goods or services, in an amount greater than $50,000,000 (or $10,000,000, determined on an average annual basis, in the case of such a contract vehicle performed over more than one year). The term does not include a multiple award schedule contract awarded by the General Services Administration, a Governmentwide acquisition contract for information technology awarded pursuant to sections 11302(e) and 11314(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, or orders against existing Governmentwide contract vehicles.

(2) GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT VEHICLE AND EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The terms ''Governmentwide contract vehicle'' and ''executive agency'' have the meanings provided in section 11501 of title 40, United States Code, as added by section 5401.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the next 6 years following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the implementation of this section, including a summary of the submissions, reviews, approvals, and disapprovals of business case analyses pursuant to this section.

(e) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall issue guidance for implementing this section.

(f) REVISION OF FAR.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.

TITLE LIV—STRENGTHENING AND STREAMLINING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Subtitle A—Strengthening and Streamlining IT Program Management Practices

SEC. 5401. ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMON APPLICATION COLLABORATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 115—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

''§ 11501. Federal infrastructure and common application collaboration center

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish a Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Collaboration Center') within the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44 in accordance with this section. The purposes of the Collaboration Center are to serve as a focal point for coordinated program management practices and to develop and maintain requirements for the acquisition of IT infrastructure and common applications commonly used by various Federal agencies.

''(b) ORGANIZATION OF CENTER.—

''(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Center shall consist of the following members:

''(A) An appropriate number, as determined by the CIO Council, but not less than 12, full-time program managers or cost specialists, all of whom have appropriate experience in the private or Government sector in managing or overseeing acquisitions of IT infrastructure and common applications.

''(B) At least 1 full-time detailee from each of the Federal agencies listed in section 901(b) of title 31, nominated by the respective agency chief information officer for a detail period of not less than 2 years.

''(2) WORKING GROUPS.—The Collaboration Center shall have working groups that specialize in IT infrastructure and common applications identified by the CIO Council. Each working group shall be headed by a separate dedicated program manager appointed by the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''(c) CAPABILITIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COLLABORATION CENTER.—For each of the IT infrastructure and common application areas identified by the CIO Council, the Collaboration Center shall perform the following roles, and any other functions as directed by the Federal Chief Information Officer:

''(1) Develop, maintain, and disseminate requirements suitable to establish contracts that will meet the common and general needs of various Federal agencies as determined by the Center. In doing so, the Center shall give maximum consideration to the adoption of commercial standards and industry acquisition best practices, including opportunities for shared services, consideration of total cost of ownership, preference for industry-neutral functional specifications leveraging open industry standards and competition, and use of long-term contracts, as appropriate.

''(2) Develop, maintain, and disseminate reliable cost estimates that are accurate, comprehensive, well-documented, and credible.

''(3) Lead the review of significant or troubled IT investments or acquisitions as identified by the CIO Council.

''(4) Provide expert aid to troubled IT investments or acquisitions.

''(d) GUIDANCE.—The Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance addressing the scope and operation of the Collaboration Center. The guidance shall require that the Collaboration Center report to the Federal Chief Information Officer.

''(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall annually submit to the relevant congressional committees a report detailing the organization, staff, and activities of the Collaboration Center, including—

''(A) a list of IT infrastructure and common applications the Center assisted;

''(B) an assessment of the Center's achievement in promoting efficiency, shared services, and elimination of unnecessary Government requirements that are contrary to commercial best practices; and

''(C) the use and expenditure of amounts in the Fund established under subsection (i).

''(2) INCLUSION IN OTHER REPORT.—The report may be included as part of the annual E-Government status report required under section 3606 of title 44.

''(f) IMPROVEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENTWIDE SOFTWARE PURCHASING PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Collaboration Center, in collaboration with the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration, shall identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative to enhance Governmentwide acquisition, shared use, and dissemination of software, as well as compliance with end user license agreements.

''(2) EXAMINATION OF METHODS.—In developing the initiative under paragraph (1), the Collaboration Center shall examine the use of realistic and effective demand aggregation models supported by actual agency commitment to use the models, and supplier relationship management practices, to more effectively govern the Government's acquisition of information technology.

''(3) GOVERNMENTWIDE USER LICENSE AGREEMENT.—The Collaboration Center, in developing the initiative under paragraph (1), shall allow for the purchase of a license agreement that is available for use by all executive agencies as one user to the maximum extent practicable and as appropriate.

''(g) GUIDELINES FOR ACQUISITION OF IT INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMON APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) GUIDELINES.—The Collaboration Center shall establish guidelines that, to the maximum extent possible, eliminate inconsistent practices among executive agencies and ensure uniformity and consistency in acquisition processes for IT infrastructure and common applications across the Federal Government.

''(2) CENTRAL WEBSITE.—In preparing the guidelines, the Collaboration Center, in consultation with the Chief Acquisition Officers Council, shall offer executive agencies the option of accessing a central website for best practices, templates, and other relevant information.

''(h) PRICING TRANSPARENCY.—The Collaboration Center, in collaboration with the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the General Services Administration, and the Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, shall compile a price list and catalogue containing current pricing information by vendor for each of its IT infrastructure and common applications categories. The price catalogue shall contain any price provided by a vendor for the same or similar good or service to any executive agency. The catalogue shall be developed in a fashion ensuring that it may be used for pricing comparisons and pricing analysis using standard data formats. The price catalogue shall not be made public, but shall be accessible to executive agencies.

''(i) FEDERAL IT ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT FUND.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF FUND.—There is a Federal IT Acquisition Management Improvement Fund (in this subsection referred to as the 'Fund'). The Administrator of General Services shall manage the Fund through the Collaboration Center to support the activities of the Collaboration Center carried out pursuant to this section. The Administrator of General Services shall consult with the Director in managing the Fund.

''(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Five percent of the fees collected by executive agencies under the following contracts shall be credited to the Fund:

''(A) Governmentwide task and delivery order contracts entered into under sections 4103 and 4105 of title 41.

''(B) Governmentwide contracts for the acquisition of information technology and multiagency acquisition contracts for that technology authorized by section 11314 of this title.

''(C) Multiple-award schedule contracts entered into by the Administrator of General Services.

''(3) REMITTANCE BY HEAD OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The head of an executive agency that administers a contract described in paragraph (2) shall remit to the General Services Administration the amount required to be credited to the Fund with respect to the contract at the end of each quarter of the fiscal year.

''(4) AMOUNTS NOT TO BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—The Administrator of General Services, through the Office of Management and Budget, shall ensure that amounts collected under this subsection are not used for a purpose other than the activities of the Collaboration Center carried out pursuant to this section.

''(5) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts credited to the Fund remain available to be expended only in the fiscal year for which they are credited and the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

''(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning provided that term by section 105 of title 5.

''(2) FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—The term 'Federal Chief Information Officer' means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44.

''(3) GOVERNMENTWIDE CONTRACT VEHICLE.—The term 'Governmentwide contract vehicle' means any contract, blanket purchase agreement, or other contractual instrument that allows for an indefinite number of orders to be placed within the contract, agreement, or instrument, and that is established by one executive agency for use by multiple executive agencies to obtain supplies and services.

''(4) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'relevant congressional committees' means each of the following:

''(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

''(k) REVISION OF FAR.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 115 in the table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle III of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''115. Information Technology Acquisition Management Practices ..... 11501''.

(b) DEADLINES.—

(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance under section 11501(d) of title 40, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, in accordance with section 11501(a) of such title, as so added.

(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center shall—

(A) identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative in accordance with section 11501(f) of such title, as so added; and

(B) establish guidelines in accordance with section 11501(g) of such title, as so added.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3602(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) all of the functions of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, as required under section 11501 of title 40; and''.

SEC. 5402. DESIGNATION OF ASSISTED ACQUISITION CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, as amended by section 5401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 11502. Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to develop specialized assisted acquisition centers of excellence within the Federal Government to promote—

''(1) the effective use of best acquisition practices;

''(2) the development of specialized expertise in the acquisition of information technology; and

''(3) Governmentwide sharing of acquisition capability to augment any shortage in the information technology acquisition workforce.

''(b) DESIGNATION OF AACEs.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, and every 3 years thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Chief Acquisition Officers Council and the Chief Information Officers Council, shall designate, redesignate, or withdraw the designation of acquisition centers of excellence within various executive agencies to carry out the functions set forth in subsection (c) in an area of specialized acquisition expertise as determined by the Director. Each such center of excellence shall be known as an 'Assisted Acquisition Center of Excellence' or an 'AACE'.

''(c) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of each AACE are as follows:

''(1) BEST PRACTICES.—To promote, develop, and implement the use of best acquisition practices in the area of specialized acquisition expertise that the AACE is designated to carry out by the Director under subsection (b).

''(2) ASSISTED ACQUISITIONS.—To assist all Government agencies in the expedient and low-cost acquisition of the information technology goods or services covered by such area of specialized acquisition expertise by

engaging in repeated and frequent acquisition of similar information technology requirements.

''(3) DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF IT ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.—To assist in recruiting and training IT acquisition cadres (referred to in section 1704(j) of title 41).

''(d) CRITERIA.—In designating, redesignating, or withdrawing the designation of an AACE, the Director shall consider, at a minimum, the following matters:

''(1) The subject matter expertise of the host agency in a specific area of information technology acquisition.

''(2) For acquisitions of IT infrastructure and common applications covered by the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center established under section 11501 of this title, the ability and willingness to collaborate with the Collaboration Center and adhere to the requirements standards established by the Collaboration Center.

''(3) The ability of an AACE to develop customized requirements documents that meet the needs of executive agencies as well as the current industry standards and commercial best practices.

''(4) The ability of an AACE to consistently award and manage various contracts, task or delivery orders, and other acquisition arrangements in a timely, cost-effective, and compliant manner.

''(5) The ability of an AACE to aggregate demands from multiple executive agencies for similar information technology goods or services and fulfill those demands in one acquisition.

''(6) The ability of an AACE to acquire innovative or emerging commercial and noncommercial technologies using various contracting methods, including ways to lower the entry barriers for small businesses with limited Government contracting experiences.

''(7) The ability of an AACE to maximize commercial item acquisition, effectively manage high-risk contract types, increase competition, promote small business participation, and maximize use of available Governmentwide contract vehicles.

''(8) The existence of an in-house cost estimating group with expertise to consistently develop reliable cost estimates that are accurate, comprehensive, well-documented, and credible.

''(9) The ability of an AACE to employ best practices and educate requesting agencies, to the maximum extent practicable, regarding critical factors underlying successful major IT acquisitions, including the following factors:

''(A) Active engagement by program officials with stakeholders.

''(B) Possession by program staff of the necessary knowledge and skills.

''(C) Support of the programs by senior department and agency executives.

''(D) Involvement by end users and stakeholders in the development of requirements.

''(E) Participation by end users in testing of system functionality prior to formal end user acceptance testing.

''(F) Stability and consistency of Government and contractor staff.

''(G) Prioritization of requirements by program staff.

''(H) Maintenance of regular communication with the prime contractor by program officials.

''(I) Receipt of sufficient funding by programs.

''(10) The ability of an AACE to run an effective acquisition intern program in collaboration with the Federal Acquisition Institute or the Defense Acquisition University.

''(11) The ability of an AACE to effectively and properly manage fees received for assisted acquisitions pursuant to this section.

''(e) FUNDS RECEIVED BY AACEs.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, funds obligated and transferred from an executive agency in a fiscal year to an AACE for the acquisition of goods or services covered by an area of specialized acquisition expertise of an AACE, regardless of whether the requirements are severable or non-severable, shall remain available for awards of contracts by the AACE for the same general requirements for the next 5 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the funds were transferred.

''(2) TRANSITION TO NEW AACE.—If the AACE to which the funds are provided under paragraph (1) becomes unable to fulfill the requirements of the executive agency from which the funds were provided, the funds may be provided to a different AACE to fulfill such requirements. The funds so provided shall be used for the same purpose and remain available for the same period of time as applied when provided to the original AACE.

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—This subsection does not limit any existing authorities an AACE may have under its revolving or working capital funds authorities.

''(f) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF AACE.—

''(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review and assess—

''(A) the use and management of fees received by the AACEs pursuant to this section to ensure that an appropriate fee structure is established and enforced to cover activities addressed in this section and that no excess fees are charged or retained; and

''(B) the effectiveness of the AACEs in achieving the purpose described in subsection (a), including review of contracts.

''(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the designation or redesignation of AACES under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing the findings and assessment under paragraph (1).

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ASSISTED ACQUISITION.—The term 'assisted acquisition' means a type of interagency acquisition in which the parties enter into an interagency agreement pursuant to which—

''(A) the servicing agency performs acquisition activities on the requesting agency's behalf, such as awarding, administering, or closing out a contract, task order, delivery order, or blanket purchase agreement; and

''(B) funding is provided through a franchise fund, the Acquisition Services Fund in section 321 of this title, sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, or other available methods.

''(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term 'executive agency' has the meaning provided that term by section 133 of title 41.

''(3) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'relevant congressional committees' has the meaning provided that term by section 11501 of this title.

''(h) REVISION OF FAR.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to implement this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, as amended by section 5401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''11502. Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence.''.

Subtitle B—Strengthening IT Acquisition Workforce

SEC. 5411. EXPANSION OF TRAINING AND USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure timely progress by Federal agencies toward developing, strengthening, and deploying personnel with highly specialized skills in information technology acquisition, including program and project managers, to be known as information technology acquisition cadres.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1704 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) STRATEGIC PLAN ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION CADRES.—

''(1) FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a 5-year strategic plan (to be known as the 'IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan') to develop, strengthen, and solidify information technology acquisition cadres. The plan shall include a timeline for implementation of the plan and identification of individuals responsible for specific elements of the plan during the 5-year period covered by the plan.

''(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan shall address, at a minimum, the following matters:

''(A) Current information technology acquisition staffing challenges in Federal agencies, by previous year's information technology acquisition value, and by the Federal Government as a whole.

''(B) The variety and complexity of information technology acquisitions conducted by each Federal agency covered by the plan, and the specialized information technology acquisition workforce needed to effectively carry out such acquisitions.

''(C) The development of a sustainable funding model to support efforts to hire, retain, and train an information technology acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill to effectively carry out the acquisition programs of the Federal agencies covered by the plan, including an examination of interagency funding methods and a discussion of how the model of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund could be applied to civilian agencies.

''(D) Any strategic human capital planning necessary to hire, retain, and train an information acquisition cadre of appropriate size and skill at each Federal agency covered by the plan.

''(E) Governmentwide training standards and certification requirements necessary to enhance the mobility and career opportunities of the Federal information technology acquisition cadre within the Federal agencies covered by the plan.

''(F) New and innovative approaches to workforce development and training, including cross-functional training, rotational development, and assignments both within and outside the Government.

''(G) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, and acquisition intern programs.

''(H) Assessment of the current workforce competency and usage trends in evaluation technique to obtain best value, including proper handling of tradeoffs between price and nonprice factors.

''(I) Assessment of the current workforce competency in designing and aligning performance goals, life cycle costs, and contract incentives.

''(J) Assessment of the current workforce competency in avoiding brand-name preference and using industry-neutral functional specifications to leverage open industry standards and competition.

''(K) Use of integrated program teams, including fully dedicated program managers, for each complex information technology investment.

''(L) Proper assignment of recognition or accountability to the members of an integrated program team for both individual functional goals and overall program success or failure.

''(M) The development of a technology fellows program that includes provisions for recruiting, for rotation of assignments, and for partnering directly with universities with well-recognized information technology programs.

''(N) The capability to properly manage other transaction authority (where such authority is granted), including ensuring that the use of the authority is warranted due to unique technical challenges, rapid adoption of innovative or emerging commercial or noncommercial technologies, or other circumstances that cannot readily be satisfied using a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement in accordance with applicable law and the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(O) The use of student internship and scholarship programs as a talent pool for permanent hires and the use and impact of special hiring authorities and flexibilities to recruit diverse candidates.

''(P) The assessment of hiring manager satisfaction with the hiring process and hiring outcomes, including satisfaction with the quality of applicants interviewed and hires made.

''(Q) The assessment of applicant satisfaction with the hiring process, including the clarity of the hiring announcement, the user-friendliness of the application process, communication from the hiring manager or agency regarding application status, and timeliness of the hiring decision.

''(R) The assessment of new hire satisfaction with the onboarding process, including the orientation process, and investment in training and development for employees during their first year of employment.

''(S) Any other matters the Director considers appropriate.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1 in each of the 5 years following the year of submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Director shall submit to the relevant congressional committees an annual report outlining the progress made pursuant to the plan.

''(4) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF THE PLAN AND ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(A) Not later than 1 year after the submission of the plan required by paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the plan and submit to the relevant congressional committees a report on the review.

''(B) Not later than 6 months after the submission of the first, third, and fifth annual report required under paragraph (3), the Comptroller General shall independently assess the findings of the annual report and brief the relevant congressional committees on the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations to ensure the objectives of the plan are accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'Federal agency' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31.

''(B) The term 'relevant congressional committees' means each of the following:

''(i) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

''(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.''.

SEC. 5412. PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.

(a) PLAN ON STRENGTHENING PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than June 1 following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a plan for improving management of IT programs and projects.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Creation of a specialized career path for program management.

(2) The development of a competency model for program management consistent with the IT project manager model.

(3) A career advancement model that requires appropriate expertise and experience for advancement.

(4) A career advancement model that is more competitive with the private sector and that recognizes both Government and private sector experience.

(5) Appropriate consideration and alignment with the needs and priorities of the Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, the Assisted Acquisition Centers of Excellence, and acquisition intern programs.

(c) COMBINATION WITH OTHER CADRES PLAN.—The Director may combine the plan required by subsection (a) with the IT Acquisition Cadres Strategic Plan required under section 1704(j) of title 41, United States Code, as added by section 411.

SEC. 5413. PERSONNEL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN THE ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall develop policy and guidance for agencies to develop a program to recognize excellent performance by Federal Government employees and teams of such employees in the acquisition of information systems and information technology for the agency.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The program referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable—

(1) obtain objective outcome measures; and

(2) include procedures for—

(A) the nomination of Federal Government employees and teams of such employees for eligibility for recognition under the program; and

(B) the evaluation of nominations for recognition under the program by 1 or more agency panels of individuals from Government, academia, and the private sector who have such expertise, and are appointed in such a manner, as the Director of the Office of Personal Management shall establish for purposes of the program.

(c) AWARD OF CASH BONUSES AND OTHER INCENTIVES.—In carrying out the program referred to in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish policies and guidance for agencies to reward any Federal Government employee or teams of such employees recognized pursuant to the program—

(1) with a cash bonus, to the extent that the performance of such individual or team warrants the award of such bonus and is authorized by any provision of law;

(2) through promotions and other nonmonetary awards;

(3) by publicizing—

(A) acquisition accomplishments by individual employees; and

(B) the tangible end benefits that resulted from such accomplishments, as appropriate; and

(4) through other awards, incentives, or bonuses that the head of the agency considers appropriate.

TITLE LV—ADDITIONAL REFORMS

SEC. 5501. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFIT OF THE FEDERAL STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall prescribe regulations providing that when the Federal Government makes a purchase of services and supplies offered under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative (managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy) but such Initiative is not used, the contract file for the purchase shall include a brief analysis of the comparative value, including price and nonprice factors, between the services and supplies offered under such Initiative and services and supplies offered under the source or sources used for the purchase.

SEC. 5502. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

(a) PRICE INFORMATION TO BE TREATED AS PUBLIC INFORMATION.—The final negotiated price offered by an awardee of a blanket purchase agreement shall be treated as public information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF BLANKET PURCHASE AGREEMENT INFORMATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall make available to the public a list of all blanket purchase agreements entered into by Federal agencies under its Federal Supply Schedules contracts and the prices associated with those blanket purchase agreements. The list and price information shall be updated at least once every 6 months.

SEC. 5503. ADDITIONAL SOURCE SELECTION TECHNIQUE IN SOLICITATIONS.

Section 3306(d) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period and inserting ''; or'' at the end of paragraph (2); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) stating in the solicitation that the award will be made using a fixed price technical competition, under which all offerors compete solely on nonprice factors and the fixed award price is pre-announced in the solicitation.''.

SEC. 5504. ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

(a) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION ABOUT IT INVESTMENTS.—Section 11302(c) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall make available to the public the cost, schedule, and performance data for at least 80 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments Governmentwide, and 60 percent (by dollar value) of all information technology investments in each Federal agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, notwithstanding whether the investments are for new IT acquisitions or for operations and maintenance of existing IT. The Director shall ensure that the information is current, accurate, and reflects the risks associated

with each covered information technology investment.

''(B) WAIVER OR LIMITATION AUTHORITY.—The applicability of subparagraph (A) may be waived or the extent of the information may be limited—

''(i) by the Director, with respect to IT investments Governmentwide; and

''(ii) by the Chief Information Officer of a Federal agency, with respect to IT investments in that agency;

if the Director or the Chief Information Officer, as the case may be, determines that such a waiver or limitation is in the national security interests of the United States.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 11302(c) of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The report shall include an analysis of agency trends reflected in the performance risk information required in paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 5505. ENHANCED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe a regulation making clear that agency acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry, so long as those exchanges are consistent with existing law and regulation and do not promote an unfair competitive advantage to particular firms.

SEC. 5506. CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW WITH RESPECT TO TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY IN ACQUISITION OF SOFTWARE.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish guidance and processes to clarify that software acquisitions by the Federal Government are to be made using merit-based requirements development and evaluation processes that promote procurement choices—

(1) based on performance and value, including the long-term value proposition to the Federal Government;

(2) free of preconceived preferences based on how technology is developed, licensed, or distributed; and

(3) generally including the consideration of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software technologies.

(b) TECHNOLOGY NEUTRALITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the Federal Government's long-standing policy of following technology-neutral principles and practices when selecting and acquiring information technology that best fits the needs of the Federal Government.

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council, shall issue guidance concerning the technology-neutral procurement and use of software within the Federal Government.

(d) MATTERS COVERED.—In issuing guidance under subsection (c), the Director shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Guidance to clarify that the preference for commercial items in section 3307 of title 41, United States Code, includes proprietary, open source, and mixed source software that meets the definition of the term ''commercial item'' in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, including all such software that is used for non-Government purposes and is licensed to the public.

(2) Guidance regarding the conduct of market research to ensure the inclusion of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software options.

(3) Guidance to define Governmentwide standards for security, redistribution, indemnity, and copyright in the acquisition, use, release, and collaborative development of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(4) Guidance for the adoption of available commercial practices to acquire proprietary, open source, and mixed source software for widespread Government use, including issues such as security and redistribution rights.

(5) Guidance to establish standard service level agreements for maintenance and support for proprietary, open source, and mixed source software products widely adopted by the Government, as well as the development of Governmentwide agreements that contain standard and widely applicable contract provisions for ongoing maintenance and development of software.

(6) Guidance on the role and use of the Federal Infrastructure and Common Application Collaboration Center, established pursuant to section 11501 of title 40, United States Code (as added by section 5401), for acquisition of proprietary, open source, and mixed source software.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the issuance of the guidance required by subsection (b), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the relevant congressional committees a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the guidance;

(2) an identification of barriers to widespread use by the Federal Government of specific software technologies; and

(3) such legislative recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to further the purposes of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 15__. LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR THE AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN AIRCRAFT, VEHICLES, AND EQUIPMENT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), $2,600,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure until the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report as described in subsection (b).

(b) REPORT.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is a report that includes the following information:

(1) A list of all covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment to be purchased with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to the Department of Defense for the ASFF.

(2) The expected date on which such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment would be delivered and operable in Afghanistan.

(3) The full requirements for operating such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment.

(4) The plan for maintenance of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment and estimated costs of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment by year, through 2020.

(5) The expected date that ASFF personnel would be fully capable of operating and maintaining such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment without support from United States personnel.

(6) An explanation of the extent to which the acquisition of such covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment will impact the longer-term United States costs of supporting the ASFF.

(c) COVERED AIRCRAFT, VEHICLES, AND EQUIPMENT.—In this section, the term ''covered aircraft, vehicles, and equipment'' means helicopters, systems for close air support, air mobility systems, and armored vehicles.

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

At the end of subtitle I of title X of division A, add the following:

SEC. 1090. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESERVATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED OR RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

(2) Approximately 40,000 servicemen and women across all branches of the Armed Forces either live in or are stationed on active duty within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Unless these individuals are granted a waiver as serving in a law enforcement role, they are subject to the District of Columbia's onerous and highly restrictive laws on the possession of firearms.

(3) Military personnel, despite being extensively trained in the proper and safe use of firearms, are therefore deprived by the laws of the District of Columbia of handguns, rifles, and shotguns that are commonly kept by law-abiding persons throughout the United States for sporting use and for lawful defense of their persons, homes, businesses, and families.

(4) The District of Columbia has one of the highest per capita murder rates in the Nation, which may be attributed in part to previous local laws prohibiting possession of firearms by law-abiding persons who would have otherwise been able to defend themselves and their loved ones in their own homes and businesses.

(5) The Gun Control Act of 1968 (as amended by the Firearms Owners' Protection Act) and the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act provide comprehensive Federal regulations applicable in the District of Columbia as elsewhere. In addition, existing District of Columbia criminal laws punish possession and illegal use of firearms by violent criminals and felons. Consequently, there is no need for local laws that only affect and disarm law-abiding citizens.

(6) On June 26, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* held that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess a firearm for traditionally lawful purposes, and thus ruled that the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirements that rifles and shotguns in the home be kept unloaded and disassembled or outfitted with a trigger lock to be unconstitutional.

(7) On July 16, 2008, the District of Columbia enacted the Firearms Control Emergency Amendment Act of 2008 (D.C. Act 17-422; 55 DCR 8237), which places onerous restrictions on the ability of law-abiding citizens from possessing firearms, thus violating the spirit by which the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

(8) On February 26, 2009, the United States Senate adopted an amendment on a bipartisan vote of 62-36 by Senator John Ensign to S. 160, the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009, which would fully restore Second Amendment rights to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully their rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and therefore should be exempt from

the District of Columbia's restrictions on the possession of firearms.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. 6___. RECOGNITION OF ADDITIONAL MEANS BY WHICH MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD CALLED INTO FEDERAL SERVICE FOR A PERIOD OF 30 DAYS OR LESS MAY INITIALLY REPORT FOR DUTY FOR ENTITLEMENT TO BASIC PAY.

Section 204(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''date when he appears at the place of company rendezvous'' and inserting ''date on which the member, in person or by authorized telephonic or electronic means, contacts the member's unit''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following new sentence: ''However, this subsection does not authorize any expenditure before the member makes authorized contact that is not authorized by law to be paid after such authorized contact.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I urge the committee to adopt the amendments en bloc, all of which have been examined by both the majority and the minority.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment is not controversial, but it's critical. At a time when over $80 billion is spent and over 10 percent of it goes completely wasted on information technology purchases by the government, there has never been a more important time to update the legendary, historic Clinger-Cohen Act. That Act in 1996 was attached to the NDAA, exactly as this one is, and it created the positions of Chief Information Officers to oversee IT management.

□ 1040

1996 was a time in which you could still have an IBM AT 286 computer on your desk. The idea of cloud servers didn't exist, and the size and scope and dependency on the cyber environment was never even anticipated.

So as we modernize this act, I would ask to both have it considered as important, but also have it recognized as critically necessary.

One of the most important things and something that makes common sense to the people who may hear this today or read it in the transcript is that we have more chief information officers today than we have departments, and all but one have no budget authority.

This legislation, when enacted, will eliminate that. It will eliminate duplicative IT purchases that give us overruns of as much as 20 percent in our purchasing of licenses, but it also will put real meaning behind the term ''chief information officer.'' Never again will someone have that title and have no budget authority or responsibility. When a program goes right, the chief information officer is responsible; when a program goes awry, it's his or her job to make it right.

Once again, I urge support for a bill that was considered, numerous hearings were held, and it was passed unanimously out of my committee.

FEDERAL IT ACQUISITION REFORM ACT (FITARA) AMENDMENT TO NDAA

My amendment is a modified version of a bill reported from my committee unanimously in March. It reforms—Government-wide—the process by which federal information technology is acquired.

It is particularly fitting that this reform be included in the defense authorization bill. First, because majority of the Government's annual $80 billion in federal IT purchases is defense-related. Second, because this reform is a major update to a federal IT law originally enacted as part of a defense authorization bill—the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act.

The 1996 NDAA included the Information Technology Management Reform Act—popularly known as Clinger-Cohen Act. It changed the way the federal government managed its IT resources—for instance by creating agency Chief Information Officers to oversee IT management.

Upon the introduction of this historic legislation, Chairman Clinger said,

''From the time the Second Continental Congress established a Commissary General in 1775, the procurement system has commanded the attention of both public officials and the American taxpayer. Unfortunately and all too often, the attention has focused on individual abuses rather than the overall system. Over the years, in response to these horror stories, Congress passed many laws—long and short, significant and trivial, new and old which standing alone were not overly harmful, but when added together created an increasingly overburdened mass of statutory requirements.

In December 1994, a report prepared for the Secretary of Defense found that, on average, the Government pays an additional 18 percent on what it buys solely because of the requirements it imposes on its contractors. This confirmed the average estimate by major contractors surveyed by GAO that the additional costs incurred in selling to the Government are about 19 percent. While some of the Government's unique requirements certainly are needed, we clearly are paying an enormous premium for them—billions of dollars annually.

And this is only part of the Government's inflated cost of doing business—for it includes only what is paid to contractors, not the cost of the Government's own administrative system. The Government's contracting officials are confronted with numerous mandates of their own, often amounting to step-by-step prescriptions that increase staff and equipment needs, and leave little room for the exercise of business judgment, initiative, and creativity.''

Many of his sentiments are still applicable today. Since the mid-Nineties, technology has leaped forward, and the federal government's spending on IT procurement has tripled. So my amendment—the Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act—updates Clinger-Cohen, with an emphasis on reforming the way the federal government purchases IT products and services.

GAO has identified duplicative IT investment as a problem in its annual reports to Congress on duplication. IT acquisition program failure rates and cost overruns are between 72 and 80%. Some estimate as much as $20 billion is wasted annually in this area.

We need to enhance the best value to the taxpayer by aligning the cumbersome federal acquisition process to major trends in the IT industry.

This amendment accomplishes this by empowering agency CIO's with budget authority over IT programs. It establishes centers of excellence in specific areas of IT procurement to develop expertise and leverage the Government's economy of scale in purchasing commonly-used IT products and services, so that agencies buy cheaper, faster and smarter. It accelerates consolidation and optimization of the Federal Government's proliferating data centers. And it ensures procurement decisions give due consideration to all technologies—including open source—and that contracts are awarded based on best long-term value proposition.

A discussion draft of the FITARA bill was posted last September. I held two full committee hearings on the bill, and the language has evolved through the course of several rewrites and extensive feedback from contracting and technology experts from inside and outside Government.

This is a significant and timely reform that will enhance both defense and non-defense procurement. I urge all members to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate the leadership for including this amendment in the en bloc amendment.

It is important that we deal with improving the quality of life for our servicemembers and their families.

In a situation all too familiar for our military families, every few years they find themselves living in a new military base with their children having to start a new school and having to adapt to a new environment. Making this transition even more difficult, their loved ones could be serving in Iraq or Afghanistan in constant danger.

This is an effort to make sure that we help our military installations include things that enhance the livability of that environment, to help with green space, public gardens, sidewalks, bike and running trails, things that are recognized in urban development as important amenities that add value and quality of life, while also helping the Department of Defense adapt best practices to build military bases to promote close-knit communities that work for families, which is critical.

I appreciate the progress that's been made and the committee working with us to make sure that this is enhanced as we move forward.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today to engage my friend, Chairman MCKEON, in a colloquy regarding the Defense Contract Audit Agency, or DCAA, and express concerns about the potential overreach of its authority.

The DCAA plays a critical role in our contracting system. As such, in recent years, Congress has provided substantial human and financial resources to address its well-documented workload backlog and other challenges. I am in favor of such resources and encourage DCAA to focus on eliminating the backlog. However, it appears that DCAA may be broadly accessing a myriad of contractor documents that have little or no impact on determining the effectiveness of contractor business systems.

The FY13 National Defense Authorization Act contained a provision, section 832, which set parameters for DCAA's access to the internal audits of companies that provide goods and services to the Department of Defense. Specifically, it is my understanding the committee was focused on contractors' business systems and ensuring robust and independent internal audit controls to those systems. However, it appears DCAA is broadly interpreting section 832 as providing DCAA with the authority to access all contractor internal audits and supporting documents. This is concerning on many levels.

I would ask the chairman if he has considered the potentially chilling effect on a company's desire to maintain a robust internal audit program if the government is demanding unfettered access to information they may not need or may potentially misuse. This is especially worrisome when this overreach extends to the very proprietary data that makes these companies competitive in the marketplace.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and ask if he shares my concerns regarding the potential overreach of DCAA in this area.

Mr. MCKEON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank my friend for bringing up this important issue.

As you are aware, we did not reopen the issue in the current bill. However, I share your concerns and would hope that DCAA is not overreaching on its authority. The potential for DCAA to misuse corporate internal audits or to go fishing through these audits without understanding their context or purpose is very concerning. The committee is continuing to monitor their implementation of access to company internal audits and is willing to take additional action if we determine DCAA is acting beyond the limited grant of authority that Congress provided.

Again, thank you for raising this important issue.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

First, I also want to thank my friend, Congressman PAT MEEHAN, for cosponsoring my amendment.

Due to sequestration, the Department of Defense has not been allowing military bands to perform at community events, even when the sponsoring community organization pays for all associated expenses, because the Department of Defense is saying that the reimbursement is never credited to the proper account.

Well, this is hard to believe. First, because it's been going on before, where community events have reimbursed the Department of Defense and there have not been any problems that we've been aware of. But since sequestration, they're now saying it cannot be done. Well, this is a civilian force of over 700,000 people. I'm sure that we can find a way to make this work and support our community events.

My amendment is simple. It will allow military bands to perform at community events when the hosting organization fully funds the band's expenditures by ensuring that the money from the hosting organization is returned to the relevant department's accounts.

This issue came to my attention when a Marine Corps veteran from my district in Pleasanton, California, Brooks Wilson, informed me that at this year's 148th Scottish Gathering and Games in Pleasanton, the Marine Corps band wouldn't be able to perform, even though his organization would fully fund the band's expenditure just as they have always done previously.

Public performances by military bands like the Marine Corps band bring a sense of patriotism and community to our cities and towns. They also help enliven events like the Scottish Games, increasing attendance and helping boost and lift economic activity.

I ask my colleagues to join Congressman MEEHAN and I in supporting our military bands and our amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to thank the ranking member and the chair for making my amendment an en bloc amendment.

This amendment deals with the 50-plus billion dollars that we have spent on the Afghan National Security Forces. An additional $7.7 billion is to be added this year. That is a 50 percent increase over last year.

The $2.6 billion addition is for equipment with absolutely no justification, no idea what the equipment is—airplanes, related. There is no knowledge of whether the Afghan National Security Force can use it or not. The amendment simply says that money will not be available until and unless there is clarity as to where the money is going to be spent, how it's going to be spent, how the equipment will be purchased. We don't want to write a $2.6 billion blank check for additional graft and corruption in Afghanistan.

This amendment will be in the en bloc amendment, and I thank the committee for making it possible.

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

□ 1050

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee as well.

I want to talk about the FITARA bill, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, that I am a coauthor of with the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. ISSA. This is the most sweeping reform legislation since Clinger-Cohen.

Today, Federal IT acquisition is a cumbersome, bureaucratic, and wasteful exercise. In recent decades, taxpayers have been forced to foot the bill for massive IT failures that ring up staggeringly high costs and exhibit astonishingly poor performance. Program failures and cost overruns plague the vast majority of major Federal IT investments, while Federal managers report that 47 percent of the budget is spent on maintaining antiquated and inadequate IT platforms even today. The annual pricetag of this wasteful spending is estimated at $20 billion a year.

The Air Force, for example, invested 6 years in a modernization effort that cost more than $1 billion but failed to deliver a usable product, promptly its Assistant Secretary to state:

I'm personally appalled at the limited capabilities that program has produced relative to that amount of investment.

Mission-critical IT investment failures not only waste taxpayer dollars, but they jeopardize our Nation's safety.

Our bill would modernize, streamline, and make more transparent by actually posting 80 percent of all acquisitions on the Web site. It would streamline the decisionmaking process. Right now, the 26 major Federal agencies, Madam Chairwoman, have over 250 people called CIO, chief information officers. We would designate one per agency who is responsible primarily and accountable primarily for IT acquisitions.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I again thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee and their very

able staff for cooperating with Chairman ISSA and myself on this very important reform legislation, and I certainly hope when we get to conference with the Senate it will persevere.

Madam Chair, today, Federal IT acquisition is a cumbersome, bureaucratic, and wasteful exercise. In recent decades, taxpayers have been forced to foot the bill for massive IT program failures that ring up staggeringly high costs, but exhibit astonishingly poor performance. Program failure and cost overruns still plague the vast majority of major Federal IT investments, while Federal managers' report that 47 percent of their budget is spent on maintaining antiquated and inadequate IT platforms. The annual price tag of this wasteful spending on Federal IT programs is estimated to add up to approximately $20 billion.

The Air Force invested six years in a modernization effort that cost more than $1 billion, but failed to deliver a usable product, prompting its Assistant Secretary to state, ''I am personally appalled at the limited capabilities that program has produced relative to that amount of investment.''

Mission-critical IT investment failures not only waste taxpayer dollars, but they jeopardize our Nation's safety, security, and economy. From malfunctioning Census handheld computers that threatened to undermine a critical constitutional responsibility, to a promised electronic border fence that never materialized, time and time again, agency missions have been sabotaged by failed IT acquisitions.

This status quo is unacceptable and unsustainable.

I want to thank Chairman ISSA for working with me in a productive and bipartisan manner to develop Amendment 117, a modified version of H.R. 1232, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, which was favorably reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with unanimous support in March 2013.

Our comprehensive proposal seeks to streamline and strengthen the Federal IT acquisition process and promote the adoption of best practices from the technology community. We have solicited extensive input from all stakeholders to refine and improve our amendment in an open and transparent manner.

The resulting bipartisan amendment would elevate and empower agency CIOs with authority over, and accountability for, effectively managing the IT portfolio. It would also enhance OMB's role, tasking it with leading enterprise-wide portfolio management, and coordinating shared services and shared platforms across government.

This bipartisan amendment would also empower agencies to eliminate duplicative and wasteful IT contracts that have proliferated for commonly-used, IT Commodity-like investments, such as e-mail. In this era of austerity, agencies cannot afford to spend precious dollars and time creating duplicative, wasteful contracts for products and licenses they already own.

In addition to improving how the government procures IT, this amendment would also enhance how the government deploys these tools. It would accelerate data center optimization to achieve greater operating efficiency and cost-savings, as recommended by the U.S. Government Accountability Office; provide agencies with flexibility to leverage efficient cloud services; and strengthen the accountability and transparency of Federal IT programs. If enacted, 80 percent of the approximately $80 billion annual Federal IT investment would be required to be posted on the public IT Dashboard, compared to the 50 percent coverage that exists today.

Consistent with the principle that public contracts are public documents, our amendment also strengthens transparency in regard to the final negotiated price a company charges a Federal agency for a good or service. Today, far too many agencies negotiate blanket purchase agreements in silos, without any knowledge that another agency has already negotiated a BPA with the same exact vendor, for the same exact product, but at a different price.

Nearly two decades after the Information Technology Management Reform Act and the Federal Acquisition Reform Act were enacted as Division E and Division D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996—reforms that are better known today as the foundational ''Clinger-Cohen Act''—a bipartisan consensus is finally forming around the urgent need to further streamline and strengthen how the Federal Government acquires and deploys IT.

The bipartisan Issa-Connolly Amendment 117 will enhance the statutory framework established by Clinger-Cohen to create an efficient and effective Federal IT procurement system that best serves agencies, industry, and most importantly, the American taxpayer. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan reform measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. We have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm going to use that time to make up for the time that I lost earlier.

What I would like to do is read the letter from the National Guard Association of the United States. This is a letter to Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, and he says:

As you are aware, there is an amendment sponsored by Reps. Van Hollen, Moran, Mulvaney, and Woodall that would strip $5 billion out of the Overseas Contingency Operation funding and the underlying readiness and modernization plus-ups supported in the bill, which includes $400 million for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA). This would have a significant impact on National Guard equipment, as this funding is critical for new equipment purchases not planned for or funded by the active components in the President's budget. We urge you to oppose amendment 39.

Then he goes into some details about what that would mean.

Finally he ends with:

For these reasons, we urge you to oppose amendment 39 to remove the $5 billion in OCO funds, where National Guard's NGREA funds are included. Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

It is signed Gus Hargett, Major General, U.S. Army, Retired, National Guard Association.

I think it is very important that we understand fully what we're talking about in these funds. Congressman VAN HOLLEN referred to General Dempsey saying this was all the money we needed. Let me just read to you from the transcript that he was talking to General Dempsey about in their hearing:

Congressman Van Hollen: General Dempsey, does the OCO request that was made, in your judgment, satisfy our military requirement for OCO?

General Dempsey: Yeah, it does. But this year's request proved inadequate to the task. We have to have some understanding of trying to predict the future 2 years out.

Let me just go back a couple years. They asked for a certain amount of money in last year's budget, but they actually spent $10 billion over that. So they're over-budget coming into this year, and we know, based on past experience, that they're going to spend more than that. And then to try to have an amendment to take $5 billion out of that when we're trying to compensate for the shortfall they had from last year, and then going into this year, is just irresponsible.

When I was in Afghanistan a couple of months ago, I was meeting with a commander there, General Dunford, and he said the thing that people need to understand, as we're winding down this war effort in Afghanistan, and we have to have the troops out of there by the end of 2014, it's going to cost us more because we're closing down the bigger bases, and we have to accomplish that this year.

So we've got the commander saying it's going to cost us more, and we have an amendment saying we should cut $5 billion out. I think it's important that we really put this all in context and understand how those troops who are out there today, fighting, going outside the wire and having attacks on their compounds, are going to be short $5 billion if this amendment is passed.

There exists a nearly $7 billion shortfall in funding to meet just the current readiness requirements. The Army alone needs an additional $3.2 billion beyond what's requested in the President's budget. This is testimony from the chiefs of these different services. The Marine Corps needs another $321.6 million. The Navy is funded $1.62 billion below required levels, and the Air Force $1.3 billion short of needed funding.

So I needed that time, Madam Chair, those 15 seconds that I thought I lost earlier.

But I think it's very important that people understand, this will be one of the most important votes coming up in this next series. We cannot afford to cut money out for warfighters who are over there putting their life on the line for us today.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of my amendment to

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. This amendment gives the land owners and ranchers in the Piñon Canyon community of Southeast Colorado peace of mind and economic certainty by requiring Congressional approval in order for the Department of Defense to expand Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site (PCMS) near Fort Carson, Colorado. It also requires specific appropriation approval for PCMS expansion.

The passage of this amendment would represent a major step forward in providing assurance for the people of Southeast Colorado, who for the last several years have been subjected to a constant state of uncertainty over possible PCMS expansion into their lands. Despite an annual funding ban placed on the Department of the Army that effectively prohibits the expansion of the boundaries of PCMS, my constituents wonder every year whether the rules will change and the rug will be swept from under their feet. Today I ask my colleagues to come together to create a permanent fix. With the passage of this amendment, there would be stringent guidelines that restrict the expansion of PCMS, fully codifying that Congress must vote on PCMS land acquisition, that the appropriation must be authorized, and that the appropriation must be made.

Make no mistake, the soldiers at Fort Carson exemplify the finest and bravest our nation has to offer. By removing the uncertainty surrounding expansion plans for the PCMS, we believe relations with surrounding communities will stabilize and greatly improve. Our armed forces are focused on defending freedom, and the specter of PCMS expansion has served only as a distraction to those on base and those in neighboring communities.

Few other places in the U.S. have this level of statutory protection. In fact, a Congressional authorization for a specific land acquisition is unique to this amendment. I am pleased to help provide assurance to the farmers, ranchers, and families of Southeast Colorado that there will be no expansion of Piñon Canyon without the deliberation and explicit approval of Congress.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, included in this en bloc amendment is amendment #163 to H.R. 1960, made in order by H. Res. 260. This amendment is bipartisan and submitted by myself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN of Tennessee and Mr. LUJÁN of New Mexico. It will protect and provide public access to Manhattan Project facilities at three Department of Energy former defense sites through the establishment of an historical park. This is essentially the text of H.R. 1208, reported favorably by the Committee on Natural Resources by unanimous consent in May 2013.

These three locations that the park will encompass were integral to the tremendous engineering and human achievements of the Manhattan Project launched during World War II. The three locations are the Hanford site in my home State of Washington, Los Alamos in New Mexico, and Oak Ridge in Tennessee.

The vast majority of the facilities that are eligible to be included in this park are already owned by the federal government, and they are located on former defense lands owned and controlled by the Department of Energy.

As our nation already possesses these pieces of history, the real purpose of this amendment is to officially declare the importance of preserving the history, providing access to the public, and include the unique abilities of the National Park Service to help tell this story.

Currently, some of these facilities slated for inclusion in this park are scheduled to be destroyed at considerable taxpayer expense. A great many local community leaders in all three states and interested citizens have worked to coordinate a commitment to preserving this piece of our history. Additionally, the government will save tens of millions of dollars from foregone destruction, as opposed to the minimal cost of providing public access and park administration.

Under this amendment, not only will history be protected, but so will taxpayer dollars.

Let me describe one example of the savings. The B Reactor at the Hanford site in Washington state is the first full-scale nuclear reactor ever constructed. Walking into its control room and viewing the reactor itself are like walking back in time. The federal government has a legal obligation to clean up the B Reactor that involves partial demolition, then cocooning the building in concrete for 75 years with continual monitoring, before final removal and demolition at a total cost in today's dollars of $90–100 million. With the amendment, this $100 million will not be spent and this piece of history will not be demolished.

This matter has been carefully studied by both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy. Both Departments and the National Park Service support this action. On behalf of the Obama Administration, Interior Secretary Salazar has repeatedly expressed support for the park, as have Department of Energy officials of both the Obama and Bush Administrations.

In recognition of the important contributions to the Manhattan Project by the men and women at sites across the country, the amendment contains a provision allowing communities like Dayton, Ohio, for example, outside the historical park, to receive technical assistance and support from the Department of the Interior as they seek to preserve and manage their own Manhattan Project park resources.

Many, many individuals and organizations have dedicated countless hours towards this effort to preserve and tell this piece of history, and to ensure current and future generations not only will learn this story, but be able to visit and see it themselves. Among those endorsing this effort are the Atomic Heritage Foundation, the National Parks Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Energy Communities Alliance, the City of Richland Washington, the City of Oak Ridge Tennessee, the Tri-City Development Council, and many more in Los Alamos and other areas across the nation. Additionally, this effort has received strong endorsements from newspapers from one side of our nation to the other, including the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, and the Los Angeles Times.

This is a good amendment that preserves and shares our nation's history.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I rise to discuss of my amendment, number 146, to H.R. 1960, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014." My amendment simply states that nothing in the bill should be construed as an authorization for the use of military force against Iran. I would like to thank the cosponsors of my amendment: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota, and Ms. LEE of California. I would also like to thank Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for accepting this amendment in en bloc amendment number eight. By adopting this amendment, the House of Representatives is making it clear, for the second straight year, that none of the provisions in this bill should be interpreted as a war authorization against Iran.

In recent months, the possibility of a preemptive military strike against Iran has been openly discussed as a policy option of last resort as our country and our allies determine how to best confront the challenge posed by Iran's nuclear program.

At the same time, this national discussion has prompted a large number of current and former military and intelligence officials to come forward to encourage the Congress and the Administration to consider the possible consequences, both intended and unintended, of such a strike.

These include high-level former U.S. and Israeli national security officials, including a Bush administration National Intelligence Council chairman, a former national intelligence officer for the Near East and South Asia, Colin Powell's chief of staff, five retired generals, the former Director of the Israeli Mossad, and a former Chief of Staff of the Israeli Defense Forces.

These experts have raised concerns that an attack on Iran could possibly result in serious harm to the world economy, potentially ignite a regional war, and even push Iran into building a nuclear weapon.

With consequences as serious as these being raised by outside and former national security experts, it is critical that any decision to initiate military action against Iran be rigorously debated and, if necessary, be backed by a separate war authorization.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting my amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chair, I rise to strongly oppose Amendment #171 to H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2014. This amendment is part of what for many of our Republican colleagues is an obsession with singling out the District of Columbia for anti-democratic bullying. There is no federal law that exempts active duty military personnel in their personal capacities from otherwise applicable federal firearms laws, except for residency requirements, or from any state or local firearms laws. Yet this amendment expresses the sense of Congress that active duty military personnel should be exempt from the gun laws of only one local jurisdiction, the District of Columbia. If the sponsor of this amendment believes that active duty military personnel should be exempt from federal, state or local firearms laws, why did he not offer an amendment that would apply nationwide instead of only to the District of Columbia? Republicans, who profess to support a limited federal government and local control of local matters, pick on the District of Columbia because they think they can. They are wrong.

The sponsor of this amendment lives in the past, acting as if the changes D.C. made to its gun laws after the Supreme Court's Heller decision in 2008 had never happened and as if a federal district court and a federal appeals court have not upheld the constitutionality of those revised gun laws. The sponsor also acts as if the Supreme Court's McDonald decision in 2010 had not happened. In McDonald, the court said that the Second Amendment does not confer the ''right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose.''

This amendment is the second time this year the sponsor has tried to interfere in the local affairs of the District of Columbia. Earlier this year, the sponsor introduced this amendment as a stand-alone bill. Although this amendment is non-binding, we will fight every attack on our rights as a local government, just as any member here would. This amendment does nothing less than attempt to pave the way for actual inroads into the District of Columbia's gun safety laws. The majority can expect a fierce fight from us whenever they treat the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia as second-class citizens. The House adopted this amendment last year, but, working with our allies, led by Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL LEVIN and House Armed Services Committee Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, we were able to keep it out of the final bill, and we will fight to do so again this year.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, I am pleased to cosponsor this bipartisan amendment, which would prohibit the Defense Department from circumventing Congressional intent with regard to Russian state arms dealer Rosoboronexport. This amendment prohibits the Department of Defense from purchasing military helicopters from Rosoboronexport—a company that has been supplying weapons to Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in its ''campaign of terror against its own people,'' as characterized by Secretary of State Kerry.

The civil unrest and violence that has engulfed Syria and fueled instability across the region just entered its third year. This week, the United Nations reported that 93,000 people have been killed in this conflict. In addition, more than 1.6 million Syrian refugees are now displaced across five countries, and it is estimated that half of the population of Syria will be in need of aid by the end of this year.

Russia has been the Assad regime's main arms supplier, recently announcing that it would provide Syria with advanced S–300 missile defense batteries. The Syrian Army also requested 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenades, and sniper rifles with night-vision sights from Rosoboronexport.

The bipartisan amendment before us today, which I am pleased to cosponsor with Representatives DELAURO, GRANGER, MORAN, KINGSTON, ELLISON, and WOLF, would simply clarify the restrictions outlined in last year's defense authorization bill, which prohibited the Pentagon from using FY13 funds to enter into any contract with the Russian state arms dealer. Unfortunately, the Defense Department ignored that Congressional direction and found a way to maneuver around the law. Defense officials announced in April that they would use FY12 Afghanistan Security Forces Funds to purchase 30 more Mi–17 helicopters from Rosoboronexport. The signing of this contract is imminent.

Our amendment would ensure that no funding is used to purchase equipment from this Russian arms dealer unless it cooperates with a pending Defense Contract Audit Agency review of another contract in which Rosoboronexport is suspected of overcharging the U.S. Navy. Moreover, the amendment would also ensure that future helicopter purchases for the Afghan National Security Force will be competitively bid.

I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment, which will hold this Russian arms dealer accountable for its reprehensible role in the Syrian conflict, as well as ensure that the Pentagon complies with Congressional intent.

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

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 496, insert after line 24 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1218. IMPROVEMENT OF THE IRAQI SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

The Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended—

(1) in section 1242, by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) IMPROVED APPLICATION PROCESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014,'';

(2) in section 1244, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Homeland Security, or, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, may provide an alien described in subsection (b) with the status of a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a)(27)), and shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, ensure efficiency by which applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a) are processed so that all steps incidental to the issuance of such visas, including required screenings and background checks, are completed not later than 9 months after the date on which an eligible alien applies for such visa, if the alien—'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (4) by adding at the end the following:

''(A) REVIEW PROCESS FOR DENIAL BY CHIEF OF MISSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An applicant who has been denied Chief of Mission approval required by subparagraph (A) shall—

''(I) receive a written decision; and

''(II) be provided 120 days from the date of the decision to request reopening of the decision to provide additional information, clarify existing information, or explain any unfavorable information.

''(ii) SENIOR COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of State shall designate, in the Embassy of the United States in Baghdad, Iraq, a senior coordinator responsible for overseeing the efficiency and integrity of the processing of special immigrant visas under this section, who shall be given—

''(I) sufficiently high security clearance to review Chief of Mission denials in cases that appear to have relied upon insufficient or incorrect information; and

''(II) responsibility for ensuring that an applicant described in clause (i) receives the information described in clause (i)(I).'';

(3) in section 1248, by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report, with a classified annex, if necessary, to—

''(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

''(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall describe the implementation of improvements to the processing of applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a), including information relating to—

''(A) enhancing existing systems for conducting background and security checks of persons applying for special immigrant status, which shall—

''(i) support immigration security; and

''(ii) provide for the orderly processing of such applications without delay;

''(B) the financial, security, and personnel considerations and resources necessary to carry out this subtitle;

''(C) the number of aliens who have applied for special immigrant visas under section 1244 during each month of the preceding fiscal year;

''(D) the reasons for the failure to expeditiously process any applications that have been pending for longer than 9 months;

''(E) the total number of applications that are pending due to the failure—

''(i) to receive approval from the Chief of Mission;

''(ii) for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to complete the adjudication of the Form I-360;

''(iii) to conduct a visa interview; or

''(iv) to issue the visa to an eligible alien;

''(F) the average wait times for an applicant at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E);

''(G) the number of denials or rejections at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E); and

''(H) a breakdown of reasons for denials at by the Chief of Mission based on the categories already made available to denied special immigrant visa applicants in the denial letter sent to them by the Chief of Mission.

''(g) PUBLIC QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish a report on the website of the Department of State that describes the efficiency improvements made in the process by which applications for special immigrant visas under section 1244(a) are processed, including information described in subparagraphs (C) through (H) of subsection (f)(2).''.

SEC. 1219. IMPROVEMENT OF THE AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) REVIEW PROCESS FOR DENIAL BY CHIEF OF MISSION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—An applicant who has been denied Chief of Mission approval shall—

''(aa) receive a written decision; and

''(bb) be provided 120 days from the date of receipt of such opinion to request reconsideration of the decision to provide additional information, clarify existing information, or explain any unfavorable information.

''(II) SENIOR COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of State shall designate, in the Embassy of the United States in Kabul, Afghanistan, a senior coordinator responsible for overseeing the efficiency and integrity of the processing of special immigrant visas under this section, who shall be given—

''(aa) sufficiently high security clearance to review Chief of Mission denials in cases that appear to have relied upon insufficient or incorrect information; and

''(bb) responsibility for ensuring that an applicant described in subclause (I) receives the information described in subclause (I)(aa).'';

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PROHIBITION ON FEES'' and inserting ''APPLICATION PROCESS'';

(B) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall improve the efficiency by which applications for special immigrant visas under paragraph (1) are processed so that all steps incidental to the issuance of such visas, including required screenings and background checks, are completed not later than 6 months after the date on which an eligible alien applies for such visa.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—The Secretary''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report, with a classified annex, if necessary, that describes the implementation of improvements to the processing of applications for special immigrant visas under this subsection, including information relating to—

''(A) enhancing existing systems for conducting background and security checks of persons applying for special immigrant status, which shall—

''(i) support immigration security; and

''(ii) provide for the orderly processing of such applications without delay;

''(B) the financial, security, and personnel considerations and resources necessary to carry out this section;

''(C) the number of aliens who have applied for special immigrant visas under this subsection during each month of the preceding fiscal year;

''(D) the reasons for the failure to expeditiously process any applications that have been pending for longer than 9 months;

''(E) the total number of applications that are pending due to the failure—

''(i) to receive approval from the Chief of Mission;

''(ii) for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to complete the adjudication of the Form I-360;

''(iii) to conduct a visa interview; or

''(iv) to issue the visa to an eligible alien;

''(F) the average wait times for an applicant at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E);

''(G) the number of denials or rejections at each of the stages described in subparagraph (E); and

''(H) a breakdown of reasons for denials by the Chief of Mission based on the categories already made available to denied special immigrant visa applicants in the denial letter sent to them by the Chief of Mission.

''(13) PUBLIC QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish a report on the website of the Department of State that describes the efficiency improvements made in the process by which applications for special immigrant visas under this subsection are processed, including information described in subparagraph (C) through (H) of paragraph (12).''.

SEC. 1219. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(b) PURPOSE.—Expressing the Sense of the House or Representatives that the Special Immigration Visa programs authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 and the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 are critical to the U.S. national security, and that these programs must be reformed and extended in order to meet the Congressional intent with which they were created.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress created the Special Immigration Visa program for the purposes of protecting and aiding the many brave Iraqis and Afghans whose lives, and the lives of their families, were endangered as a result of their faithful and valuable service to the United States during Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

(2) The Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program is set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2013.

(3) The Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa program is set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2014.

(4) Despite the pending expiration of the Special Immigrant Visa programs, many brave Iraqis, Afghans, and their families, continue to face ongoing and serious threats as a result of their employment by or on behalf of the U.S. Government.

(5) Between FY08-FY12, only 22 percent of the available Iraqi SIVs (5,500 visas out of 25,000 visas) have been issued and 12 percent of the available Afghan SIVs (1,051 visas out of 8,500 visas) have been issued.

(6) As the Washington Post reported in October 2012, over 5,000 documentarily complete Afghan SIV applications remained in a backlog.

(7) The implementation of the Special Immigration Visa programs has been protracted and inefficient.

(8) The application and approval process for the Special Immigration Visa program is unnecessarily opaque and difficult to navigate.

(9) Applicants in both Iraq and Afghanistan often have effusive recommendations from numerous military personnel, have served the U.S. war efforts for many years, and have served valiantly, in some instances literally taking a bullet for a U.S. service member, and yet are denied approval for a Special Immigration Visa with little to no transparency.

(10) Overly narrow provisions contained in the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 leave many deserving Afghans and their families in need of U.S. assistance, but unable to access the Special Immigration Visa program.

(11) The United States has a responsibility to follow through on its promise to protect those Iraqis and Afghans who have risked their lives to aid our troops and protect America's security.

(12) The extension and reform of the Iraq and Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa programs is a matter of national security.

(13) The extension and reform of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program is essential to the U.S. mission in Afghanistan.

(c) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Iraq and Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa programs should be—

(1) reformed by—

(A) ensuring applications are processed in a timely, and transparent fashion;

(B) providing parity between the two Special Immigrant Visa programs so that Afghan principal applicants, like Iraqi principal applicants, are able to include their spouse, children, siblings, and parents; and

(C) expanding eligibility for the Special Immigrant Visa programs to Afghan or Iraqi men and women employed by, or on behalf of, a media or nongovernmental organization headquartered in the United States, or an organization or entity closely associated with the United States mission in Iraq or Afghanistan that has received U.S. Government funding through an official and documented contract, award, grant, or cooperative agreement; and

(2) extended in—

(A) Iraq through the year 2018, without authorizing any additional Special Immigrant Visas as authorized in the original statue; and

(B) Afghanistan through the year 2018, without authorizing any additional Special Immigrant Visas as authorized in the original statue.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Madam Chair, we spend appropriate time on the floor commemorating the bravery of our men and women who were in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there were other brave men and women who worked with our soldiers, putting themselves in harm's way, and I'm referring to foreign nationals—Iraqis and Afghanistan citizens who were interpreters and who were drivers, people working for NGOs, people who made it possible for our troops to perform at the highest level. They served shoulder to shoulder with our men and women in uniform.

Now, I am pleased that there is a partial extension in the Special Immigrant Visa program in the underlying bill for Iraqis and Afghanis. It's important that we have these special visas. I have been pleased to have played a small role in helping create the Special Immigrant Visa program that enables these people to escape harm's way. Many of them are in danger of being killed because people know that they helped our forces, and they are left behind.

I really appreciate the ranking member, the chair, and their staff for the work to help partially extend the Special Immigration Visa program. But this bipartisan amendment, offered with my colleagues, Congresswoman GABBARD and Representatives KINZINGER and STIVERS, all three of whom served in the field of battle, is an opportunity to help ensure these programs finish the job for which they were created.

□ 1100

These programs expire for Iraq at the end of this fiscal year. That's September 30, and the following September 30 for Afghanistan. And while they are set to expire, those in Iraq and Afghanistan who made our mission possible continue to be plagued by inefficiencies and bureaucratic hurdles. Through fiscal year 2012, only 22 percent of the available Iraq SIVs have been issued, and only 12 percent for Afghanistan.

The Washington Post reported that over 5,000 documentarily complete Afghan applications remain in a backlog. The backlog and delay means not just weeks or months, but years for those who risked their lives to help the U.S. mission, and means living in constant fear and hiding, knowing they or their families could be killed at any moment.

Our amendment demonstrates a strong commitment from the House for comprehensive extension and reform in conference. It enhances the programs by providing efficiency, transparency, accuracy, and oversight.

Madam Chair, I yield the remaining time to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment to improve the Special Immigrant Visa programs for local civilians who put their lives in danger to aid our troops as they've served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We see in times of war and in times of conflict that our servicemembers are lauded and honored for their service and tremendous sacrifice, but there are many stories that remain untold. There are many unseen heroes who sacrifice every single day as they serve alongside our troops.

During my first deployment to Iraq, I served in a medical unit, and we had two interpreters who worked with us on a daily basis. One was named Kaddam. He sat in our clinic, went out on missions with our medics. I spoke to him almost every day and learned so much about his family, his community, and the challenges that he overcame every day to just work with us.

He drove home every night with a firearm under his driver's seat, in fear, not only of his own life, but in fear of the health and safety of his family. He had a few young children, and he spoke very strongly about his hopes and his dreams for them being able to have a future, to have an education, which was a far cry from the life that he was living there; and that's why he served with us.

We had another interpreter who we called, our Hawaii unit called Kahuna. And his situation was very different. He lived in secrecy, where his neighbors and his friends didn't know that he was working with us; and because of that, he stayed in our camp. He lived with us and worked with us on a daily basis because he believed in what we were doing, and he wouldn't want to risk his family's life.

The stories go on and on of those who have sacrificed so much, not only because they believed in what we were doing, what our mission was, what our work was, but in the hopes that they could also live a free life for themselves, a life where they were not fraught on a daily basis with just getting by.

And for that, I personally stand in strong support of this.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment; however, I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate you yielding.

And, Mr. BLUMENAUER, thank you for leading on this, Ms. GABBARD and Mr. STIVERS as well. This is such an important issue.

You know, we're a Nation of commitments, and a lot of the times Washington gets this reputation of Republicans and Democrats don't agree on anything, and we just fight like cats and dogs. I feel like some of that is true, but I think this is a great example of where, frankly, people are coming together to say as a Nation what's the right thing to do here.

We've made commitments. We've taken ourselves and made promises to people, and people have put themselves out on the line for us. What's the right thing to do?

I would even dare to speculate that those of us that are sponsoring this amendment probably don't even agree on the future of the Iraq war or the Afghanistan war. But we do know that we believe we have to hold to this.

As Ms. GABBARD was talking about, there's a lot of unsung heroes in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. I experienced it as well as a pilot in the military as people that were Iraqi nationals, in my case, that really stood up and put their lives on the line in order to fight for a new Iraq, to fight for a new freedom, to provide for their families, and to understand that they want to build an alliance between Iraq and the United States.

And a lot of them went home at night, as was eloquently expressed, went home at night in fear that this was going to cost them their lives, but knowing that the strength and the power of the United States was there with them, and that they could rest easy at night, knowing that we could keep to our words.

Unfortunately, many of these folks have been killed or targeted for killing, and do continue to live in fear. And so we created a program which would allow a lot of these that have put their lives on the line in order to facilitate what our interest is in Afghanistan and Iraq, to be able to come to the United States.

And, unfortunately, this has been bogged down in bureaucracy that doesn't make a lot of sense to me. It's been bogged down in the definition of whether they worked for the United States or whether they actually worked for ISAF. Well, I would tend to say that whether you worked for ISAF or the United States, you should probably fall under this program.

I think it's just right that we, as a Nation, figure out what's going wrong and do this, and I think this is a great opportunity. This is a great opportunity to come together and say, you know, you put your life on the line for us; we're going to do everything we can for you.

I think about all the times when I would be ready to go fly and, you know, you talk to folks that are associated with what we're doing; and had we not had interpreters there to be able to bring the languages, frankly, the United States and Iraq or Afghanistan together, we'd often just be staring at each other, not knowing what we're thinking, but we're each thinking something.

But to be able to have these folks that come together and really talk

about what it is that we need to do is the right thing to do.

I just, again, want to say that, as Americans, we have to hold to our commitments. This program provides lifesaving protection to those that served us. It will provide refuge to the countless Iraqis and Afghan civilians that have helped us, and it's the right thing to do.

So, again, I just want to say to Mr. BLUMENAUER, to Ms. GABBARD, to Mr. STIVERS and to everybody watching, frankly, and listening to these proceedings, thank you for your help.

Thank you to America for standing up and doing the right thing, and to those that continue to defend us day by day.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 137 printed in part B of House Report 113–108.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII of division A, add the following new section:

SEC. 12__. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT FROM ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) LIMITATION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2013 may be used for the purchase of any equipment from Rosoboronexport until the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that, to the best of the Secretary's knowledge—

(1) Rosoboronexport is cooperating fully with the Defense Contract Audit Agency;

(2) Rosoboronexport has not delivered S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles to Syria; and

(3) no new contracts have been signed between the Bashar al Assad regime in Syria and Rosoboronexport since January 1, 2013.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that the waiver in order to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport is in national security interest of the United States.

(2) REPORT.—If the Secretary waives the limitation in subsection (a) pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 30 days before purchasing equipment from Rosoboronexport pursuant to the waiver, a report on the waiver. The report shall be submitted in classified or unclassified form, at the election of the Secretary. The report shall include the following:

(A) An explanation why it is in the national security interest of the United States to purchase equipment from Rosoboronexport.

(B) An explanation why comparable equipment cannot be purchased from another corporation.

(C) An assessment of the cooperation of Rosoboronexport with the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

(D) An assessment of whether and how many S–300 advanced anti-aircraft missiles have been delivered to the Assad regime by Rosoboronexport.

(E) A list of the contracts that Rosoboronexport has signed with the Assad regime since January 1, 2013.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITIVELY BID CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall award any contract that will use United States funds for the procurement of helicopters for the Afghan Security Forces using competitive procedures based on requirements developed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 260, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strengthen a prohibition unanimously supported last year to stop the Defense Department from purchasing equipment from the Russian arms dealer Rosoboronexport.

As we have debated this bill, estimates of the death toll in Syria hit 93,000 and the administration confirmed use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime. Yet, remarkably, U.S. taxpayers continue to provide subsidies to Russia's arms dealer through no-bid Pentagon purchases of Mi-17 helicopters, even as the firm continues to serve as the top supplier of the weapons the Syrian regime is using to fuel the tragic war.

In fact, the Russian arms dealer recently took an order from the Syrian Army for a wide range of weaponry, and the possibility remains that Russia may provide Syria with S–300 air defense systems.

□ 1110

It is unacceptable that at the same time the Pentagon is purchasing Mi-17 helicopters for the Afghan National Security Forces from Rosoboronexport through no-bid contracts that do not allow U.S. companies to compete.

Last year, the Army purchased 31 Mi-17s from the Russian arms dealer. The President then signed into law last year's defense bill banning the Pentagon from using 2013 funds to enter into a contract with the Russian arms dealer. Yet, in a clear violation of the spirit of the law, DOD announced in April it would use 2012 Afghanistan Security Forces funds to purchase 30 more Mi-17s, a contract signing that is imminent. Meanwhile, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, or DCAA, attempted an audit of Rosoboronexport's pricing of Mi-17 helicopters, which the firm refused to cooperate with. This is outrageous.

My bipartisan amendment prohibits the Pentagon from purchasing equipment from the Russian arms maker unless the Secretary certifies the firm is cooperating with DCAA, not delivering S–300 missile defense batteries to Syria, and has not signed new contracts with Syria since the beginning of the year. The amendment also requires that any new contract for helicopters for the Afghans be competitively bid.

The Defense Department should not engage in contracts with companies arming the Syrian regime. This can and must stop. Furthermore, if we are going to spend U.S. taxpayers' dollars to provide helicopters to the Afghan National Security Forces, we should spend those dollars for the purchase of U.S.-made helicopters.

I urge support for my amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who has worked on this issue with me.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from Connecticut—and the chairman of the committee because I trust that he will support this as well.

This amendment passed overwhelmingly last year, bipartisan vote. The problem is that the Defense Department ignored it. They went ahead, continuing to buy weapons from Rosoboronexport, the very same Russian arms supplier that is enabling President Assad to kill more than 90,000 of his own people, who is now, we confirmed, using chemical weapons against his people. 1.6 million Syrian refugees are scattered across five countries; and within the year, half of the Syrian population is going to be in need of aid. So this has to be fixed. This is not a sustainable situation.

The Obama administration says, well, we are going to have to get more aggressively involved, supplying more military assistance to the insurgents. But think about this: the problem is that Assad is getting all the weapons he wants. In fact, he's asked this Russian arms exporter, Rosoboronexport, for advanced S–300 missile defense batteries, 20,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles, 20 million rounds of ammunition, machine guns, grenade launchers, grenade sniper rifles with night vision sights. Mi-17 helicopters are also made by Rosoboronexport, and we're buying helicopters from them. Can't we coordinate the right hand with the left

hand? We should not be basically subsidizing Rosoboronexport, which is a large part of the problem in Syria.

Some have suggested that without Russia's aid, President Assad cannot continue killing his own people. Now, I don't know that we can ever convince President Putin to stop this—it's obviously a state-owned arms supplier—but surely the Congress can say, no, don't purchase from the same person that is supplying the Syrian regime.

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 Connecticut will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–108 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 25 by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. GIBSON of New York.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 19 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

Amendment No. 123 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 137 by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

AYES—239

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Johnson (GA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter
Westmoreland

□ 1142

Mr. FARR and Ms. BROWNLEY of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BARTON, CRAWFORD, DUFFY, and LIPINSKI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

52ND ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have my 7-year-old son, Jack, with me this week.

As we walked on the floor, he asked me, ''Daddy, why is that trophy on that desk?''

And I said, ''Well, son, they won the game last night.''

So I rise in reluctant recognition of the fact that last night, at Nationals Park, the Democrats squeaked out a 22–0 victory over the stalwart Republican team.

Our MVP is Senator JEFF FLAKE from Arizona, who was a Member of this body until last year. We had a number of other Members who played very well—JOHN SHIMKUS, BILL JOHNSON, MIKE CONAWAY, RODNEY DAVIS, RON DESANTIS, and the list goes on and on. The fact remains that the Democrats won, and they are entitled to the trophy.

Our hats are off to you.

With that, I yield to my good friend, the manager from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKE DOYLE.

Mr. DOYLE. First off, I want to thank my good friend JOE BARTON—he is my good friend—for a good game last night.

I can't really single out individuals. This was a team effort on the Democratic side. Our team had 24 hits and no errors in the field. CEDRIC RICHMOND normally strikes out a lot of batters, and, last year, Cedric had 16 strikeouts. For the first five innings, Cedric didn't strike out a single batter. We had 15 putouts in the field. When you hit the ball, we fielded it, and we made the throws to first, and we made the plays.

It was the best team effort that I've seen out of the Democratic side in the 19 years I've been associated with the game, and I want to congratulate my team.

As my good friend JOE BARTON knows, the real winners of this game are three charities. We broke a record this year. We raised $300,000 for our charities—the Washington Boys & Girls Club, the Washington Literacy Council, and the Dream Foundation, which is going to help children in the Seventh Ward in Washington, D.C. This is going to be a great program for the kids—for boys and girls to learn baseball, but also to learn more important things in after-school learning centers and the like.

So, to the charities—the real winners of this game—congratulations.

This is a great tradition that helps bring us together. I can tell you that the members of the Republican baseball team are friends of ours, and we enjoy the camaraderie and the game every year, and we look forward to it again next year.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

There was no objection.

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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 362, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—61

Bass	Higgins	Nolan
Blumenauer	Himes	Pallone
Braley (IA)	Holt	Payne
Clarke	Honda	Pelosi
Clay	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Conyers	Jeffries	Pocan
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Levin	Rush
DeGette	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda T.
Dingell	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lowey	Schakowsky
Doyle	Maloney, Carolyn	Schrader
Ellison	Matheson	Serrano
Eshoo	McCollum	Slaughter
Esty	McDermott	Speier
Farr	McGovern	Tierney
Fattah	Miller, George	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Waters
Grijalva	Nadler	Watt
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Welch
Hastings (FL)		

NOES—362

Aderholt	Cooper	Hall
Alexander	Cotton	Hanabusa
Amash	Courtney	Hanna
Amodei	Cramer	Harper
Andrews	Crawford	Harris
Bachus	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Barber	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Culberson	Heck (NV)
Barr	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Hensarling
Barton	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Becerra	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Benishek	Delaney	Horsford
Bentivolio	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Hudson
Bilirakis	Denham	Huelskamp
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (NY)	DeSantis	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hunter
Black	Deutch	Hurt
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Bonamici	Duckworth	Issa
Bonner	Duffy	Jackson Lee
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (GA)
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks (AL)	Enyart	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Jones
Broun (GA)	Fincher	Jordan
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Brownley (CA)	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Buchanan	Fleming	Keating
Bucshon	Flores	Kelly (IL)
Burgess	Forbes	Kelly (PA)
Bustos	Fortenberry	Kennedy
Butterfield	Foxx	Kildee
Calvert	Frankel (FL)	Kilmer
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Capito	Gabbard	King (NY)
Capps	Gallego	Kingston
Capuano	Garamendi	Kinzinger (IL)
Cárdenas	Garcia	Kirkpatrick
Carney	Gardner	Kline
Carson (IN)	Garrett	Kuster
Carter	Gerlach	Labrador
Cartwright	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Cassidy	Gibson	Lamborn
Castor (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Castro (TX)	Gohmert	Langevin
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gosar	Larsen (WA)
Cicilline	Gowdy	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Granger	Latham
Clyburn	Graves (GA)	Latta
Coble	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Coffman	Grayson	LoBiondo
Cohen	Green, Al	Loebsack
Cole	Green, Gene	Long
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Lowenthal
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
Conaway	Grimm	Luetkemeyer
Connolly	Guthrie	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cook	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Lynch	Polis	Smith (NE)
Maffei	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Price (GA)	Smith (WA)
Marino	Price (NC)	Southerland
Massie	Quigley	Stewart
Matsui	Radel	Stivers
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Stockman
McCaul	Rangel	Stutzman
McClintock	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
McHenry	Reichert	Takano
McIntyre	Renacci	Terry
McKeon	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McMorris Rodgers	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McNerney	Rigell	Thornberry
Meadows	Roby	Tiberi
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tipton
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Titus
Meng	Rogers (KY)	Tonko
Messer	Rogers (MI)	Tsongas
Mica	Rohrabacher	Turner
Michaud	Rokita	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rooney	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Miller, Gary	Roskam	Vargas
Moran	Ross	Veasey
Mullin	Rothfus	Vela
Mulvaney	Royce	Visclosky
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Wagner
Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Walberg
Negrete McLeod	Ruppersberger	Walden
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Walorski
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Nugent	Salmon	Wasserman Schultz
Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Nunnelee	Sanford	Weber (TX)
O'Rourke	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Olson	Schiff	Wenstrup
Owens	Schneider	Westmoreland
Palazzo	Schock	Whitfield
Pascrell	Schwartz	Williams
Pastor (AZ)	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Wolf
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Peters (CA)	Sessions	Woodall
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Peterson	Sherman	Yoder
Petri	Shimkus	Yoho
Pittenger	Shuster	Young (AK)
	Simpson	Young (FL)
	Sinema	Young (IN)
	Sires	

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Costa	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1152

Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—134

Alexander
Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Gardner
Gosar
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Noem
Nolan
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Reichert
Richmond
Roby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman

NOES—290

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1156

Mr. CARDENAS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. MAFFEI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 71, noes 353, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—71

Amash
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Capuano
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters
Welch

NOES—353

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon

McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1200

Mr. ENGEL changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. LARSEN OF WASHINGTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—195

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1204

Mr. PERRY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 301, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—123

Aderholt
Amash
Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Capps

Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Coffman
Conyers
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Enyart
Eshoo
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foxx
Garamendi
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kind
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
Meadows
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Radel
Reed
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothfus
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Walz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Yoho

NOES—301

Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1209

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LABRADOR, McHENRY, GUTIERREZ, and PERRY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. COFFMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 313, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—110

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Cicilline
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Fattah
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kind
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Meehan
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rahall
Ribble
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOES—313

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin

Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
DeFazio
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1213

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—236

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—188

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1217

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 236 I inadvertently voted "nay" when I intended to Support the Amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 249, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—174

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney

DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Kuster
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1220

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 237, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 274, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—150

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—274

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin

Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1223

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—146

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—278

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1227

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 232, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—191

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes

Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter
Vargas

□ 1230

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

AYES—420

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey	Waters	Wilson (SC)
Vela	Watt	Wittman
Velázquez	Waxman	Wolf
Visclosky	Weber (TX)	Womack
Wagner	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Walberg	Welch	Yarmuth
Walden	Wenstrup	Yoder
Walorski	Westmoreland	Yoho
Walz	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Wasserman Schultz	Williams	Young (FL)
	Wilson (FL)	Young (IN)

NOES—3

Duncan (TN)	Peterson	Price (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Coffman	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1234

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

AYES—423

Aderholt	Bustos	Crowley
Alexander	Butterfield	Cuellar
Amash	Calvert	Culberson
Amodei	Camp	Cummings
Andrews	Cantor	Daines
Bachus	Capito	Davis (CA)
Barber	Capps	Davis, Danny
Barletta	Capuano	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Cárdenas	DeFazio
Barrow (GA)	Carney	DeGette
Barton	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Bass	Carter	DeLauro
Beatty	Cartwright	DelBene
Becerra	Cassidy	Denham
Benishek	Castor (FL)	Dent
Bentivolio	Castro (TX)	DeSantis
Bera (CA)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	Dingell
Bishop (UT)	Clay	Doggett
Black	Cleaver	Doyle
Blackburn	Clyburn	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Coble	Duffy
Bonamici	Cohen	Duncan (SC)
Bonner	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Ellmers
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Engel
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Enyart
Bridenstine	Conyers	Eshoo
Brooks (AL)	Cook	Esty
Brooks (IN)	Cooper	Farenthold
Broun (GA)	Costa	Farr
Brown (FL)	Cotton	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fincher
Buchanan	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Bucshon	Crawford	Fleischmann
Burgess	Crenshaw	Fleming
Flores	Lee (CA)	Ribble
Forbes	Levin	Rice (SC)
Fortenberry	Lewis	Richmond
Foster	Lipinski	Rigell
Foxx	LoBiondo	Roby
Frankel (FL)	Loebsack	Roe (TN)
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Rogers (AL)
Frelinghuysen	Long	Rogers (KY)
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Rogers (MI)
Gallego	Lowey	Rohrabacher
Garamendi	Lucas	Rokita
Garcia	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Gardner	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Roskam
Gerlach	Lummis	Ross
Gibbs	Lynch	Rothfus
Gibson	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney, Carolyn	Royce
Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz
Goodlatte	Marchant	Runyan
Gosar	Marino	Ruppersberger
Gowdy	Massie	Rush
Granger	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon
Grayson	McCaul	Sánchez, Linda T.
Green, Al	McClintock	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McCollum	Sanford
Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Sarbanes
Griffith (VA)	McGovern	Scalise
Grijalva	McHenry	Schakowsky
Grimm	McIntyre	Schiff
Guthrie	McKeon	Schneider
Gutierrez	McKinley	Schock
Hahn	McMorris Rodgers	Schrader
Hall	McNerney	Schwartz
Hanabusa	Meadows	Schweikert
Hanna	Meehan	Scott (VA)
Harper	Meeks	Scott, Austin
Harris	Meng	Scott, David
Hartzler	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Sessions
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)	Sherman
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Shuster
Higgins	Moore	Simpson
Himes	Moran	Sinema
Hinojosa	Mullin	Sires
Holding	Mulvaney	Slaughter
Holt	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Horsford	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Smith (TX)
Hudson	Negrete McLeod	Smith (WA)
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Southerland
Huffman	Noem	Speier
Huizenga (MI)	Nolan	Stewart
Hultgren	Nugent	Stivers
Hunter	Nunes	Stockman
Hurt	Nunnelee	Stutzman
Israel	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)
Issa	Olson	Takano
Jackson Lee	Owens	Terry
Jeffries	Palazzo	Thompson (CA)
Jenkins	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (OH)	Pastor (AZ)	Thornberry
Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Tierney
Jones	Pearce	Tipton
Jordan	Pelosi	Titus
Joyce	Perlmutter	Tonko
Kaptur	Perry	Tsongas
Keating	Peters (CA)	Turner
Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)	Upton
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Valadao
Kennedy	Petri	Van Hollen
Kildee	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
Kilmer	Pittenger	Veasey
Kind	Pitts	Vela
King (IA)	Pocan	Velázquez
King (NY)	Polis	Visclosky
Kingston	Pompeo	Wagner
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walberg
Kirkpatrick	Price (GA)	Walden
Kline	Price (NC)	Walorski
Kuster	Quigley	Walz
Labrador	Radel	Wasserman Schultz
LaMalfa	Rahall	Waters
Lamborn	Rangel	Watt
Lance	Reed	Waxman
Langevin	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Lankford	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Larsen (WA)		Welch
Larson (CT)		Wenstrup
Latham		Westmoreland
Latta		Whitfield
		Williams
		Wilson (FL)
		Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Wolf
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yarmuth
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (FL)
		Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Edwards	Neal
Campbell	Fudge	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Coffman	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1237

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 241 and 242, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 260, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1240

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 5___. CONVENING AUTHORITY RELIANCE ON OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PROSECUTOR RECOMMENDATION TO PROCEED TO TRIAL OF ANY CHARGE INVOLVING SEXUAL ASSAULT OR OTHER SEX-RELATED OFFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 834 of title 10, United States Code (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended—

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

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

''(c)(1) In the case of any charge involving sexual assault or other sex-related offense covered by section 920, 920a, 920b, or 920c of this title (article 120, 120a, 120b, or 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), the convening authority shall also refer the charge to the Office of the Chief Prosecutor of the armed force of which the accused is a member for additional consideration and advice unless the victim (or the parent or legal guardian of the victim if the victim is a minor) of such offense elects that such charge only be referred to the staff judge advocate pursuant to subsection (a).

''(2) If the Office of the Chief Prosecutor is referred a charge covered by paragraph (1) and recommends that the charge be referred to trial, the recommendation shall be binding on the convening authority and the convening authority shall promptly direct a trial of the charge.''.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF PROSECUTOR.—For any Armed Force for which the position of Chief Prosecutor does not exist before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Judge Advocate General of that Armed Force shall establish the position of Chief Prosecutor and appoint as the Chief Prosecutor a commissioned officer in the grade of O–6 or above who has significant experience prosecuting sexual assault trials by court-martial.

Mrs. WALORSKI (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, the willingness of our troops to place the Nation first is why the scourge of sexual harassment and assault in the military is so horrific. Just a single case is unacceptable. This is a self-inflicted wound that has no place in the greatest military in the world.

I love the military with every bone in my body. The lessons I learned as an army officer, the camaraderie I experienced are at the core of who I am, just as it is for my brothers and sisters in arms. That is why I am personally devastated to see how many predators continue to abuse and attack one of our own.

The military is a place of great discipline, technical proficiency, and personal sacrifice for the greater good. It is a place where young men and women grow and thrive, developing as great leaders and team members. This is the case for so many of them. However, for some, the military has now become a place of fear and intimidation.

The services have made significant efforts to try to stamp out sexual harassment and assault, but there are still unacceptable failures in these efforts. With each new piece of data on the rates of sexual assault and on the lack of command responsibility by many in dealing with military sexual trauma, I have gradually come to the conclusion that we need another path to protect the victims.

This amendment adds a new course of action for victims to pursue should they choose it. It empowers them at a time when they feel most powerless with a new option that is outside the chain of command with an independent investigation and prosecution system.

I place the highest priority on the importance of a commander's authority to lead and discipline the men and women under his or her command. However, in the case of sexual crimes, there continues to be failures in the existing processes for investigations and punishments within that chain. That is why we must empower victims with an additional choice so that they can seek justice.

There are many, many good commanders. My own experience has been a positive one with all of my commanders, all of whom were men, being protective of all of their soldiers and doing the right thing. Yet the data shows that there are enough predators and failed commanders that we need to take care of this now. This solution supports command authority but also, importantly, empowers victims by giving them one more option.

The men and women in our Armed Forces are why we live freely in the greatest country in the world. When our warriors face combat, they must be able to focus completely and single-mindedly on the mission at hand. They cannot do this if they are threatened with sexual assault.

When our Nation's parents are approached by their brave young son or daughter who is looking to join the military, these moms and dads need to know without a doubt that their child will be cared for, that they will become disciplined, well-trained leaders. They should not have to fear that their child will become a rape victim.

The military is a place of honor, one where our troops serve with great pride. This amendment is a balanced approach that honors our military by providing the victim with a choice on how to seek justice.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlelady from California, who's been a leader in victims' rights, Ms. SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the heroic lady from Illinois, and I think, for all of us, hearing your words are profound.

What we are seeing here is, not only are there physical wounds, there are emotional wounds. So many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have shared with me the stories of victims who have been raped and sexually assaulted—the fear, the pain, the tears—and they all, to the woman and to the man, have said how powerless they feel.

This particular amendment will give them a little leverage. This amendment is going to give them a choice. This amendment respects the chain of command. This amendment gives them the opportunity to use the chain of command or to seek to go to the chief prosecutor in each of the services to seek an investigation and an evaluation as to whether or not a prosecution should move forward.

We have an opportunity here to really change the face of this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this amendment.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, we worked for months on bipartisan legislation to confront this problem. The time for this Congress to act on this issue is right now. I ask you to support the bipartisan solution in this bill, reject the procedural motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 225, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—194

Andrews	Clyburn	Foster
Barber	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Conyers	Gallego
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Becerra	Costa	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Higgins
Bustos	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	DelBene	Hinojosa
Capps	Deutch	Holt
Capuano	Dingell	Honda
Cárdenas	Doggett	Horsford
Carney	Doyle	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Huffman
Cartwright	Ellison	Israel
Castor (FL)	Engel	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Enyart	Jeffries
Cicilline	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clarke	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Farr	Jones
Cleaver	Fattah	Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann
Bachus
Campbell
Chu
Edwards
Fudge
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Issa
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Poe (TX)
Shea-Porter

□ 1254

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 315, noes 108, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—315

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—108

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clarke
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutch
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)

Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Tierney	Watt	Yarmuth
Tonko	Waxman	Yoho
Van Hollen		

NOT VOTING—11

Bachmann	Fudge	Neal
Campbell	Green, Gene	Poe (TX)
Chu	Markey	Shea-Porter
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1307

Mrs. LUMMIS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 244 final passage, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1960, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1960, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1310

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland was kind enough to note and celebrate my birthday with a colloquy, and luckily, I get to return the favor today. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say happy birthday to my friend, Mr. HOYER, and wish him many, many more birthdays.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for his kindness. The American public must be thinking Geminis are, indeed, schizophrenic. I thank my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1797, the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I also expect the House to consider H.R. 1947, the Federal Agricultural Reform and Risk Management Act. Chairman FRANK LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee have worked very hard to produce a 5-year farm bill with strong reforms, and I look forward to a full debate on the floor.

I thank the gentleman and wish him a happy birthday again.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his good wishes. I thank him for the information. If I can ask him a question initially about the farm bill, which has obviously been very controversial in the past, still remains controversial in many ways, and I'm wondering, in light of the fact that the Senate passed a farm bill in a pretty bipartisan way, 66–27, with 18 Republicans voting in favor, but I know the Speaker has observed the divisions within the Republican Conference, and obviously there are some divisions within our caucus as well, and I'm wondering whether or not in fact the gentleman is confident that we will get to completion and a vote on the farm bill next week.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I would respond by saying that it's certainly our intention to complete deliberation on the farm bill. The Speaker has continued to commit himself and our conference to an open process for this House, and I look forward to a robust debate on what, as the gentleman knows, has been a bipartisan effort at the committee.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. As the gentleman knows, on our side of the aisle, there is very significant concern about the status of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and I would hope that as a rule is considered on that bill, I don't know whether the gentleman knows at this point in time, that we would have an opportunity to have a significant number of amendments on that bill to reflect the House working its will, as the Speaker has so often observed, and I yield to my friend for whatever information he may have. I know that the rule has not been written, and I don't know whether he has any insights on how much flexibility there will be on the rule.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would respond by saying that I do think there is a commitment to genuine and robust debate on all sides. And hopefully, without speaking to details because, as the gentleman knows, the Rules Committee has not met, that would include all subject matter in the bill.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that and look forward to that because I know on both sides of the aisle, this is a bill that has strong feelings among different perspectives on this bill and with respect to different subjects. And so I think as open a rule process and debate process as is possible will be helpful to the final product. I would hope that we can follow that.

Mr. Leader, you mentioned the Unborn Pain bill. I understand and I have some information that says that the text of that bill coming out of committee may be modified in the Rules Committee. Is the gentleman aware of that? And if so, is the gentleman aware of what textual change there may be from the bill that was reported out of the committee?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

There has been a lot of discussion that I have been receiving, comments, input from Members, and we're looking at weighing those suggestions and inputs as to how the Rules Committee will deliberate in terms of the rule and how the bill comes to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. His comment reflects what I've heard. There is a lot of discussion going on about this. Hopefully we would get significant notice of what changes there might be. Can the gentleman tell me, would it be safe to assume that this bill will be considered, when and if considered, no earlier than Wednesday, and will be considered Wednesday and Thursday? And I say that, I will tell you, some of my Members who are very concerned about this bill are very concerned about when it might be brought up, the timing from their perspectives. This is a very serious piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows, again from all perspectives, and I would hope that this bill would be, in light of the fact that the Rules Committee will probably deal with it—I'm not sure whether they'll deal with it on Tuesday; my presumption is they'll deal with it on Tuesday—but there will be time for proponents and opponents of whatever changes might be recommended to prepare their arguments for the floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would respond by saying, as has been the custom in this Congress and last, we will continue to abide by the 3-day notice, and I do think there will be adequate time for review by parties on all sides.